

RE. NOTICES OF PRIVILEGE MOTIONS AGAINST THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND SHRI ARUN SHOURIE—Contd.

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है। मैं आप की कार्यवाही में बाधा नहीं डालना चाहूंगा लेकिन कुछ ऐसी घटनाएँ हो रही हैं कि आप का ध्यान उस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा और ऐसा करना बहुत जरूरी हो जाता है। कल हमारी राय में आप ने नियम को छोड़ा और तोड़ा। इसके बाद भी आप की राय हम ने मान ली और श्री आडवाणी का भाषण सुन लिया, जो कि मैं समझता हूँ कि ...

श्री उपसभापति : वह तो हमने सुन लिया।

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : मेरी बात तो आप सुन लीजिए। उन्होंने कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कही थी कि जो नहीं हो। सिर्फ दो एक बातें उन्होंने अपमानजनक कहीं थीं जो कि उन को नहीं कहनी चाहिए थीं। तो उन की बात हो गयी और मैं नहीं समझता कि उन के अन्य सहयोगियों के पास कोई नयी बात कहने को है। इस के अलावा इस सदन का वक्त बहुत कीमती है। सरकारी काम बाकी है इस लिये आप इस बहस को यहीं समाप्त कराइये और इसको यहीं समाप्त माना जाये यह मेरा निवेदन है। (व्यवधान) ...

श्री उपसभापति : कल दो घंटा तक प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठा कर आप का पेट नहीं भरा। मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। यह बहस फिर चल सकती है। दिन भर चलेगी।

SHRI J. K. JAIN: Please allow me to rise on a point of order. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I would like to tell Mr. Jain that once we have allowed the matter to be raised, this will be raised. You can waste the time of the House as much as you like I do not mind it.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: The Chair is responsible because you are allowing them. (Interruptions) What is happening is not according to the procedure. Sir, I protest. Whatever is going on this House under your Chairmanship is not under the procedure. And I protest and I stage a walk-out against the behaviour of the Chair. The Chair cannot do this. You are conducting the House against the procedure and I stage a walk-out because we are not to sit here and hear whatever these people are barking here.

At this stage, the hon. Member left the Chamber.

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : मेरा अधिकार है और मैं आप से यह निवेदन कर रहा हूँ और विरोधी पक्ष के सदस्यों से भी यह निवेदन है, कि मेरा बहुत नम्र निवेदन है कि इस सदन का वक्त कीमती है देश का वक्त कीमती है और दूसरे की इज्जत भी कुछ होती है। मैं देख रहा हूँ कि पिछले दस दिनों से ...

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : क्या बात आप कर रहे हैं। (व्यवधान)

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा दूसरा निवेदन यह है कि जिस तरह से आप ने कल सदन की कुछ कार्यवाही को एकपंज किया उस की मैं सराहना करता हूँ लेकिन कुछ गलत परंपराएँ डाली जा रही हैं। प्रधान मंत्री सिर्फ इस देश की ही प्रधान मंत्री नहीं हैं। वेय ग्यतम नेताओं में एक हैं। वं एक महिला हैं और उन्होंने इस देश की मर्यादा बढ़ायी हैं। उन की शान में कुछ कहना इस देश की मर्यादा के खिलाफ है समूचे संसार में उन को प्रतिष्ठा है। (व्यवधान) इस

लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप श्री शाही को निर्देश दें कि वह सदन के सामने क्षमा मांगे क्योंकि यदि वे क्षमा नहीं मांगते हैं तो सारा दुनिया में एक अवयव फैलता है। यह सदन बाथ रूम या टायलेट नहीं है कि जहाँ कोई भी आकर कुछ कह जाय।

यह टायलेट होता शाही जी का तो दूसरी बात थी। लेकिन यह सदन है। इसकी बातें बाहर जाती है और प्रधान मंत्री की शान के खिलाफ जो कुछ कहा गया उस पर उन की प्रतिक्रिया की जाये और उन्हें कहा जाये कि आइन्दा इस तरह के शब्द वे इस्तेमाल न करें। उपसभापति महोदय, मेरी बात आप सुन लीजिए। मेरा आप से पुनः निवेदन है कि आप इस बहस को स्थगित करें और आप अपना निर्णय दें कि विशेषाधिकार का जो प्रस्ताव है वह नहीं लिया जायगा और इस बहस का कोई अर्थ नहीं है क्योंकि बहस हो चुकी है। कल आप ने जो समय दिया था उस में वह समाप्त हो चुकी।

श्री (मौलाना) असरारुल हक (राजस्थान) : मेरी गुजारिश यह है कि कल इस सदन में प्रिविलेज मोशन पर लोभ बोल रहे थे जितना डाढ़वाणी साहब की बोलना था वे बोल लिये, मगर यह बीच में जो टपक पड़े शाही साहब और उन्होंने एक ऐसी बात कही कि जिस से पूरे मुहल में आग लग जायगी (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not write. He will not go on record. (Interrupts). Nothing has been recorded. So, what is the question?

SHRI (MOLANA) ASRARUL HAQ * * *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: आप को शायद पता नहीं कि कल उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा वह न मैं ने सुना और न लिखा गया। फिर आप क्यों बोल

रहे हैं। कोई चर्चा उस पर कैसे होगी? अगर आप उस को लाना चाहते हैं, उन शब्दों को रे.र्ड पर लाना चाहते हैं तो You are free to repeat it. Nowhere has it gone on record. Yes, Mr. Advani.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for ensuring that this important matter is discussed in a proper atmosphere in this House. I am grateful also to the ruling party for enabling us to continue this discussion today. Otherwise, perhaps, it would have ended last evening in an hour or so. But, somehow because of various points of order raised and all that we have been given this opportunity of carrying on the debate today also; though it is rather unfortunate that we will be encroaching upon the non-official business.

Sir, I will try to sum up. I will not repeat anything that I have said yesterday and confine myself to the objectives that I had placed at the outset. One single sentence, statement made by Mr. Venkataraman, the Finance Minister, in the course of his replies to the Calling Attention Motion is what I impugn and what I regard as having misled the House. I hold that he has done so wilfully but at this particular point of time, when I am merely making out a prima facie case, I would say that this House has been misled by his statement and it would be for the Privileges Committee or this whole House to inquire and investigate how this kind of misleading took place. Whether someone else misled Mr. Venkataraman, I do not know. But so far as we are concerned, this is the statement that he made in the House, namely, that he told our House that Mrs. Gandhi did not agree to her name being associated with the Trust, Mr. Antulay proposed to set up. What she agreed to was that the Pratishthan should be established

***Not recorded.

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

and not that her name should be associated with it. And when she came to know about it, she asked them to withdraw her name. The first part refers to consen. The second part refers to withdrawal of her name, when she came to know of it. My contention is that on both these counts, whether she give the consent, Mr. Venkataraman has not told the truth. All the evidence that is available before the country, before us, some of which I mentioned yesterday, I do not propose to repeat it, all that evidence, and that is not evidence from me, it is from the Maharashtra Government, It is from the Government of India, Maharashtra Information Department, and also the press, because what the press reported in October 1980, if it is contradicted only in September 1981, *prima facie*, it would appear that what was said then was correct and it is only because of the nature of the facts that have surfaced, because of the exposure of various scandals, that today it is being contradicted. Otherwise, there is no ground to disbelieve today the Mombai Sarkar, or the Free Press Journal or the Maharashtra Times or the Lok Satta or the Indian Express, when in October 1980 they reported that Mrs. Gandhi gave her consent, when Mr. Antulay in the presence of Congress (I) Legislators thanked Mrs. Gandhi in her presence for having given her consent. And, Sir, when the Trust Deed was filed with the Commissioner—that is my additional point—of Charities, Maharashtra, clause 2 of which says: "The Trust hereby created shall be designed or known as Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan ..."

श्री (मौलाना) असरारिल हक : गनत है

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : बिल्कुल गलत है।

श्रीमती सरोज खापड़ें (महाराष्ट्र): इसकी तारीख बता दें।

श्री लालकृष्ण आडवाणी : मैंने तो उसी दिन वेटरामन जी को कहा था कि आप ट्रस्ट डीड टेबल पर रख दें तो बहस नहीं होगी। (व्यवधान)

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : आप तारीख बता दें।

श्रीमती सरोज खापड़ें : आप तारीख तो बता दें। (व्यवधान)

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : मेरे पास तारीख नहीं है। (व्यवधान)

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पांडेय : (उत्तर प्रदेश)। मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : कौन सा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है इनका? (व्यवधान)

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: Sir, you hear my point of order. (Interruptions.)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: There can be no point of order on this; Sir, I am not yielding.

श्री उपसभापति : डेट नहीं है तो नहीं है। (व्यवधान)

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: You cannot allow a document to be read unless it is ... (Interruptions.)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, para 2 says: "The Trust hereby created shall be designed or known as Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan hereinafter referred as Trust with its headquarters at Bombay and at such other places in Maharashtra and India as the trustees may from time to time decide for convenience."

Sir, I think that on this particular point there can be no dispute whatsoever that from October 1980 and November 1980, up to the month of June 1981—or rather August 1981—this Pratishthan continued to be known as Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan. The account that was

opened by the Pratishthan in a bank was also in the same name. The cheques that were received from various quarters—I do not know what is the amount; but I am told that the amount goes into crores; it will be for the Government to tell us what is the total amount of funds raised—were made out in the name of Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan. Even the Government of Maharashtra issued a cheque—I can give the number also if they want—on 29th October 1980, before it was even registered, by which an amount of Rs. 10 lakhs was paid to Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan.

Sir, these are the facts known to all, on the basis of which if I come to the conclusion that Mrs. Gandhi did give her consent, the Prime Minister did give her consent, how can I be blamed? It would be, perhaps if Mrs. Gandhi herself says that she did not give her consent; but till now the Prime Minister has said not a word about it. She has not said anything, and it would be for the Chairman here to examine whether consent was given or not, and to examine whatever Mr. Venkataraman says. If he wants, he can call for a statement from the Prime Minister and then examine all the documents that we have provided and come to a conclusion whether consent was given or not. My submission is that consent was given; but subsequently when it was found that money was being collected in a manner as would cast a reflection on the whole Government, in the month of June—I have with me a paper published from Bombay by name 'The Daily' which has quoted Mr. R. K. Dhawan's letter to Mr. Antulay, and this is dated June 23... (Interruptions.)

श्रीमती सरोज खापडें : आर० के० धवन का किस्सा कहाँ से आ गया . . . (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is with the Chairman.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, as you say, it is with the Chairman I have no objection; I am merely pointing out this letter because the date is relevant, that is, June 23.

श्रीमती सरोज खापडें : जो यहाँ पर डिफेंड नहीं कर सकता उनका नाम क्यों लिया जा रहा है। इनको उनका नाम लेने का क्या अधिकार है।... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Go to the next point.

श्रीमती सरोज खापडें : जो अपने आपको डिफेंड नहीं कर सकता है उनका नाम क्यों ले रहे हैं।... (व्यवधान)

श्री लालकृष्ण आडवाणी : कुछ भी छिपा नहीं है सब चीजें बाहर हो गई हैं।... (व्यवधान)

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): These are the cover-up agents. (Interruptions).

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, I am glad, you have secured the letter. On June 23rd, she wants that the name be dropped. But the name, is actually dropped in the month of August, when the whole thing has come to the surface. Therefore, even on the second aspect of Mr. Venkataraman's statement that when she came to know of it, she had her name withdrawn, my submission is, she must have known about the name of 'Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan' in the month of October itself ...

(Interruptions.)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

(Interruptions).

SHRI DHARMAVIR (Uttar Pradesh): It is only your presumption.

(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, on both these counts, I hold that Mr. Venkataraman, the Minister of Finance, has wilfully and deliberately misled the House and on the basis of the evidence that I have produced, there is a clear case for a further enquiry into the whole matter by the Committee of Privileges. If I am given consent to raise this matter formally under rule 190, I propose to move a motion referring the whole matter to the Committee of Privileges. Thank you.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : उद्भवापति जो, मेरा विशेषाधिकार हनन का प्रस्ताव श्री वेंकटरामन के खिलाफ है... (व्यवधान) उन्होंने नवन को गुमराह किया है। उन्होंने कहा कि प्रधानमंत्री जो ने प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान में अरुणा नाम जोड़ने को इजाजत नहीं दी। हकीमत यह है कि उन्होंने इसकी इजाजत दी है... (व्यवधान) ।

श्रीमती सरोज खापर्डे : आप सदन में गन्त बात बोल रहे हैं (व्यवधान)

SHRI PILOO MODY: Are you a trustee? (Interruptions).

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा : प्रधानमंत्री जो ने अपने कर कमलों से इसका उद्घाटन किया है। इसके हमारे पास दस्तावेज हैं। मैं आपके सामने कुछ फोटो रखना चाहता हूँ। 9 अक्टूबर, 1980 को मि० अतुल ने ट्रस्ट प्रदान का एकलप किया। बहुत से अजराओं में इसके दस्तावेज हैं 11 अक्टूबर, 1980 को प्रधान मंत्री जो सम्मिलित जाती हैं और अपने कार-नामसों से दस्तखत करती हैं। यह देखिये इस चित्र में अतुल साहब बंगल में खड़े हैं। उसके बाद 16 अक्टूबर, 1980 को पाँच दिनांक पर शत महाराष्ट्र सरकार का पब्लिश-

केशन जा लाक-राज्य है, उसके आ. डेक्का बताते हैं, वह भी आप चुन लीजिए। मैं कष्ट करता हूँ।

"The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, affixed her signature on the document giving her consent to name the Maharashtra Government Trust for promoting talents in literature and arts as Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan... (व्यवधान) ... अतः उनकी हस्ता-

चुप कराइये, फिर हमारे बात सुनिये... (व्यवधान) ... अक्टूबर, 18, 1980 को... (व्यवधान) ... अक्टूबर, 18 1980 को औपचारिक रूप से इंदिरा गांधी प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान का रजिस्ट्रेशन हुआ। सरकारी दस्तावेज बताते हैं। अब सुन लीजिये। अगस्त 30, 1981 को मालूम हुआ है और उस दिन वह नाम हटा दिया। हटाने की बात वहाँ आ जाती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उद्घाटन कैसे होता है, दस्तावेज बनता है, फोटा काटकर होता है।

श्री उपसभापति : वह छ डिये। प्रिविलेज पर आइये।... (व्यवधान) ...।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : ... मैं वह कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत जैसे देश में... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री उपसभापति : मैं सुन रहा हूँ आपको बात को।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : ... इंदिरा गांधी 11 अक्टूबर, को गई... (व्यवधान) ...

श्रीमती सरोज खापर्डे : आप वही रामायण पढ़ रहे हैं... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : उद्भवापति महाशय, 11 अक्टूबर, को उन्होंने उद्घाटन किया और वहाँ कांथेस कार्यकर्ताओं की बैठक हुई। यह अजराओं में आया है कि

उदघाटन किया। इसलिये यह विशेषाधिकार हनन का मामला है... (व्यवधान) ... मैं फिर जोर के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसके लिये एक कमीशन बहाल किया जाय...

श्री उपसभापति : कमीशन की बात छोड़िये। मुझे जो विषय है उस पर आइये।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : और वह कमीशन पता लगाये कि कसे ...

श्री उपसभापति : समाप्त करिये।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : दूसरी बात... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI DHARMAVIR: Sir, I want to draw your attention to the subject of the Calling Attention Motion. It is stated here:

"Shri Sawaisingh Sisodia, Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance, made a statement in response to the 'Calling Attention' matter regarding the reported irregularities in the matter of granting income-tax exemptions to certain Trusts in Maharashtra and maldistribution of essential commodities like cement in that State, raised by Shri Era Sezhiyan ..."

सर, फॉनिंग अटेंशन में विषय द्वारा है चर्चा दूसरी ओर ले जाई जा रही है।

श्री लालकुण्ठ आडवाणी : हमको खुशा होगी अगर यह अगले हफ्ते भी चर्चा। खुशी होगी बहुत अच्छा होगा चलने दोजिये।

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप समाप्त करिये।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : मैं समाप्त कर रहा हूँ।

अगर अमानत उन्होंने जोड़ने को इजाजत नहीं दी तो मेरा कहना है कि 11

अक्टूबर, 1980 में उन्होंने दस्तखत क्यों किये? उस दिन उन्होंने इसकी इजाजत दी यह साफ है और इसलिये इस प्वाइंट पर सदन को गुमराह दिया गया।

अब सवाल यह है कि तब भी यदि नहीं मालूम था, कुछ देर के लिये मन्त्रालयों, 18 नवम्बर, 1980 को इसका रजिस्ट्रेशन हुआ। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कब मालूम हुआ? क्या 30 अगस्त 1981 को मालूम हुआ। इन नौ महोनों में जो धांधलियाँ चलती रही, जो करोड़ों रुबया इकट्ठा किया जा रहा था इंदिरा गांधी प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान के लिये....

श्री उपसभापति : अब आपकी बात समाप्त हो गई।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : उपसभापति महोदय, एवः और बात है जिसके मूलिक मुझे कहना है। थोड़ी देर के लिये इसे हम टेक्निकल बात वह सवत है। वह बात इसमें नहीं आती है वह बात दूसरी है। लेकिन बात यह है कि श्री अंतुले ने यदि यह नहीं बताया प्रधानमंत्री को कि मैं इस नाम इंदिरा गांधी प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान रखने जा रहा हूँ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am calling one by one. Please be patient. Shri Dinesh Goswami.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : और दस्तखत कराये श्रीमता इंदिरा गांधी प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान के नाम पर। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह बहुत बड़ा विश्वासघात किया उस आदर्श के साथ जिन्होंने उसको महाराष्ट्र के सिंहगढ़ पर बैठाना। गांधी के देश में नेहरू के देश में मानकता का तकाजा है... (व्यवधान) और उसने इस्तीफा देकर साजित कर दिया कि उसने गलती की... (व्यवधान) इसलिए इन तमाम बातों की जांच के लिए आप इनका प्रिविलेज के मामले में रखें, कमेटी के सुपुर्द करे (व्यवधान) और वेंकटरामन जी ने सदन को गुमराह किया,

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

इसकी मर्यादा का हनन किया, इसकी सारी गरिमा और प्रतिष्ठा को खत्म कर दिया...

(व्यवधान) इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि ऐसे आदमी को अविलम्ब इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिए जैसे अंतुले जी ने इस्तीफा दिया . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : आप समाप्त करें. . (व्यवधान)

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : अविलम्ब इस्तीफा दें, . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है आप सुन लें. . . (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : मैं सुन लूंगा। मैं सुनने को तयार हूँ, सुनने में मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, मुझे दिन भर सुनना है. . . (व्यवधान) आप बैठ जाइये, इनकी बात सुन लीजिए।

SHRI PILOO MODY: Let there be a debate on this.

मुझे ख़ुशी है आप बोलिए. . . (व्यवधान)

श्री श्रीकान्त वर्मा : श्रीमन, चेयरमैन महोदय ने कहा और आपने भी कल वायदा किया था कि यहां पर पूर्ण बहस नहीं होगी बल्कि कुछ सीमित मुद्दे उठाये जायेंगे और सीमित मुद्दे काफी हद तक आडवाणी जी ने उठा दिये हैं। लेकिन फिर शिव चन्द्र झा जी पूरी बहस उठा रहे हैं यह आपके वायदे के खिलाफ है। कल आपने नियम ताड़ा और आज आप वायदा तोड़ रहे हैं कम से कम इस कुर्सी की परम्परा बनाये रखें और इस तरह की . . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: On a point of order. Sir, I would like your ruling on whether a Member can repeatedly say कि आपने कल रूल तोड़ा, आपने कल रूल तोड़ा? मेरा कहना है कि This is a reflection on the Chair.

श्री उपसभापति : मेरे कहने का मतलब दूसरा था चेयर पर कोई रिफ्लेक्शन नहीं है। . . . (व्यवधान)

Yes, Mr. Dinesh Goswami.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: On the other point, in this House during this debate, neither I nor Shri Shiva Chandra Jha have raised the issue of industrial liquor or of cement or any of the other things. हमका कहना यह है कि सीमित मुद्दा होना चाहिए। मैंने सीमित मुद्दे तक अपने को सीमित किया कि बेंकाट रमन जी ने जो कुछ कहा वह झूठ कंसे हैं से उन्होंने मिसलेख किया और किसी से कोई बात नहीं की लेकिन ये पूरी बहस कर रहे हैं. . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, time and again the hon. Member has said that discussion was not to be held and that we are violating that. The fact of the matter is, if he thinks that this is a discussion, I will teach him what a discussion is. There are a great many things in this matter which we can bring up—the propriety of holding party meetings at the Raj Bhavan, the propriety of the Governor attending those meetings and the propriety of having these things at official places. That is why I am saying, kindly make it quite clear but so far, according to my intelligence, nothing but pertinent points have been mentioned and I would plead with the Minister that if he does not want a full-scale debate, kindly make his people sit down.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: There should be a debate on political corruption. सचमुच तो होनी चाहिए लेकिन चूंकि प्रिविलेज मोशन है इसलिए प्रिविलेज मोशन के अन्तर्गत हम लाये। तो हम सीमित तर्क लगा रहे . . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Sir, I would like to know when I would be called.

(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will call you, Mr. Hegde. I am calling all. There are eight persons to be called.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE:
My notice is against Mr. Venkata-
raman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let
them be heard together.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (As-
sam): Sir, for once I am in disagree-
ment with Mr. Advani because I be-
lieve—and this is my conviction—that
Mr. Venkataraman cannot mislead
the House and cannot tell a lie.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, it
seems that the whole House is in
agreement with his motion that with-
out a debate it could be referred to
the Privileges Committee.

(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They
have agreed to this discussion.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir, if
I am permitted in the serious debate
to introduce lighter vein and intro-
duce my private experience of life,
I may say in fact I am facing a
divorce in my house because of my
conviction to believe the hon. Fin-
ance Minister. My wife says that pri-
ces are rising every day.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharash-
tra): It is a divorce of convenience.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir, my
wife says that prices are rising
every day but I say: "No, Mr. Ven-
kataraman has told us in the House
that inflation is under control; I be-
lieve him." I know, Sir, that but for
my conviction it would have been
very difficult for me to believe that
Mr. Venkataraman has not misled be-
.... (Interruptions).

SHRI SITA RAM KESRI: Sir, this
is being discussed. (Interruptions).
Please listen. The Chair has given or-
ders that they will confine themselves
only to ... (Interruptions).

SHRI PILOO MODY: It is a much
better point. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please
come to the point.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I
am making the point. Sir,
but for my conviction it is very
difficult to disbelieve Mr. Advani
that Chief Minister of her own
party can make a play-thing of
the Prime Minister's name for so
long. It is something which is very
difficult for me to disbelieve yet I
believe Mr. Venkataraman because I
am firmly convinced that the King
can do no wrong. I believe Mr. Ven-
kataraman although in the Maharash-
tra Legislative Assembly the Finance
Minister has said that the Trust is
named as Indira Gandhi Pratibha
Pratishthan. That the Finance Minis-
ter in a State can associate the name
of the Prime Minister is something
very difficult to believe; but still I
believe Mr. Venkataraman. That the
Finance Minister has given two crores
of rupees to a private trust is very
difficult to believe; but still I believe
Mr. Venkataraman. I believe Mr.
Venkataraman in spite of the fact that
the Government publications have
associated the name of the Prime
Minister; still I believe Mr. Venkata-
raman. And I as I fully believe
whatever he has said. Mr. Shourie

by saying that petty lies have been
told in Parliament has denigrated the
Parliament implying that Parliament
is a place where petty lies are ex-
changed. This is what it has been
reduced to. People are telling us,
"Look here, you go to Parliament to
exchange petty lies." Sir, I am sure,
the Chairman, being a man of firm
conviction will disbelieve Mr. Ven-
kataraman in spite of the over-
whelming evidence. But if he believes
Mr. Venkataraman, then Mr. Shourie
is guilty of saying that Mr. Ven-
kataraman has told a petty lie; and
if this is not a breach of privilege,
God knows what a breach of privilege
is. (Interruptions). I can quote
from Kaul and Shakhder, page 123.

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA: I say the Opposition is making the House ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: "It is a breach of privilege and contempt of the House to make speeches or to print or publish any libels reflecting the character of any Member." It cannot be both ways. Either Mr. Venkataraman has told a lie. In that case, there must be a privilege motion against Mr. Venkataraman. Or, alternatively, by saying that Mr. Venkataraman has misled though he has not misled, Mr. Shourie has committed a breach of privilege. Or, in the alternative, it is a case where the Chairman may not be able to find out who has misled or who has told the correct thing, in which case both the cases should go to the Privilege Committee.

Before I sit, I want to clear only one point. Somebody may say, "What is your interest?", because I am not affected, my reply would be that Mr. Shourie by saying that petty lies are told in Parliament has denigrated Parliament as a whole and we are all affected. Even when a Member's privilege is breached; another Member can bring a breach of privilege motion. There are number of precedents. The cases are of Mr. F.M. Khan and two others against Mrs. Alva and of Mr. H. V. Kamath in the case of Shibban Lal Saxena. If we take the extreme case, that the Deputy Chairman's privilege is breached, will you bring a privilege motion or will the Chairman (or the Speaker) bring a privilege motion? Somebody else of the House will have to bring a privilege motion. Therefore, my submission is that being firmly convinced that Mr. Venkataraman cannot tell a lie, I feel that the case against Mr. Shourie should go to the Privilege Committee. It cannot be that none of them has committed a breach of privilege. In that case, I do not know how we can avoid sending one of the party to the privilege Committee.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I do not know how the Chairman is going to decide when neither of them have committed a breach of privilege.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will see the ruling.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): He will be guided by your advice.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Legal quibble in legal jargon.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am strictly confining my remarks to the issue whether a *prima facie* case exists for reference of the case of the issue of privilege that I have made, that I have raised, against Mr. Arun Shourie. I am not now concerned with Mr. Venkataraman.

What are the facts? I am now confining myself only to that. I do not want to repeat what he said. The facts of the case are that Mr. Arun Shourie had made certain serious allegations against the Maharashtra Government, against Mr. Antulay, against a certain trust created by Mr. Antulay in the name of, what the Maharashtra Government publications themselves have called, the Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan. He has

made very serious allegations with regard to the collections and all that. These are not ordinary allegations but very serious allegations concerning the integrity, morality of public life and also the question of the functioning of the Government. Therefore, when these allegations were made, they were discussed in this House, and in the course of the discussion, Mr Venkataraman, the Finance Minister, stated clearly, in unambiguous words, that the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, did not lend her name, did not give her consent to associate her name with that Pratishthan, that trust. These are the facts. The day after he had categorically denied that, comes Mr. Arun Shourie

in a leading newspaper which has probably got a number of editions throughout the country and whose circulation runs to about 3 lakhs, stating that what Mr. Venkataraman had stated in the House was "a deliberate lie and deliberate misleading" of this House. He has stated that.

Now, Sir, when such a statement has been made, on the face of it, *a priori*, it is a question of contempt not only of Mr. Venkataraman but also of the entire House that we here are a pack of nincompoops to listen to lies and misleading statements made by the Government and not to react to them. That is how the people judge us. Naturally, I had expected that Mr. Venkataraman himself would bring a motion of privilege against Mr. Arun Shourie. Unfortunately, he has not done that. Why he did not do that is not my concern. But I can only submit, I can tell the other people that people are drawing their own inferences from that. I am not concerned with that. But the point is that after the privilege motion was moved in this House, again Mr. Arun Shourie comes with a leading article in that paper, repeating in stronger words that Mr. Venkataraman has lied and Mr. Venkataraman has done that, and in answer to the Chairman also he has again repeated the same thing.

Sir, under these circumstances, what are we to do? Are we a pack of nincompoops? Are we, the Members of this House, a pack of idiots? The House has been brought into contempt. It is not for the Chair to decide whether a contempt has been made or not. He is not a Supreme Court Judge sitting here in this House to decide this question. What is this Privileges Committee for? These are serious matters on which the Privileges Committee has got to go, into the entire evidence. When the man is prepared to stick to his words, the Privileges Committee has to go into the entire evidence. It has to call Mr. Venkataraman, it has to call the

Prime Minister and cross examine them and come to a proper decision and place it before the House. The entire evidence has also got to be placed before the House. Otherwise, Sir, no justice can be done in this case. Therefore, Sir, there is a *prima facie* case. These are the grounds on which there is a *prima facie* case for reference to the Privileges Committee. It is not a question where the Chair can decide that there is no such thing. There is a *prima facie* case and on the basis of that it must be referred to the Privileges Committee. In the course of that, if it is found that Mr. Arun Shourie is telling the truth, then the necessary consequences must also follow and the House will have to take those necessary consequences. Therefore, Sir, under these circumstances, I submit that the Chair must immediately refer it to the Privileges Committee so that we can go into the entire evidence. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hegde. Please don't repeat all the things that have been said earlier

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: I will not repeat.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is my request.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Well, that is an unnecessary request.

Sir, I would like to confine myself to only two points. Actually there are two sets of notices of breach of privilege. One is relating to Mr. Venkataraman; the other one is relating to Mr. Arun Shourie. Sir, actually these are two sides of the same coin. Either Mr. Venkataraman has lied and by doing so, misled the House and committed breach of privilege and contempt of the House, or Mr. Arun Shourie, by writing an article in a largely circulated daily in which he calls Mr. Venkataraman a liar, has committed breach of privilege. We have to decide. One of them has committed breach of privilege. If Mr. Venkataraman has not told a lie,

[Shri Ramakrishna Hegde]

he has to prove that he has not told a lie. If he has told the truth and if he is not misleading the House, then we must bring Mr. Arun Shourie to the bar of this House and we must give him the punishment that he deserves.

Sir, I feel that Mr. Venkataraman not only lied—he lied; it is my impression; I am giving sufficient material to prove it—but he did so deliberately. If he had no intention to lie, if he had no intention to mislead this House, he should have gathered all the necessary information by this time and come out with a statement, "I am sorry, I was misled. I did not have sufficient facts at my command at that time". And, therefore, he should have apologised to the House. He has not done so. That only means that he had intention to do what he did. Sir, what is "deliberate"? "Considering carefully; not impulsive; slow in deciding; and cautious". Sir, any Minister of the Government here, and for that matter, any Member, makes a statement, he must make the statement with due deliberation, with due cautiousness, with the knowledge that whatever statement he is going to make is true to facts. And particularly the responsibility of a Minister of the Government is much greater. He has taken an oath when he entered into this office and he has broken that oath, the sanctity of the oath. Sir, let me show you a couple of things which will prove beyond any doubt that Mr. Venkataraman's statement that the Prime Minister did not give her consent to Mr. Antulay for naming this trust, this Pratibha Pratishthan, after her, is not true. Sir, I do not quote the 'Indian Express' because Mr. Arun Shourie is the Executive Editor of that paper and he himself might be guilty of committing a breach of privilege. Therefore, leave the Indian Express. I do not quote, as Mr. Advani said, other newspapers also. Now, what is this?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Lok Rajya.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: This Lok Rajya, Maharashtra Government's official organ. This is Lok Rajya. This is the official organ of the Maharashtra Government...

SHRI SULTAN SINGH (Haryana): How many times do you show it?

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: As long as you don't see it. Now, I will only read one sentence. "The Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan."

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I am on a point of order. My learned friend is reading from a document. That document must be placed in the House. Under the rules he must produce it before the House. There are innumerable rulings that when a Member has been permitted to read from a document, another Member can insist that the document must be produced in the House and he is dutybound to produce it in the House.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: We have quoted from journals often but those have not been laid on the Table of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a newspaper, like any other newspaper. There is nothing for placing on record. It is not a document.

Now, Mr. Hegde, what you are saying has already been said by Mr. Advani. That has already been read out by him. Don't repeat.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: The Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan at Raj Bhavan in Bombay on October 11...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is only a repetition. That has been raised by Mr. Advani...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: We would only like the Chairman to take that into consideration while deciding the issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Newspaper published by anybody...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I have submitted a copy of it already.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh): An official publication of a Government of which Mr. Antulay is the Chief Minister cannot be relied upon. Therefore, you cannot permit this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: What is the consent? Mrs. Gandhi signed under these lines: "Pratibha Pratishthan Maharashtra... brobar Sahabhagi honyas mala atishaya anand watat ahe".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That has been referred to already. Don't repeat.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: On a point order...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hegde, perhaps you know the document has been quoted. What is the use of repeating it?

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, on a point of order...

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: According to dictionary 'Sahabhagi' means Co-partner. Consequently, *saha* implies association or connection, along with, union or conjunction; it is just like *sahagaman*, *sahabharan*, *sahabhojan*, *sahavas* and *sahapan*.

SHRI DHARMAVIR: Sir, does this relate to the issue of privilege against Mr. Venkataraman?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now, Mr. Hegde.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: Sir, on a point of order.
(Interruptions)

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Sir, this is another publication of the Maharashtra Government. (Interruptions). You see...

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, on a point of order. (Interruptions). Sir, I wish to draw your attention to one thing. (Interruptions). Please hear me.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Sir, here is another publication of the Maharashtra Government.
(Interruptions)

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पांडेय : . श्रीमान्, मरा प्वायंट आफ आर्डर है। आप इधर सुनते ही नहीं हैं। . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : बताइये प्वायंट आफ आर्डर क्या है ? . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पांडेय : आप इधर सुनते ही नहीं हैं। . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : आप कहिये, गुस्सा मत कीजिए। . . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: I am rising on a point of order and you have to hear me.
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let not this be recorded. Let none go on record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:***

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I wish to raise an important point of order. I have been trying to draw your attention. But you are not listening to me. I wish to draw your attention to rule 188.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which rule?

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: Sir, it is rule 188. You open the book and see that. It says:

"A member wishing to raise a question of privilege shall give notice in writing to the Secretary before the commencement of the sitting on the day..."

***Not recorded.

[Shri Narsingh Narain Pandey]

The rule is here and you see it. (Interruptions). Please hear me, Sir. Have the patience and hear me. I am reading it out and you please hear me. This is a question of privilege. You hear me and then you will agree with me. It says:

"A member wishing to raise a question of privilege shall give notice in writing to the Secretary before the commencement of the sitting on the day the question is proposed to be raised. If the question proposed to be raised is based on a document, the notice shall be accompanied by the document."

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, Sir.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: Sir, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the documents which Mr. Advani and the other friend, Mr. Hegde, are showing are not parts of any document.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: I am prepared to produce it. (Interruptions)

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: You cannot place it here. (Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the rule says that if the question proposed to be raised is based on a document, the notice shall be accompanied by the document.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, on this point of order I would like to say something. The rule says:

"If the question proposed to be raised is based on a document, the notice shall be accompanied by the document."

I would submit that I have already enclosed it alongwith my notice, enclosed alongwith my notice...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: ...a photostat copy of the "Lokraj". (Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, on a point of order.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: Sir, this is not enough. He must produce the original document. (Interruptions). You must produce the original document. It must be in the original.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, I want to know one thing now. The earlier ruling is that newspapers cannot be put, cannot be placed here and now he says that the document has to be submitted. I want a ruling now: so you consider this a newspaper or a document? (Interruptions). I say this because, Sir, ... *** (Interruptions)

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Sir, here is the document, "Maharashtra Marches Ahead". (Interruptions).

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PANDEY: Sir, it has to be in original. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing mentioned by both the sides should go on record. Yes, Mr. Hegde, you conclude now.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Sir, here is another publication of the Maharashtra Government. (Interruptions). This is another official document called "March of Maharashtra. Its name ought to have been "March of Maharashtra from Scandal to Scandal. (Interruptions). It is also an official publication, an official document. It says: "...to give recognition to and encourage talents in the fields of art and literature, the Government of Maharashtra has set up the Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan." (Interruptions).

***Not recorded.

1.00 P.M.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: I want to know how much time will be taken like this. He has already taken 15 minutes. (Interruptions) Do not allow him more time. (Interruptions) He has already taken 15 minutes. I will request you not to allow him any more...

(Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY: It was cheap publicity. You walked out and you have already returned... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think you should conclude now.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: After lunch. It is time for lunch.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude within two minutes.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: I will take a few minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken 15 minutes. (Interruptions) Please conclude.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: This is a photo-copy of the letter written by Mr. Sudarshan Arya, Hon. Secretary of Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan. This is addressed to the Secretary, Deccan Sugar Factories' Association, Stadium House, Block No. 2, V. N. Road, Bombay. In this again, it is Secretary, Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan.

(Interruptions)

श्री धर्मवीर : इन्दिराजी का बार-बार नाम लेजिए आप त : जाओगे । इन्दिरा गांधी का बार-बार नाम लेने से आप तर जाओगे ।
... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do not reply to them.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Is the word 'Indira Gandhi' unparliamentary?

SHRI PILOO MODY: Declare 'Indira Gandhi' as unparliamentary. (Interruptions)

श्री सतपाल निलत (पंजाब) : कम से कम इन्दिरा गांधी का नाम तो दिया । अब तो काफी भी कुत्तन पढ़ने लगे हैं । (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: These are the questions I ask, Mr. Deputy Chairman, through you, of Mr. Venkataraman himself. Can he deny that Mrs Gandhi was present in Bombay on the 11th October? Can he deny the fact that she was present on that day at the Raj Bhavan at a function where her party legislators had assembled and Mr. Antulay thanked her for giving her consent? Can he deny, again, that the trust was described as a Government trust even in the... (Interruptions) Can he deny the fact that an amount of Rs. 10 lakhs was contributed by the Government to the trust even before it was registered, actually three weeks before it was registered. Sir, may I ask one more question? My friends on the other side made their protest that Mrs. Gandhi had not given her consent... (Interruptions) Let me accept it for argument's sake for a moment. Sir, our Prime Minister knows what happens in every place in this country. Even if there is a gossip, she has got the means to know.

(Interruptions) ***

श्री (मौलाना) असरारुल हक : इसको कितना टाइम दिया है । ... (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The last question will not go on record.

श्री जे.के. जैन : इसको रिकार्ड से निकलवाया जाए । वह अपने गिरेबाज में हाथ डाल कर देखें कि कितना करोड़ों रुपया इन्होंने खर्चा है । ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Lastly, Sir.

***Not recorded.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The last question will not go on record.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: I am quoting ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, please. Conclude now.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: It is very relevant.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will not help you. Mr. Hegde, I think, you are referring to something else because the limited point is ...

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE: Not at all.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant here. It will not go on record.

SHRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE:***

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Nageshwar Prasad Shahi. (Interruptions) Nothing will go on record.

SHRI J. K. JAIN:***

SHRI PILOO MODY:***

श्री शरीफुद्दीन शारिक (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : जनाब डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, मसी मेरे भाई जैन साहब बहुत तैश में आकर ऐसे लफ्ज बोल गये जिनके मायने से वे खुद वाकिफ नहीं हैं। इस तरह से चीखने-चिल्लाने से, मेरे ख्याल से, उन्होंने अपनी पार्टी के वकार को ही नहीं बल्कि इस हाउस के वकार को भी जक पहुंचाया है।

SHRI J. K. JAIN:*** आपके मुंह से ऐसी बात शोभा नहीं देती... (व्यवधान)

... काश्मीर में घाघलियां... (व्यवधान) माननीय सदस्य इस तरह से... (व्यवधान)... पर्दा नहीं डाल सकते काश्मीर सरकार ने भारत सरकार के जो अधिकारी वहां गये थे उन अधिकारियों को पिटाया और यहां पर काश्मीर के सदस्य यह बात कहते हैं... (व्यवधान)...

***Not recorded.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH): Sir, please restore order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What can I do? Please control the Members.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: You should also keep in mind that while making their observations, the Members cannot make wrong speeches.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What can I do? If Members interrupt, then it goes on. (Interruptions)

मैं क्या करूँ कोई भी सुनने के लिये तैयार नहीं है।

SHRI GURUDEV GUPTA (Madhya Pradesh): This is what is happening in the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jain, Mr. Mittal, please allow the discussion to continue.

श्री जे० के० जैन : जिस समय नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही जी ने कहा... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI PATTIAM RAJAN (Kerala): You please tell us what he said yesterday.

श्री जे० के० जैन : आज आप हमें कहते हैं, पर जब कल नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही जी ने कहा उस वक्त आपने कुछ नहीं कहा।

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Leader, please move a motion to expel him, Mr. Jain.

श्री उपसभापति : जैन जी को पता नहीं है कि... (व्यवधान)

श्री जे० के० जैन : जिस वक्त शाही जी ने भद्दे शब्द कहे उस वक्त आपने हाउस एडजर्न कर दिया।... (व्यवधान)

SHRI PILOO MODY: Why don't you get rid of him?

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this additional evidence? ... (Interruptions)

श्री उपसभापति: जरा सुनिये ...
(व्यवधान)...

श्री जैन मेरे ऊपर आरोप लगा रहे हैं, इन्हें पता नहीं है इस बात का। अगर इन्हें प्रिय है शर्मा जी के शब्द तो वे दोहरा सकते हैं, लिख लिखा जायेगा। वे शब्द कहीं रिकार्ड नहीं हुए हैं पर वे बार बार इसको दोहरा रहे हैं। मुझे भय है वे स्वयं इनको रिकार्ड में लाना चाहते हैं, इतना मैं रोक नहीं सकता। क्यों आप गलत आरोप लगाते हैं मेरे ऊपर? मैंने उस समय सदन स्थगित कर दिया जब दो घंटे तक यहां पर बहल करने की इजाजत नहीं दी गई। अब वही स्थिति आप चाहते हैं तो मुझे कोई अपत्ति नहीं है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन बातों की अनुमति दी गई है वे बातें सुनी जायेंगी। आप देर करवा लें, मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं। लेकिन आप आरोप मत लगाइये। वह रिकार्ड में नहीं हैं। कृपा करके आप अपनी वाददास्त ताजा कर लीजिये।

श्री नगेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, चूंकि चेयरमैन साहब के केवल एडिशनल एवॉइन्ट का जिक्र करने की इजाजत दी है, इसलिये मैं केवल एडिशनल एवॉइन्ट एडिशनल अगुमेंट पेश करूंगा। किसी भी तथ्य के बारे में अगर किसी की कहीं हुई बात हो, किसी को लिखी हुई बात हो तो सबसे ज्यादा विश्वसनीय शहदत उसी व्यक्ति की हो सकती है। इसलिये इस मायने में कि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने इस इंदिरा गांधी प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान का उद्घाटन किया या नहीं किया और अपना नाम उन प्रतिष्ठान के साथ जोड़ने के लिये अपनी स्वीकृति प्रदान की या नहीं की, उपसभापति जो इनका सबूत प्रधानमंत्री जी का ही स्टेटमेंट हो सकता है। श्रीमन्, एक हफ्ते से संसद के दोनों सदन इस विषय पर चिंतन रहे हैं और पूरे देश में जनमत उकेलित है और आन्दोलित है। लेकिन श्रीमन् ... (व्यवधान) ... प्रधानमंत्री जी की ओर से, उनके कार्यालय की ओर से आज तक इस

बात की डिनाइल नहीं आई कि उन्होंने अपनी स्वीकृति नहीं प्रदान की या उन्होंने इसका उद्घाटन नहीं किया या उन्होंने, जो शब्द इस पर लिखे हुए हैं कि मैं इसके साथ सहभागी बन रहा हूँ। उसका भी डिनायल नहीं आया कि मैंने ये शब्द नहीं लिखे और ये दस्तखत नहीं किये। इसलिए श्रीमन्, यहां पर बड़े-बड़े योग्य बैरिस्टर हैं, आप भी जाने माने एडवोकेट हैं, इस तथ्य के ऊपर ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI PILOO MODY: Miss Saroj, you must also have been present there.

SHRIMATI SAROJ KHAPARDE: I am not saying anything, Mr. Mody.

SHRI PILOO MODY: You are welcome.

श्री नगेश्वर प्रसाद शाही: सबसे बड़ा सबूत प्रधानमंत्री जी का ही सकता है, उन्होंने आज तक इससे इन्कार नहीं किया। Therefore, the question is of deliberate misleading.

मिसलीड हो सकता है, लेकिन वह डेलीवरेट न हो। यहां मिसलीडिंग डेलीवरेट हो सकती है। डेलीवरेट के लिए सर्टेन प्रोग्रेशन होते हैं कि सर्टे। फ्रैक्टस् के ऊपर प्रिज्यूम किया जाता है कि वह डेलीवरेट है कि नहीं है। तो श्री वेंकट रमन जो जिस प्रधानमंत्री जी की कैबिनेट के सदस्य हैं उनकी ओर से इस तथ्य पर कोई डिनायल नहीं आ रहा है। यह इस बात का सबूत है कि उन्होंने जानबूझकर डेलीवरेटली मिसलीड किया है हाउस को। उनको इन तथ्यों की जानकारी थी ... (व्यवधान) ... कि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने अपना कन्सेंट दिया उसके बावजूद यहां पर उन्होंने असत्य बयान दिया।

श्रीमन्, कल हमारे साथियों ने

चलें कि या कि यह मराठी का जो है
उसमें मराठी लिखा हुआ है व प्रधान-
मंत्री जो मराठी नहीं जानती हैं ।
लेकिन अंग्रेजी तो जानती हैं । श्रीमन्,
यह सही है कि वे मराठी नहीं जानती
हैं, अंग्रेजी जानती हैं लेकिन जो अंग्रेजी
में उन्होंने लिखा है वह आपको कस्टडी
में है, आपको सरकार की कस्टडी में
है, उसको आप क्यों नहीं रखते यहां
पर । आप उसको छिपा रहे हैं, आप
उस डाकूमेंट को छिपा रहे हैं ...

(व्यवधान)

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHER-
JEE: For your information, every-
thing has been given to the Speaker,
and if you want, everything will be
given to the Chairman. Both English
and Marathi versions, in original, have
been placed before the Speaker.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD
SHAH: That is what I am submit-
ting, Sir.

(Interruptions)

श्री जे० के० जैन : श्रीमन्...
(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is
all right; papers are with the Chair-
man.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : इसलिए
मैं कहता हूँ कि उन ओरिजिनल को
क्यों नहीं रखा जाता है ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is all
with the Chairman; you can see.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : इसलिए
श्रीमन्, यह बात सही है कि उन्होंने
साईन किया और उन्होंने सहभागी होना
स्वोत्तर किया ।

अब श्रीमन्, दूसरी चीज है जो
और जोर से कही जा रही है ।
that no Government document of
Maharashtra Government should be
relied upon or should be believed.

यह कौन सा यहां प्रश्न—श्रीमन्
जो तो चले गये—यह कौन सा नया
कानून बनेगा जिस कानून के अंदर
गवर्नमेंट डाकूमेंट्स जो हैं, जो गवर्नमेंट
स्वयं छापती है और डिस्ट्रिब्यूट करती
है उसको कह रहे हैं कि उसपर व्यवस्था
न करें । और वह डाकूमेंट मेरे साथियों
ने पेश किया है । मैं उसको दोहराना
नहीं चाहता हूँ । श्रीमन्, इतनी बार
यहां पर रिपोर्ट किया गया, रिक्वेस्ट
की गयी कि सचवाई अगर आपको
छिपाने नहीं है तो ट्रस्ट डीड को रख
वोजिए टेबुल पर... (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : छोड़िए उसको ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही । मगर
वह ट्रस्ट डीड जो है आज तक यहां नहीं
रखा गया... (व्यवधान)

श्री कल्पनाथ राय (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
अरे, क्या है यह सब । यहो लिखेंट
है ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : अगर
लोग राज्य को ...

श्री उपसभापति : वह तो आपने वह
दिया ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : दो
बातें और, कि महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेंट ने
इंदिरा गांधी प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान के नाम
से चैक दिया और आप चाहते हैं कि
उसको डिमबिलोज किया जाए ।

SHRI DHARMAVIR: Sir, what is
the new additional point he is raising?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : उसके
अनावा दर्जनों कोऑपरेटिव फैक्टरीज ने,
जो लेमीनगवर्नमेंट इंस्टिच्यूशंस हैं, आप
उनको प्राइवेट नहीं वह सकती हैं, उन्होंने
इसी नाम पर चैक दिये और वे चैक
जाकर उसी अकाउंट में क्लैकट हुए ।

श्री धर्मवीर : अरे, यह सब मालूम है। (व्यवधान)

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : बैंक में भी जो अकाउंट खुला... (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : वह तो हो गया... (व्यवधान) लम्बा कर देंगे... (व्यवधान)

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : देखिए, श्रीमन्, मैं अधिक टाइम नहीं लूंगा... (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सरोज खापर्डे : श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी ने उस दिन सारा इतिहास सुना दिया... (व्यवधान)

SHRI J. K. JAIN: Sir, on a point of order.

श्री धर्मवीर : लाखों, करोड़ों रुपया देश की जनता का चंदे के नाम पर खा गये... (व्यवधान)

श्री जे० के० जैन : प्रश्न यह है कि जब इन्दिरा गांधी ने यह लिख कर दिया है कि मैं इस प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान से संबंधित नहीं हूँ... (व्यवधान) मेरी बात सुन लीजिए। आप जो चर्चा कर रहे हैं कि अंतुले जी ने क्या किया, वह एक अलग चोख है। देखिये यहां पर श्रीमती गांधी ने अपनी तरफ से चिट्ठियां लिख-लिख कर भेजीं कि मैं प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान से संबंधित नहीं हूँ, फिर शाही जी का यह बातें करना बेकार है।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : हमको पता नहीं था कि चिट्ठियां लिख कर के भेजी हैं।

श्री जे० के० जैन : तुमको क्या बताया जाए, बेकार के लोगों को... (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : जैन जी... (व्यवधान) माननीय सदस्य जैन जी, मैं

आपसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि समाप्त कीजिए; नहीं तो फिर टाइम बढ़ता जाएगा... (व्यवधान)

श्री पीलू मोदी : प्रार्थना करने के लायक ही हैं... (व्यवधान)

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : इस ट्रस्ट के अकाउंट में गवर्नमेंट के चैंक गये। बैंक में जब अकाउंट खोला गया, अकाउंट खोलते समय, अकाउंट को आपरेट करने के लिए जो फार्म भरा गया, उस फार्म में लिखा कि इस अकाउंट का नाम होगा "इन्दिरा गांधी प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान ट्रस्ट अकाउंट"।

श्री उपसभापति : ठोक है, ठोक है।

श्री धर्मवीर : आप वहां मौजूद थे उस समय?... (व्यवधान)

श्री पीलू मोदी : आप मौजूद थे क्या? आप जानते हैं कि ऐसा नहीं हुआ है।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : यह सारे चैंक उस अकाउंट में क्लैक्ट हुए हैं। इसलिए न मैं मौजूद था और न आप मौजूद थे। मैं तो सर्टेन फैक्ट्स कहता हूँ जिनके ऊपर यह प्रिज्यूम होगा। वह फैक्ट्स यह हैं कि बैंक में जब अकाउंट खुला, जो फार्म भर कर दिया गया, उस पर लिखा गया कि "इन्दिरा गांधी प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान ट्रस्ट"... (व्यवधान)

आखिरी प्वाइंट, कि क्या हमारे दोस्त यह चाहते हैं कि यह विश्वास किया जाए कि अंतुले जी जैसे जो प्रधान मन्त्री का विश्वासपात्र व्यक्ति हैं... (व्यवधान)

श्री जे० के० जैन : अरे, विश्वासपात्र तो तुम भी थे। दल बदल कर वहां बैठ गये। विश्वासपात्र थे, इसीलिए इन्दिरा गांधी ने तुम्हें टिकट दिया और

[श्री जे० के० जैन]

इसके बाद आप जनता पार्टी में जाकर तलुवे चाटने लगे... (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सरोज खापर्डे : कौसी बात कर रहे हैं... (व्यवधान)

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं आखिरी बात कह रहा हूँ... (व्यवधान) कहने तो दें कि क्या यह लोग चाहते हैं कि हम विश्वास करें कि अंतुसे जी जैसे विश्वसनीय व्यक्ति जो एक इतने बड़े राज्य का मुख्य मंत्री है... (व्यवधान) मैं जानता हूँ कि आपकी रिटायरमेंट है, इसलिए आप चापलूसी कर रहे हैं... (व्यवधान) शांति से बैठिये... (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : इनको मत कहिए, इधर कहिए... (व्यवधान)

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : यह सारे लोग जो हल्ला कर रहे हैं, यह 1982 में रिटायर होने वाले हैं... (व्यवधान) सुन लीजिए... (व्यवधान) श्रीमन्, मैं कह रहा हूँ... (व्यवधान)

श्री महेन्द्र मोहन मिश्र (बिहार) : चरण सिंह जो ने आपको क्यों नहीं लिया ?

SHRI PILOO MODY: I recommend they all be given tickets again.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : इसलिये मैं कह रहा हूँ कि किसी भी टच आप इमैजिनेशन से... (व्यवधान)

श्री जे० के० जैन : शाही जी ने जो बात कही कि रिटायरमेंट वाले हैं, इनको रिटायरमेंट 1982 में होने वाली है। चरण सिंह के तलुवे नहीं चाटेंगे, तो इनको टिकट कहाँ से मिलेगा।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ कि किसी भी तरह से यह विश्वास करना कि महार पट्ट

सरकार और अंतुले जी ने सारा जाल-बट्टा कर दिया—हम तो नहीं कहते उन्होंने जाल-बट्टा किया, मगर आप हमको यह कह रहे हैं, विवश कर रहे हैं कि साहब, अंतुले जी ने सारा जाल-बट्टा कर दिया—और जाल-बट्टा करके इतना विशाल धन इकट्ठा किया, अपने लाभ के लिए। इसलिए, श्रीमन्, आखिरी बात यह है कि हम ने अपनी ओर से अपनी कोई बात नहीं कही। ***

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I don't allow this. This will not go on record.

श्री जे० के० जैन : इस वक्त क्यों आप खामोश हैं शारिक जी ? अब क्यों नहीं कहते।

श्री शरीफुद्दीन शरीक : जो कोई भी किसी शख्सियत का नाम बदनीयती से, बदनामी करने के लिए लेंगे, हम उसकी मज्जमत करेंगे। हम किसी के एजेण्ट नहीं हैं। हम शराफत और इन्सानियत और सियासी अदब के हिमायती हैं।

श्री जे० के० जैन : कल आप सदन में नहीं थे। कल अगर सदन में होते तो सुनते। ***

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए जैन साहब। कुछ लिखा नहीं गया। श्री सत्यपाल मलिक।

श्री सत्यपाल मलिक (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं बहुत कम वक्त लूंगा क्योंकि जो कायदे की बातें थीं करोब करोब सारी बातें कह दी गई हैं। मैं समझता हूँ जो कहना जरूरी था वह कह चुके हैं।

***Not recorded.

मेरा निवेदन मान्यवर, यह है कि आपको अभी इस मामले में कोई रूलिंग नहीं देनी चाहिए। यह मामला इतना लम्बा मामला हो गया है कि बहुत से कागजात आप को मंगाने पड़ेंगे जिसमें कंसन्ड कागजात, कन्सेन्ट डाक्यूमेंट, बक ड्राफ्ट, ट्रस्ट की मेम्बरशिप आदि हैं। इस मामले में आपको इन्दिरा जी से बातें करनी होंगी। उन का भी बयान होना चाहिए। इसलिए इस प्रिविलेज का जो नोटिस मैंने दिया है इसमें चेयरमैन साहब कोई रूलिंग देने के पहले सारे कंसन्ड डाक्यूमेंट, सारे कंसन्ड लोगों सभी को बुला लें, सब से बात कर लें, उस के बाद रूलिंग दें। एक तो मेरा यह निवेदन है।

दूसरे, मुझे कहना है कि इस में किसी न किसी ने असत्य जरूर बोला है। या तो अरुण शोरी साहब ने असत्य बोला है या वेंकटरमन साहब ने असत्य बोला है। मेरी मान्यता है कि वेंकटरमन साहब ने असत्य बोला। लेकिन मैं दो बातें कहना चाहूंगा, मान्यवर। एक तो यह कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी का उस इन्दिरा गांधी प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान नाम के ट्रस्ट से ताल्लुक होना या उसके उद्घाटन का मामला—उस को मैं फिलहाल छोड़े देता हूं। मैं दूसरा मुद्दा जो उठाया नहीं गया है, उठाना चाहता हूं। उस के मामले में वेंकटरमन जी ने असत्य बोला। दूसरा मुद्दा मान्यवर, जो बहुत इम्पोर्टेंट था उस में वेंकटरमन जी ने संसद् को, सदन को मिसलीड किया; जानकारी नहीं दे कर, या सुपरफ्लुअस जानकारी देकर। सारा मामला यह था कि उस दिन सदन जानना चाहता था कि यह ट्रस्ट क्या है? क्या सरकारी ट्रस्ट था, यह हम लोग जानना चाहते थे। हम लोगों ने जानना चाहा था कि क्या श्री अंतुले मुख्य मंत्री होने के कारण उस

के चेयरमैन थे, या निजी केपेसिटी में उसके चेयरमैन थे। मान्यवर, मेम्बर लोग यह जानना चाहते थे कि नेचर ऑफ ट्रस्ट क्या था, ट्रस्टीज की पावर्स क्या थीं, ट्रस्ट के सदस्य कौन थे और जो ट्रस्टीज थे उनकी आपस में रिश्तेदारियां या रिश्ते क्या थे। अगर आप हाउस की प्रोसीडिंगज को देखेंगे तो आप पाएंगे कि वेंकटरमन जी ने उन सारे मामलों को इवेंट करके इस दिन को जन-बूझ कर गुमराह किया, क्योंकि श्रीमती शालिनीताई पाटिल कहती हैं, मुझ को यह विश्वास है यह सरकारी ट्रस्ट है, जितने चैंक आए ह उसमें ज्यादातर सरकारी हैं। जो सरकार का चैंक है वह किसी प्राइवेट ट्रस्ट को जग नहीं सकता था। वह भी इस विश्वास से दे कि यह सरकार का है। जितने कोऑपरेटिव्ह है उनमें वही एक के प्रस्ताव में लिखा हुआ है कि हम सरकारी ट्रस्ट के लिए रुपया दे रहे हैं। और मान्यवर, जो ट्रस्ट डीड मैंने देखे, जो जानकारी मुझ को मिली है उस के अनुसार मैं कह सकता हूं, चार ट्रस्ट हैं, जो ट्रस्ट हैं उन की तादद सिर्फ 3 है। उन में एक अंतुले जी और दूसरी उन की पत्नी हैं। इन सारी जानकारी को न केवल वित्त मंत्री जी ने सदन को गुमराह किया है।

दूसर जो असल मुद्दा है उस की तरफ मैं आना चाहता हूं। वेंकटरमन जी ने कहा कि श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने अपना नाम इन्दिरा प्रतिभा प्रतिष्ठान के लिए देने की अनुमति नहीं दी। मेरी जानकारी में यह असत्य है। सचचाई इस प्रकार है। 9 अक्टूबर, 1980 को अंतुले जी ने ट्रस्ट की स्थापना का अपना इरादा घोषित किया। उन्होंने यह इच्छा जाहिर की मैं ट्रस्ट का नाम श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी

[श्री सत्यपाल मलिक]

के नाम र रखन चाहता हूँ 11
अक्टूबर को राजभवन में एक सम्मेलन हुआ। (व्यवधान) यह कहा कि चुका है, मैं उसमें नहीं जाना चाहता। मान्यवर, जो मैं बात कह रहा हूँ उस के समर्थन में तीन चीजें उभरती हैं। महाराष्ट्र सरकार के जितने प्रकाशन हैं उनके जरिए इस बात का प्रचार किया गया कि यह सरकारी ट्रस्ट है और श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के नाम पर ट्रस्ट है। जितने अखबार थे उनकी जो तस्वीरें और केषन महाराष्ट्र सरकार के डायरेक्टोरेट आफ इन्फार्मेशन ने दिये उन में इस बात का जिक्र था कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने ट्रस्ट को अपनी सहमति दे दी। उस के अलावा कांग्रेस (आई) के कार्यकर्त्ताओं की बैठक में अन्तुले जो ने श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को सहमति की बात कही वह सारे अखबारों में आया और यह मामला उठने तक कोई उसका कन्ट्राडिक्शन नहीं हुआ। महाराष्ट्र के अखबार, सरकारी अखबार और सारे अखबारों में उसका जिक्र होता रहा मेरे, मान्यवर, सिर्फ कहना यह है कि 23 अगस्त, 1981 के पहले किसी भी शकल में कहीं भी श्रीमती गांधी का नाम नहीं जुड़ा है, इसका कोई प्रमाण न प्रधान मंत्री के सेक्रेटेरियट से आया, न महाराष्ट्र सरकार से आया।

मैं, अन्त में, निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि अभी वक्त है। पहले एक बार प्रधान मंत्री इस तरह की गलती कर चुके हैं। मैं ट्रेजरी बेंच का हमदर्द इसलिए होता चाहता हूँ कि आज सारे देश को निगाह इस बात पर लगी हुई है। प्रधान मंत्री जब चुन जाता है तो सारे देश का प्रधान मंत्री होता है—यह अलग बात है कि आप 32 सेंकड़ा

वोट से या 35 सेंकड़ा वोट से चुन कर आये हैं। चूंकि उन का नाम इन-वाल्ड है और जो वातावरण बना है उस की सफाई करने के लिए जरूरी है कि यह मामला प्रिविलेज कमटी के सामने जाना चाहिए और देश के सामने इस बात की सफाई होनी चाहिए। मैं नेता-सदन से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा—विद्वान आदमी हैं— कि वह मेज पार्लियामेंटरी प्रक्टिस का एक रिकॉर्ड देख लें। यह हाउस आफ कामन्स का जर्नल है 1963 का है पेज नम्बर 246 है प्रोफ्यूमों वाले मामले में। टोरी पार्टी के जो लीडर थे इयान मेक-लियोड उन्होंने खुद प्रस्ताव किया था। मैं चाहूंगा कि उसी तरह का प्रस्ताव वेंकटरमन के खिलाफ आप करें। आज नहीं करेंगे तो कल करना होगा। उस प्रस्ताव की पढ़ कर मैं अपनी बात खत्म कर देता हूँ। प्रस्ताव यह था :

"Mr. John Profumo, in making a personal statement to this House on the 22nd day of March, 1963 which contained words which he later admitted not to be true, was guilty of a grave contempt of this House."

उसी पार्टी के लीडर ने यह प्रस्ताव किया था। मैं आप से निवेदन करता हूँ कि आप इसी तरह का प्रस्ताव कर के अपनी साख को बचा सकते हैं। यह कह कर मैं अपनी बात को खत्म करता हूँ।

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the question of contempt of the House ... (Interruptions) Sir, every question ...

श्री हुसम देव नारायण दावव (बिहार) : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : आप ने कहा कि हमको संक्षेप में अपनी बात कहनी चाहिए, अपने को कंफाइड करना चाहिए। तो यह कोई डिबेट नहीं है कि हर एक को मौका दिया जाये। यह क्यों बोलेंगे ?

श्री नारायण प्रसाद शाही : वे भी अरुण शोरी के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज का नोटिस दे दें और उसके बाद बोलें ।

श्री उपसभापति : मैं ने उन को इजाजत दी है। आई हैव परमिटिड देम।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): You hear this side also. (Interruptions). This is highly improper. Mr. Advani himself has expressed his desire to hear this side also. So, this is highly improper.

श्री हुक्म देव नारायण यादव : जिस रूल और नियम 187, 188 और 190 के तहत यह उठाया जा रहा है ...

श्री सीताराम केसरी : चेयरमैन ने जो यह परमिशन दी है वह उन्होंने अपने प्रोरोगेटिव पावर्स से दी है और उन लोगों को बोलने का मौका दिया है। उस में उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि एक एक आदमी इधर से भी बोलेगा । इस लिये किसी किसी प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर का इसमें प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : कोई नियम तो होगा कोई रूल तो होगा जिस के तहत आप बोलेंगे ?

श्री उपसभापति : सवाल यह नहीं है। जब यह इजाजत दी गयी कि आप अपना प्वाइंट आफ व्यू रख सकते हैं तो उसी समय यह इजाजत भी दी गयी कि एक सदस्य को इधर से भी सुना जाएगा। आप अपनी बात कह सकते हैं इस बारे में कि इस पर इजाजत क्यों दी जाये और वे कह सकते हैं, बता सकते हैं कि इसके लिये इजाजत क्यों न दी जाये। यही उन का कहना है।

श्री हुक्म देव नारायण यादव : मेरी आपत्ति है कि क्या

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : आप क्या सुनते हैं ? क्या यही तरीका है ?

डा० माई महावीर : चेयरमैन के साथ बात करने का क्या यही तरीका है ? (व्यवधान)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: They have moved a motion of privilege. Now we want to hear this side also.

श्री हुक्म देव नारायण यादव : मैं बहुत विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि ...

श्री उपसभापति : एक आदमी को अभी मैं सुन रहा हूँ और आप इधर से खड़े हो गये । यह क्या है ?

श्री हुक्म देव नारायण यादव : मेरा यह कहना है कि जब आप नियम के अनुसार चल रहे हैं ...

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): I am making a submission. (Interruptions) What he is saying is ...

श्री जे० के० जैन : यह कौन सा नियम है कि जिसके अनुसार हुक्मदेव जी बोल रहे हैं ? यह जो सभापति महोदय ने डिबेट करायी है यह बिना नियम के करायी है। इसके लिये कोई नियम नहीं है।

श्री हुक्म देव नारायण यादव : जिस नियम का उन्होंने उल्लेख किया था उस नियम के तहत वह लोग आपके प्रदेश की अहेलता कर रहे थे। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वे लोग अब किस नियम के तहत बोल रहे हैं। (व्यवधान) किस नियम के तहत वे बोल रहे हैं यह मुझे बता दें ।

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठें । मिस्टर साल्वे प्लीज ।

श्री हुक्म देव नारायण यादव : उन का विशेषाधिकार किस के खिलाफ है यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। (व्यवधान)

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : आप को माफी
मांगनी पड़ेगी इसी सदन में।

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I think the question of privilege, the whole House will agree, is as much an important subject for the purposes of this House or the other House as it is a sacred subject. It is a serious subject because the question involves maintaining the dignity of the House; it involves invariably where it is a question of breach of privilege of one Member protecting the rights of that Member against any infringement of the rights given to him qua Member of Parliament, compendiously described as privilege of the Member. I would have expected that in a debate like this because an extraordinary procedure, an unprecedented procedure, has been adopted this time. Members have been allowed to make their submissions to entitle them for admission of the motion which they have given, to make their submissions to make out a *prima facie* case. A precedent never followed earlier, but you in your wisdom have allowed this. But, since this happened, I would have expected, seeing the seriousness and the importance of the matter, the Members should have shown highest of circumspection, highest of restraint and not utilize the occasion to outrage the sanctity of this House. And some of the Members, I submit respectfully, have degraded and debased the floor of this House under the name of the privilege motion only to show what in the highest degree can be termed as political gimmickry only for the purposes of publicity. I regret very much that this should have been done. Some of the Members have restrained themselves; others have shown lack of restraint just to make use of political gimmickry.

Now I come to the point—and when I do that, you will find that what is

said in this House is entirely for collateral purposes; the privilege of the House is not at their heart. They think that they can make some political gains out of it. But they are totally mistaken.

Sir, two types of motions have been given: One relates to Mr. Venkataraman and the other to Mr. Arun Shourie. What is the gravamen of the charge so far as Mr. Venkataraman is concerned? That I will deal with, and the other will automatically have been dealt with. So far as Mr. Venkataraman is concerned, the gravamen of the charge is that Mr. Venkataraman, *inter alia*, stated, and I quote:

"What she agreed to was that the Pratishthan should be established and not that her name should be associated with it, and when she came to know about it she asked them to withdraw her name. Therefore, there is no question of her having asked them to associate her name with these things."

This is what he said. Sir, every word, every alphabet, every comma and full stop which he has said is utterly true and correct, and what Mr. Arun Shourie has written is wholly untrue, irresponsible. Why it is that we do not support the privilege motion against him, is a matter to which I will come later on.

Suffice it to say that they have themselves agreed that if Mr. Venkataraman was right, Mr. Shourie was wrong, and if Mr. Shourie was right, Mr. Venkataraman was right. And still both of them are trying to raise the question of privilege.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: What is meant by both? I am an independent Member?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: An absolutely independent Member (Interruptions) Sir, I have no doubt about the independence of Mr. Goswami. The only thing is that once a while he performs a marriage of convenience

and at inconvenient times he gets out of the marriage. That is part of the game. Why go further into it? Let us come to the main issue straight-away.

Sir, if every comma and full stop of this is correct, then, there is no question of any privilege against Mr. Venkataraman. Sir, no one has denied one fact which must be stated at the outset. No one has denied that in Bombay the trust has functioned in the name of Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan. That is not the issue. No one has denied that a photograph was taken. No one has denied that a certain caption was given to the photograph. But, Sir, the crucial factor which all of them have neglected to mention is, assuming while not conceding, that the Marathi translation given of 'Sahbhagi' is correct. That is hopelessly incorrect. I have got the dictionary here, and I am going to show you the meaning, in the dictionary, of association. Whether it is 'Sahbhagi' or 'sahkari' or anything else, can that document, even by any wildest stretch of imagination, be called a document of consent?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: The Maharashtra Government calls it.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: If the Maharashtra Government calls it, are we, in this House, to sit in judgement over the acts of commissions and omissions of the Maharashtra Government? Tomorrow the Maharashtra Government will sit in judgement over the acts of commissions and omissions of this House. The Maharashtra Government cannot commit some error and cannot publish something which is incorrect but whatever Mr. Venkataraman says, duly substantiated by documents which I will be referring to here, is wrong, wilfully so, Sir! Surely, a document of consent—I do not know whether Mr. Advani is conversant with the rules of interpretation of documents—is a legal consent, and it has to be given in a particular manner. In a Marathi document it is not written. If you were to mistake 'sahbhagi' to be a document of consent and if

you say this in Maharashtra, people will only laugh at you; they will not even smile, for the simple reason that a document of consent is an entirely different document, and this has nothing to do whatsoever with consent. That is the truth accepted by each one of them. Not one of them has said that it was a document of consent. What consent has been given?

The 'document of consent' and the photograph have been so much relied upon. Was there anything else? They have said that the declaration was made before large many people and that Mrs. Gandhi had consented to the name of the Pratishthan to be made the Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan. Have they relied upon any document whatsoever? Have they relied upon any evidence whatsoever which is credible even before the people? Forget the test of evidence to be applied in a court of law.

What have they relied upon or their statement even before the people that Mrs. Gandhi has given her consent for the Pratibha Pratishthan to be named as Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Antulay has said it.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Again Mr. Antulay is brought in. Mr. Antulay has also said one thing; may I quote it?

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: After ten months he says this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Let me quote what Mr. Antulay said on the floor of the House there, which is equally true. Otherwise he will be hauled up for breach of privilege in that House. We cannot haul him up here. This is what Mr. Antulay said. Now, Mr. Antulay is being quoted right, left and centre and out of context. Whatever may be the lapses of Mr. Antulay, whatever may be the lapses of the Maharashtra Govern-

Shri Arun Shouri

ment, whatever may be the lapses of the Information and Publicity Department of Maharashtra, this is what Mr. Antulay said, and I want to quote from a national daily. It is not from Bombay...

SHRI PILOO MODY: Which paper?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: "The Hindu".

SHRI PILOO MODY: What is your contention? "The Hindu" of this date is correct but all the newspapers of October, 10 are wrong?

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: This is the latest.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: My difficulty is that my learned friend on the opposite side has had nothing to do with the forensic field. He is busy drawing caricatures and drawing buildings, etc. And on an issue which requires a certain degree of... (Interruptions). It is not a personal attack. In good humour he will take it. One cannot be even a Jack of all trades. I will not be able to draw a straight line. If I say something on architecture, I would be as stupid and ridiculous as he is on...

(Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY: I accept your proposition. You are the expert on corruption, not me.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, this is what Mr. Antulay says. I am quoting from "The Hindu" of the 10th September:

"The Chief Minister said in the State Assembly, while replying to the debate on the issue of collection of funds for the Pratishthan and other trusts..."

During his one-hour speech, Mr. Antulay said: "On the very first day Mrs. Gandhi had said that her name should not be associated with the Pratishthan. But I only felt..."

(Interruptions)

SHRI J. K. JAIN: What is this sound? You are capable of doing this only? (Interruptions).

SHRI RAMANAND YADAV (Bihar):***

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't record it.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I quote:

During his one-hour speech, Mr. Antulay said:

"On the very first day, Mrs. Gandhi had said that her name should not be associated with the Pratishthan. But I only felt that I would be able to persuade her and she will give her consent."

Mr. Antulay said he was deeply sorry that Mrs. Gandhi was associated with the controversy even though she had refused permission to name the Pratishthan after her. He thought he would be able to persuade her. "This was the only mistake I have made", he said.

Now, this is what Mr. Antulay said.

SHRI PILOO MODY: How much did this item cost?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Mr. Antulay may speak lies. Assuming, while not conceding, that everyone may tell a lie to save his skin, will documents tell a lie today?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: No.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: And if documents do not lie, does not this document merely say—Mr. Advani, I put it to you—"I am happy to associate myself with the Pratibha Pratishthan of Maharashtra"? If this is what is stated, are they reading into this that the Pratibha Pratishthan of Maharashtra may be named as Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: After the signing of this document, immediately it is registered as Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan. What else is the implication?

***Not recorded.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am not for a moment contesting that claim that the trust... (Interruptions).

SHRI PILOO MODY: What did you read? What did you quote just now? (Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: The alleged document of consent. This is what is written on the document.

SHRI PILOO MODY: My understanding is that the document was in Marathi. Am I correct?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: The document was in English.

SHRI PILOO MODY: This is what you were reading?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Yes. (Interruptions). I am grateful to Mr. Piloo Mody for having raised this point that the document was in English because instead of translating Marathi into English, I am now going to translate English into Marathi to show what it means. And then understand its clear implications, and you will have no doubt left, if you make an objective evaluation of what Mr. Venkataraman has said, along with some other document that I am pointing out to. You will have no doubt left whatsoever, whatever else the document may be called, but it will never be called a document of consent. That is what Mr. Arun Shourie's article said. Have I for a moment said that what Mr. Advani read as one of the recitals in the trust deed is wrong? Indeed, the trust deed, the recital, is there. It was named Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan. Is this what he said?—that for some time it was not being named as Indira Pratibha Pratishthan. The appellation was not that of Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan—that is not what Mr. Venkataraman said. What Mr. Venkataraman said was she did not give her consent. Purely a recital in a trust deed that it is named so and so does not mean that the person has given his or her consent. Many times trust deeds are made in the names of persons who have not given their consent...

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : प्रधान मंत्री जी इंकार कर दें और उसके बाद भी अंतुले साहब ज्यादाती करें, यह नहीं हो सकता है ।

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am coming to that...

SHRI PILOO MODY: May I ask another question? God knows how many hundreds of reports appeared on 10th October and thereafter this trust has been named after her... (Interruptions). She has an enormous publicity department and large staff which constantly combs all the publications. Nobody brought to her attention, she did not thereafter request for an immediate withdrawal!

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: On July 23 Mr. Dhawan wrote for this...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am coming to that...

SHRI PILOO MODY: I am asking a simple question.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: My simple answer is this. Maybe, there was some delay because of the communication gap. But long before the controversy started, long before anyone raised a finger against Mrs. Indira Gandhi...

SHRI PILOO MODY: Is it a communication gap or is it a communication lapse?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Are we debating that there was no delay? The crucial question is this. If you want to question the *bona fides*, unless we understand the fact that there was absolutely not a finger raised against the mode of collection nor any allegation made about the *mala fides* of the trust in June, and the Special Assistant of the Prime Minister wrote a letter to Mr. Antulay...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Nine months after that.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: From November to June is 9 months? What

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

method of calculation is this? June to November is 9 months? At least be correct in the calculation.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: October to June.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Mr. Advani, even from October to June does not make 9 months. Don't be obsessed with 9 months...

SHRI PILOO MODY: I would like to know which system of geometry is adopted. According to the Uclidean system of geometry on which modern mathematics is based, October to June is 9 months.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: No mention of dates? Which day of October to which day of June? Then you calculate.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: From 11th October to 7th June doesn't make 9 months. Anyway, now it is a question of privilege that I made a wrong statement. So, give another notice of breach of privilege. Now, in the month of June what is crucial is this: whether or not in the first week of June, it is well established that so far as the trust is concerned, this political controversy was nowhere on the scene. Is it not clear that sometime in the first week of June, though in Maharashtra it was functioning as Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan, either here in this House or in the other House nobody had ever said that there was anything mala fide about this Pratibha Pratishthan collecting money in the manner in which it was collecting or that there was any impropriety nor was there anything said that probity or purity in public life or public morality were involved in Mr. Antulay associating himself with a trust which was collecting funds. None of these issues were raised in the month of June and in the month of June itself Mrs. Gandhi wrote—and it is not denied that it was written in June—and the document in original has been produced here and as the basis for

exonerating Mr. Venkataraman, she stated:

"While I am interested in the subject and while I do want the functions of the Trust to go on, I do not allow my name to be associated and, therefore, I would want you to delete my name from the Trust."

This is what she has said. "I want my name to be deleted from this." This is what she said and this is what Mr. Venkataraman mentioned. This is what she said when she came to know about it and she asked him to withdraw her name.

SHRI PILOO MODY: The crucial question is when she came to know about it. (Interruptions). The crucial point is when she came to know about this.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: Sir, Mr. Antulay has thanked her for agreeing to it. (Interruptions). When he has thanked her for agreeing to this...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him conclude, please.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, before your judgment is pronounced, they are already acting hopelessly demoralised and as a last resort Let this listen now.

(Interruptions).

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, I do not want the gentlemanly behaviour of the Opposition in comparison to that of the ruling party members, to be construed as demoralised. As gentlemen, Sir, we would like to hear the other point of view even though it is fabricated.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let him conclude now.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI AMARJIT KAUR (Punjab): Sir, what is this? Every-time this honourable Member is getting up and saying something.

(Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY: Madam. I would recommend other issues like 'Khalistan' to you.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SANTOSH MITRA (West Bengal): Sir, I object to the remark of the honourable Member that the Opposition is demoralised.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let him conclude.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, I am coming to another contention against what Mr. Venkataraman has said and I will show how Mr. Venkataraman has been completely exonerated. He said: "I am producing the original document signed by the Prime Minister on 11th October, 1980", which clearly shows that the signed document bearing the caption "Pratibha Pratishtan"...

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, what is it that is being quoted now? (Interruptions). I would like to know what it is that he is quoting from. He did not quote in the House. (Interruptions). I do not think Mr. Venkataraman quoted from it. If this is an official document and if it is quoted here, it should be placed on the Table of the House.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: No, no.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, he read out from his notes. He did not quote from any document. I do not object to his mentioning it. But I want to know what it is because I thought he was only quoting from his notes. If it is a document that is being quoted, then it should be placed on the Table.

(Interruptions)

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: It is not a document. He is only quoting from his notes.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am quoting from the notes given to me by Mr. Venkataraman to show as to what his defence is in this. He has given certain defence and I am quoting from the notes. (Interruptions). I am quoting from his notes. He has given certain defence and I am quoting from the notes. (Interruptions). And, Sir, whether it is to be placed

or not to be placed may be your decision. I am reading from the notes to show what the truth of the matter is, what the newspapers publish.

SHRI PILOO MODY: The whole world knows about it. When the whole world knows about it, only his papers do not mention it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: This is what Mr. Venkataraman's contention is and his contention is that he was producing the original document of 11-10-1980 which says that Mrs. Gandhi signed the document bearing the caption "Pratibha Pratishtan". (Interruptions). "When it is 'Pratibha Pratishtan'", further he says, "and not Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishtan as stated in the newspaper report relied upon by the honourable Members, the honourable Members can see that report and decide that Mrs. Gandhi has not signed document of consent to the Trust of Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishtan to be named after her."

(Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY: I do not think this is correct.

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am not yielding. Please sit down. (Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, a copy of the "Lokraj" was produced before you. (Interruptions) It is a copy of the "Lokraj".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right. Let him conclude now.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: "The Indian Express" is not the right thing. It is the "Lokraj" which is important because that is the Government document.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Both the things are there. They must be there.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: What I mean to say is that I am not relying on "The Indian Express".

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, the Trust deed was registered on the 18th November, 1980 and you can see the tour programme of Mrs. Gandhi. If it is registered on the 18th November, 1980, how could it be inaugurated in October? *(Interruptions)*. Sir, this is just like saying that a child is guilty of certain acts which, in point of time, were done before the child was born. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: No, no.
(Interruptions)
2 P.M.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: This is your interpretation.
(Interruptions).

The inauguration of the trust by usage, by practice, and by every known social custom....
(Interruptions).

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: No. *(Interruptions)*. A trust can be inaugurated before registration.
(Interruptions).

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, he is misleading the House. Mr. Salve and I can sit in the lobby and discuss the matter. The trust is operative from that moment. That is the law.
(Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: There is some function. There is some... *(Interruptions)*. There is bound to be some ceremony, and if you are going to say 'No' ... *(Interruptions)* let the country know... *(Interruptions)*. Please yourself.
(Interruptions).

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Salve used the word * I think it is totally unparliamentary.
(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will not be recorded.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Let it be on record and let it show what sort of person he is.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It is totally unparliamentary. You cannot call an hon. Member a *

SHRI PILOO MODY: I want it to be on record.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now it has been done.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I want it to be known that Mr. Salve called me *and it should be on records.
(Interruptions)

SHRI J. K. JAIN: Are you not a *
(Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I regret having used the word in the rush of the moment which I should not use. But I will humbly pray to him not to act as one.
(Interruptions).

The trust was registered itself in November, and it is nobody's case that Mrs. Gandhi anywhere near this date went to Bombay and, therefore, the question of inauguration just does not arise. There is a document in original which, Mr. Venkataraman tells me, has been submitted to the Chairman. And this is a crucial document I rely upon, submitted to the Speaker and Chairman. Mr. Venkataraman says that the Prime Minister did not accord permission to Shri Antulay for naming the trust as Indira Gandhi Pratibha Pratishthan as the letter from the Special Assistant to the Prime Minister in June, 1981 clearly shows. *(Interruptions)*. What is it that you are trying to rely upon to drag Mrs. Gandhi's name into this, for dragging Mr. Venkataraman into this or....

*Not recorded.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: He wants only Mr. Antulay to be dragged into this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Who am I to drag him? (Interruptions). I am nobody to drag Mr. Antulay. Mr. Antulay himself said that it was his own error. He dragged himself into this by error. (Interruptions). This is the difficulty. He dragged himself into this by mistake, and as a result of this, by complete distortion, by falsehood, by capricious and malicious propaganda they are dragging the name of two persons who have nothing to do with the trust.

(Interruptions)

This is capricious, this is malicious, entirely untrue. Sir, this is borne out by these documents. (Interruptions) The person concerned obviously has no knowledge of the document of consent or deliberately and wilfully does not say it. Whatever he writes constitutes a question of privilege. But is it proper that we give importance to such utterly false, untrue and irresponsible statements by newspapers? (Interruptions) I will show you precedents: forget about it. One way of punishing the guilty is by showing the contempt he deserves, by completely ignoring it.

Sir, I am citing the case in England. (Time bell rings). Sir, I will take five minutes. Sir, there have been cases in England where such instances have come about. The newspapers have published defamatory and libel statements but the Privileges Committee refused them and decided not to take cognizance of them and ignored with the contempt they deserved. And that is what we want to do. Sir, from the May's Parliamentary Practice, I shall show you two famous cases, one in England and the other in India, from the May's Parliamentary Practice, 18th Edition, page 167. That will suffice. Sir, this is from the May's Parliamentary Practice, 18th edition, page 167. Sir, in some ins-

tances, the House has contended itself with adjudging the papers' complaint of a libel without taking any further action. And, Sir, I am reading from the famous 'Daily Mail' case. This is as recent as 1947. And this is what the Privileges Committee had held that a breach had been committed by a false reporting that there was some secret session of the Parliament, that the Members participated in a secretive manner separately and then in the House, which was very derogatory to the dignity of the House. In that connection, the Privileges Committee said, and I am quoting from the report of the Privileges Committee of the House of Commons in the 'Daily Mail' case, 1948, page 4:

"Whilst recognising that it is the duty of Parliament to intervene in the cases of attacks which may tend to undermine public confidence in and support of the institution of Parliament itself, your Committee think it important on the one hand, the law of Parliamentary privilege should not be administered in a way which would fetter or discourage the free expression of opinion or criticism, however prejudice or exaggerated such opinions or criticisms may be, and on the other hand the process of parliamentary institution should not be used in a way which would give importance to irresponsible statements."

Sir, this is the procedure . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir, may I ask one question?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Is it a Committee's Report?

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: . . . below our dignity to give importance to untrue, false capricious matters.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir may I put one question to Mr. Salve? Is it not a fact that in both the cases the matter went to the Privileges Committee... (Interruptions) In both

[Shri Dinesh Goswami.]

the cases, the matter went to the Privileges Committee and the Committee decided. Are you saying that if the permission is refused, there will be no privilege? In one case, the consent was given. These cases went to the Privileges Committee. They decided not to take up.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVA: Secondly Sir, I may read from the report of the Privileges Committee in India. Sir, I am reading from the 9th Report of the Privileges Committee of the Second Lok Sabha...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Is it the Privileges Committee Report?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: The Report of the Privileges Committee.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Send it to the Privileges Committee.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the hon. Member has quoted... (Interruptions). Sir, I am on a point of order. (Interruptions) Kindly make him sit down. I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Please.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, he has quoted two examples, both Reports of the Privileges Committee, one of the House of Commons and the others of the Lok Sabha. We also maintain the same thing. Let the Privileges Committee come out with the same ruling. We do not mind. Let it go to the Privileges Committee first.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, you rightly heard the argument. It was only to be heard for the purposes of rejection. It is not understandable what they are saying.

Sir, I am reading from the 9th Report of the Privileges Committee of the Second Lok Sabha, page 2, and this is what they said:

"The Committee are of the opinion that such remarks which cast aspersions and attribute irresponsibility tend to diminish the respect due to Parliament. Strictly construed, they would amount to a breach of the privileges of the committee. The Committee, however, feel that it is not consistent with the dignity of the House to take notice of every such statement which may technically constitute a contempt of the House. The House would best consult its dignity if it ignored such improprieties and indiscretions."

Sir, I submit that the best way we can show contempt for utterly untrue, incorrect and false reporting in the Indian Express is by showing the contempt it deserves by ignoring it and by not sending it to the Privileges Committee.

श्री उपसभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही
सवा 3 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती
है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at eleven minutes past two of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at eighteen minutes past three of the clock, The Vice-Chairman (Shri Dinesh Goswami) in the Chair.

REFERENCE TO THE ALLEGED PLIGHT OF BUILDING CONSTRUCTION WORKERS IN DELHI

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Special mentions. Shri Malik.

श्री सत्यपाल मलिक (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
मान्यवर, मैं सरकार का ध्यान दिल्ली में
विभिन्न परियोजनाओं में निर्माण के काम
में लगे हुए मजदूरों की कठिनाइयों की
तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। मेरे एक