

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: There has been no precedent like this. Do not create a new precedent. There has never been a precedent. Let us finish it today. *(Interruptions)* We cannot do it like that. This House is not to decide that. What are you talking? *(Interruptions)*.

MR.- CHAIRMAN: One by one, please.

*(Interruptions)*

संसदीय कार्य तथा संचार मंत्री (श्री भोष्म नारायण सिंह) : मान्यवर, आज तक कभी ऐसा नहीं हुआ है कि सदन बड़े या नहीं, इस पर कोई मत विभाजन हो। ऐसा कभी नहीं हुआ है। लेकिन सदन के नेता ने स्वयं ही अभी कहा कि विपक्ष के नेता के अनुरोध पर कहा, इसके पहले भी माननीय सदस्यों से बातचीत होती रही है अगर यह बिजनेस खत्म नहीं होगा तो हमारे पास कल बैठने के अतिरिक्त और कोई आशय नहीं। पहले बिजनेस शुरू तो होना चाहिए।

*(Interruptions)*

MR, CHAIRMAN: There is no such thing as a precedent or a convention for determining the completion of business in this House. When I am in the Chair, I shall lay down the proper guidelines for it... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Ma, I suggest three items for today, namely, the Appropriation Bill, 1980, the Appropriation (Railways) Bill, 1980, and the Prevention of Blackmarketing and Maintenance of Supplies of Essential Commodities Bill, 1980? These three may be taken up today. The rest of the business may be taken up tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us take it up now. *..(Interruptions)* Special Mention, Mr. Dwivedi... *(Interruptions)* No disturbance now.

**REFERENCE TO JUSTICE VAIDIALINGAM COMMISSION'S REPORT INDICTING FAMILY MEMBERS OF EX-PRIME MINISTER SHRI MORARJI DESAI AND EX-HOME MINISTER SHRI CHARAN SINGH.**

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, with your kind permission I rise to make a special mention of a subject which is uppermost in the minds today not only of the Members of this House but in the minds of the people in this country.

Sir on the penultimate day of the session of the Rajya Sabha, a news appeared yesterday which not only vindicates the stand that some of us have been taken in the past one year but which also confirmed the worst fears that we have had in the past year and a half. I am making special mention of the findings of the Vaidialingam Commission which has indicted the son of a former Prime Minister, the daughter-in-law of a former Prime Minister, and the wife of yet another ex-Prime Minister, Chaudhury Charan Singh.

AN MON. MEMBER: A Caretaker Prime Minister.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Let me not be interrupted, so that I can finish within five or seven minutes. This Commission has a very sad and sordid history behind it. It is the history of the obstinacy and bull-headedness of the Janata Government. It is the history of the manner in which the Rajya Sabha has been treated with contempt by Mr. Morarji Desai and the then Leader of the House, the present Leader of the Opposition Mr. Advani, and of the manner in which this House has been vindicated.

I will tell you in two or three minutes the history. The whole thing started by appearance in a section of the Press, of a news that certain letters had passed hands between the

then Prime Minister and the then Home Minister, Shri Charan Singh, in which both had levelled serious allegations and charges against the family members of each other. It appeared in the Press. Then, the Rajya Sabha played a very important role in it. That is why I am making this special mention of the history. Then, in the Rajya Sabha a Calling Attention motion was admitted on the 7th of August. The Calling Attention was discussed here in which the Prime Minister summarily rejected the idea of the correspondence being placed on the Table of the House. He said that there was nothing to the whole matter. Then, subsequently, some of us moved a motion under Rule 168 whereby we sought the House to direct the Government to place the correspondence on the Table of the House. This again was rejected by the Government. Ultimately, the then Chairman in his wisdom decided that the House be allowed to discuss the motion on the 10th of August. The Rajya Sabha discussed the motion and it passed the motion of the hon. Member Shri N. K. P. Salve, which was amended by the amendment of Shri Bhupesh Gupta. Thereby the House sought to appoint a Committee of the House to go into the allegations made against the family members of the two top leaders of the Janata Party. Or, alternatively, a commission of Inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act was sought to be appointed in pursuance of that Resolution. Unfortunately, sir, the Government refused to comply with the recommendation or rather the Resolution of the House and for which for days and weeks together the House was bogged down with discussing as to whether the Motion was mandatory or recommendatory. We thought that it was mandatory and the Government has to comply with the Motion while the Government said that it was not mandatory, and the whole thing went on. Then, the then Home Minister submitted his resignation, and while making a

978 RS—2.

statement in the other House, that is the Lok Sabha, he read out and he placed all the letters on the Table of the House which we wanted to be placed on the Table of the House. Therefore, it became public. And then immediately we again asked for the letters to be placed on the Table of the House which was not done. When all this was happening, then the Government, sensing the mood of the House proceeded and we were informed by the Home Minister, Mr. Patel, who had become the Home Minister by that time, that the Chief Justice of India, hon. Mr. Chandrachud, had been requested to go into the allegations made on the floor of the House. We were informed of it while discussing the Motion of the 10th of August. Some of us had doubts about the constitutional propriety of what was done by the Government. And some of us have also raised our apprehensions about dragging the Head of the Judiciary in the matter, a matter which primarily concerns the Rajya Sabha. Then subsequently it so transpired that the hon. Chief Justice declined to go into the allegations and he said that he would not do it, and then on the Government the hon. Chief Justice suggested the name of Mr. Vaidialingam. And one-man Vaidialingam Commission was appointed by the Government. And the terms of reference of the Commission were to go into the allegations made in the debates of the 10th of August and find out whether there was a *prima facie* case against the various relatives of Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. Charan Singh, and in case there was a *prima facie* case, then it was open to the Commission to recommend the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act. Sir, according to the press reports, the Commission has submitted its Report and Mr. Vaidialingam has found a *prima facie* case against the son of Mr. Morarji Desai, against the daughter-in-law of Mr. Morarji Desai and against the wife of Chaudhary Charan Singh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I say one word? I take it that the Report of Justice Vaidialingam will come into my hands some day. And then it would be a matter for the House to consider it when I have passed it on to the House. I have not seen the Report, and it is not yet in my hands. Now the newspaper report is that he has given a report of a particular type. I think, this is enough for the Special Mention.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: I am afraid, what you have said may not be necessarily the best course, of action, if I may say so, Sir. Sir, what I am asking is that I am asking the Home Minister to place on the Table of the House the findings of Mr. Justice Vaidialingam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Nothing short of this will meet the requirements of the situation, nothing short of this will satisfy the hon. Members of the House who, for days together, for weeks together, had begged of the then Leader of the House to let us know what actually had transpired between them. Now, a finding has already been given. So, I beg to demand...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI:.. that in the interest of probity and incorruptibility of the highest officer—we are not concerned with individuals, Sir. This House has never been concerned with the character assassination. Character assassination is somebody else's job. That is somebody else's game and they have paid the price for it. We are not interested in character assassination—we are interested in certain standards in public life to be maintained and find out whether certain allegations which have been made are correct or not. And I ask two questions that (a) today, on the last day of the Rajya Sabha...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA ( West Bengal): No, no. The last but one day.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: All right, the penultimate day of Rajya Sabha. I demand that the hon. Home Minister place a copy of the findings of Mr. Justice Vaidialingam on the Table of the House. And, secondly, while doing so, it is incumbent on the Home Minister, on the present Government, to make an announcement to the effect that they are going to appoint a Commission of Inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act. With these words Sir, I resume my seat.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : Sir, I want to fully support Mr. Dwivedi's demand that the Report should be placed on the Table of the House. Otherwise nobody knows what is there in the Report and what is going to happen. I fully support Mr. Dwivedi's demand. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kulkarni, may I remind...

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I also support the demand of Mr. Dwivedi. I would like to go a step further and say that an inquiry commission should be appointed to go into the matter. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the House that this is not a debate and that there will be no speeches? This is a matter just for mention.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, we are fully supporting the demand of Mr. Dwivedi, (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Narasimha Reddy. I shall not allow a debate.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir while thanking you for giving me an opportunity to speak, I may mention that I do not want to repeat

what my friend, Mr. Dwivedi, has said about the Vaidialingam Commission's Report. But I would like to bring to the notice of the House that this matter, which is a very important matter, was raised in the House, and after the House passed a Resolution after a thorough discussion it was not proper for the Government to disregard the Resolution in the manner in which it was done. Sir, in order to avoid giving effect to the Resolution, which categorically requested the Government to appoint a Commission of Inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act, two diversionary methods were adopted. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN- Order, order.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Firstly, the Prime Minister^ the then Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, asked the Members of the House who had raised certain allegations against Shri Kanti Desai and others, to give those allegations in writing to the Prime Minister so that he could look into them and then forward them to the Chief Justice who would find out whether there was a *prima facie* case or not. This was one of the methods by which the Government and the then Prime Minister wanted to escape giving effect to the Resolution of the Rajya Sabha. Secondly, Sir, when further pressure was brought, when the Rajya Sabha insisted and when the majority insisted . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN; May I remind you, Mr. Reddy, that we are discussing a news item, which says that a report has, in fact, been made. How that matter came to be referred is neither here nor there.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Sir, I am only explaining the background of the Resolution of the Rajya Sabha, which was sought to be diverted and was not respected. Finally, Mr. Morarji Desai came forward to say that a Commission was appointed. This House was not satisfied with it. Now, there is the press report that there is a clear case against Shri Kanti Desai, against Shrimati Padma

Desai and against Shrimati Gayatri Devi. Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Home Minister—according to the press reports the Report of the Commission has been sent to the Home Minister a few days ago—why the Home Minister has not placed it before the House so far. That is the first point. He should have placed the Report before the House. He should have taken the House into confidence. Then, I would like the Home Minister to make a statement, we are meeting here definitely tomorrow also, whether he is prepared to accept the findings of this Commission and appoint an inquiry commission under the Commissions of Inquiry Act. These findings are only the tip of an ice-berg; there are bigger things in it. Sir, Members had raised a very important issue regarding the Jaguar deal in which Mr. Kanti Desai was said to be involved. Members raised the issue of gold auctions in the other House in which Mr. Kanti Desai, has played an important part. All these things will have to be gone into.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Everybody is aware of the importance of the question. Therefore, it is no use spelling it out over and over again. Mr. Dinesh Goswami.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; On a point of order, Sir. I am not on this subject. I only want to point out... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): After, the name of the next speaker is declared. .... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA... that there is a standing Resolution of the House. My name has been mentioned. I moved an amendment on August 10 1978; it was passed; the Resolution has not lapsed. I suggest that the Government should appoint a committee.. (*Interruptions*).

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA (Maharashtra): On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am also on a point of order. A<sub>3</sub> I was saying . . .

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: I am on a point of order; Chairman has allowed me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: ... our House has been vindicated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I say, the point of order does not mean long speech. What is your point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Unless you sit, Sir, how can I speak.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Sir, my point of order is that you said when I saw you, that those of the Members who have given notice of special mention, will be allowed to speak. Now, Sir, in between, if other Members, §<sup>et</sup> UP—with due respect to Bhupeshda—then it will be unfair to those who have given notice of a special mention. Now, Sir, you called upon Mr. Dinesh Goswami to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Goswami will have the precedence. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you will get your chance.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, with all humility I must say that though Bhupeshda is a very senior Member, it does not mean that the right of a junior Member should be taken away by him on every occasion.

I do not want to go into the history because, as you said, it is not relevant. I may only point out that when this motion was moved by Mr. Salve, there was also a motion by me which says that the matter can be inquired into by a sitting judge of the Supreme Court. The motion also said that immediately after the receipt of the report, it should be made available to the House. The Government at a subsequent time came to us and said: On principle, we have accepted your motion almost and we have decided to refer it to the Supreme Court. We

then asked the Leader of the House, Mr. Advani whether he was agreeable also to report the findings to the House. He said: Yes. And on that assurance, I did not press my own motion because he had assured that the matter would be reported to the House. Sir, if you go through the proceedings, you will find that ultimately it was assured by the Government that the findings of the Vaidialingam Commission will be made available to the House. I want to know from the hon. Home Minister that when this whole matter originated from a Resolution in this House—and on this Resolution, we spent days together—how is it that before the findings could come to this House, the matter has gone to the press? Sir, it is, to a certain extent, undermining the prestige, the value and the dignity of this House. When a matter has emanated from the House, it was in the fitness of the things that the report should come to the House first. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister how it went to the press before placing it on the table of the House.

I will also associate myself with the views expressed here. As we are sitting tomorrow also, the essential findings of the report, if not the whole, report, should be placed before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has already been said by Mr. Dwivedi and also by Mr. Reddy.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: And because there is an assurance that if certain things are found out to be correct there will be a Commission of Inquiry, I would like to know from the hon. Home Minister, as he himself was keen to give replies to some questions raised earlier, whether he is in a position to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has also been asked.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I want the Commission of Inquiry to be set

up not with the interest of any political vendetta or anything like that because we are against it, but in the interest of the clean public life. I would request the hon. Minister to throw some light on this also.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for permitting me to add my voice to the question raised in this House and in the other House that a Commission of Inquiry be appointed regarding the matters which were referred to Justice Vaidyalingam. Just to put the record straight I wish only to add one thing. When my friend Mr. Dwivedi from that side was saying that the Government at that time was very obstinate and Mr. Morarji Desai was very unreasonable and he rejected the demand of the House for a Commission of Inquiry to be set up, the fact of the matter is that Mr. Morarji Desai here on the floor of this House had made an offer. He had said that if one member were to give the complaints in writing to him, he would see to it that a proper enquiry was held, if necessary, under the Commissioning of Inquiry Act. My friend Mr. Salve made a very long speech, but in spite of his fretting and fuming not one member from that side of this House or that House came forward with a written complaint.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: On principle we did not do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mahavir, I must say that, it would be impossible for a Judge of the Supreme Court of the eminence of Mr. Vaidyalingam to have reached a conclusion without evidence. Let us see the report.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR:- My point, Mr. Chairman, is this. In spite of the fact that even one member did not make a written complaint about the charges, the Government and the Prime Minister at that time decided to refer the matter to the Chief Justice for his opinion. That is, Sir, the confidence \_\_\_\_ (Interruptions'). If

you keep on shouting, that shows how much interested you are in the matter. You only want your angle of the matter to be heard.

Sir, when the question was referred to the Chief Justice, I remember, my friend over there, Mr. Antulay, had made such a tearing and raging speech against the Chief Justice of India which was most unbecoming, but in spite of that, Sir, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mahavir, we are on a Special Mention. The report is now a fact in the sense that it has come in the newspaper. The report is not with me, it is not in my hands though . . . (Interruptions).

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: I am not on the merits of the report. I beg of you to give me just one minute to explain it. I am not going into what Justice Vaidyalingam has said. When it will be brought to you or sent to you and placed on the Table of the House, we will have an opportunity to discuss it, but Sir, when aspersions are cast or were cast, the record should be put straight. That is why I am saying that it is the good day for the judiciary of this country that even the members of that side who did not show much respect for the judiciary when they were in power earlier . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is all irrelevant.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: All right, I will pass on to the relevant question. May I ask the hon'ble Minister, when he is here, if he will assure the House that the report of Mr. Justice Vaidyalingam will be brought before this House at the earliest opportunity, if possible tomorrow? And I would also like to know if the Government will commit here that not only the Commission of Inquiry will be appointed but also the report of the Commission of Inquiry, when submitted, will be accepted and implemented. In addition, Sir, I hope that this respect for the Commissions of Inquiry and the judiciary will last and the Government will also make a commitment that the

[Dr. Bhai Mahavir] earlier Commission's reports, which have already been submitted, will be honoured and followed up by them in the same spirit because, as my friend Mr. Dwivedi has said, the House is not interested in persons; we are interested in probity of public life; we are interested in keeping certain public standards. For those standards to be maintained, whatever Commissions of Inquiry were appointed in the past or are likely to be appointed, their reports should be accepted and the Home Minister should make a commitment here that the reports would not only be accepted but would be followed up properly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Rafiq Zakaria.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, you have ignored me.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I will be as brief as possible and I shall not repeat what has been already stated.

Sir, the 34 charges that were made by my friend, Mr. Salve.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Thirty-eight charges.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Yes, these 38 charges formed the basis of the Resolution that was passed by the House. Therefore, it is wrong on the part of Dr. Bhai Mahavir to say that even one Member was not prepared to make the allegations before the Chief Justice. The position is that the House took the stand that since a Resolution had been passed, that Resolution must be implemented. I do not want to go into the whole history of it, but what is important here is that after a lot of pressure—both inside and outside the House—the then Prime Minister and the then Leader of the House agreed to refer this matter to the Chief Justice of India. It was suggested that first he agreed—that was the Law Minister's statement—and then the Chief Justice backed out saying that he did not want to get involved into a contro-

versy. Then the Chief Justice was approached to nominate a judge and he nominated Mr. Justice Vaidalingam.

Now, Sir, what the report is, we do not know. But we do know from the press reports what his findings are—and it is there where I would like to appeal to you to bear with me—that a *prima facie* case against Mr. Kanti Desai, Mrs. Kanti Desai and the wife of Chaudhury Charan Singh is made out. If that is so, then according to the Resolution and according to the amendment of my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Dada, the Commission of Inquiry has got to be appointed and, Sir, this Commission of Inquiry will be.—

(Interruptions).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not a Commission of Inquiry.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: It is not a Commission of Inquiry appointed by the Government *suo motu* with a political motivation and with certain vendetta. It is... (Interruptions) No, Sir. I will just finish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Zakaria, are not you rather running before the wind? The whole thing is, there is a newspaper item. There is the hon'ble Home Minister here, who will explain the position of the Government. Instead of our trying to probe it through newspaper item...

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: I will say, supposing what the newspapers have said in regard to the findings of Mr. Justice Vaidalingam is correct, then it will be a Commission of Inquiry at the instance of the Rajya Sabha, at the instance of one of the Houses of Parliament and, therefore, that Commission would stand in case the Government decides to hold that Commission of Inquiry in an entirely different category. Therefore, the demand that Dr. Bhai Mahavir has made that all commissions of inquiry should be bracketted together, I am afraid, we can never accept that position.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I make a submission, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now call upon Mr. Bhupesh Gupta but I would request him to be chary of time and be as brief as possible.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I, Sir, absolutely will obey you because you seem to be the most reasonable man amongst us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, my name has been mentioned twice and it is a fact that the amendment was mine. Sir, you are quite right. If you have not got the Report how can you pronounce on it? I do not ask you to do such a thing. But here the honour of the House is involved. I have been directly involved. In the first instance, that amendment of mine was passed. What does the amendment say? That part I will ask you to give consideration to. The amendment has said: The House should appoint a Committee of its own. Alternatively the Chairman should have a Committee of the House consisting of a number of Members. You can see that amendment. Alternatively the matter should go to a Commission of Inquiry. These were the two alternatives. The first alternative was the appointment of a Committee by the Chairman of the House in terms of the Resolution. Sir, the Government did not agree to it; neither did they agree to the alternative of a Commission. So, the Resolution was not implemented. Now, Sir, we stand vindicated. Sir, you know I was asked by Mr. Justice Vaidialingam to go before him. You will at least give me credit for that I said, "No, I rise or fall with my House. I want the Rajya Sabha to go into it. The Rajya Sabha Resolution has been ignored and rejected by the then Government; therefore, I do not come to you. This matter must be dealt with by the House itself."

Today, Sir, I demand that this be not sent to a commission of inquiry. Let the first part of the Resolution be

implemented. You, Sir, in terms of the Resolution can appoint a Committee. The Resolution is in force. It has not been implemented.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: No. The Chairman refused to appoint. It was the Chairman who gave the ruling that he shall not appoint a Committee.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My friend, Dr. Zakaria, is a nice man, lovely to see, but his points of order are not good sometimes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, this is a matter which can easily be solved by me by looking through the records and proceedings.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, suppose your successor Chairman \_\_\_\_\_

(friterruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will have a look. I am somewhat innocent of this matter because I was not in this august House before ----- I will have to look through the proceedings.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Absolutely, Sir, so that you look deeply and that is why I am bringing it to your notice. Therefore, you kindly look into it and you will find that we stand vindicated. At least I should be rewarded I did not go to the Commission. I said, "I am in the House; I want the House to be vindicated." I got two letters from Mr. Justice Vaidialingam requesting me to appear before him. Sir, I will appear only before my House, before the Committee of the House. The House has been bypassed and ignored by the previous Government. Therefore, the matter should go to the House. I told Mr. Justice Vaidialingam that this is the reason, not because I have anything against him.

Today, Sir, I request you to look into this matter. All I say is, please implement this Resolution, Sir. And the Government, I hope—they were supporting me from this tide—will not



[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

object to your appointing a Committee. A committee was not appointed because the Government would not like it; they said that there was no *prima facie* case. Today a *prima facie* case has been established. Therefore, Sir, you will be well advised with your judicial experience and prudence to appoint a committee of the House. Let us stand vindicated before the world.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, I cannot promise anything without seeing the file. Therefore, if you are waiting for me to make a statement, you are waiting in vain.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, you are absolutely right. I do not ask you to promise anything. I entirely agree with you that I cannot ask you to promise anything. What I am submitting is that all your rulings seem to be quite good; therefore,, kindly consider it. I have faith in you. I know this is an occasion . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, I have got your point that there was an occasion when you did raise the question in the House that it should not be anybody but a committee appointed by the Chairman which should look into it. Whatever has happened is all old history. Now we are on the report which has come and we have to see what the next step should be.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, it is an on-going history, not an old history. All this is not history buried in a capsule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The matter will be resolved when Gajapati speaks, his turn has yet to come. We have got your point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I ask the Home Minister whether he is agreeable to the appointment of a committee of the House in terms of the resolution. If they are going to do it, let them say so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Salve.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON  
(Kerala): Sir. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: After Mr. Salve.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: Sir, my party is a small party here. But we must also be heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Salve, first we will hear a small party with a loud voice.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: It is no doubt a small party but always taking a reasonable stand. We are not here to defend anybody, whether it is this Prime Minister or that Prime Minister.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You go on.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: Sir, our stand has been that if there are charges; against somebody, they must be looked into by a judicial officer. We still stand by that. Earlier also, we moved an amendment to Shri Bhupesh Gupta's resolution to the effect that it should be referred to a judicial officer and we welcomed the decision to have Justice Vaidyalingam look into it to see whether there is a *prima facie* case or not. Now also our stand is that we should appoint a committee of judicial officers to look into it. If it is entrusted to a committee of the House,, it will be influenced by political motives. Therefore, we want that it should be looked into by a committee of judicial officers. And one more point I want to make. When this commission of inquiry is appointed and when it goes into all these things, the former commissions of inquiry, the Shah Commission and all those bodies, should not be scrapped. They should also be proceeded with. That is our stand. Nobody, whether it is Kanti Desai or Sanjay Gandhi, can escape from the hands of the law of this country.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: The hon. Member does not know that the Shah Commission has finished its work. May be it is because he belongs to a small party.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: It is not a small party. It is ruling three States.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are bringing some other inquiries into it. (Interruptions) Mr. Salve.

SHRI N. K. SALVE (Maharashtra): Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity. I shall reciprocate this gesture by being brief. As one who moved the motion which had a marathon debate and the aftermath of which was that I was subjected to a very cruel and bitter attack outside the House as one who had joined the distinguished band of those who indulge in wreckless speech-making, who indulge in wreckless character assassination for ill-conceived political motives, my party was attacked, etc., etc., I would say that is all gone. I do not want to go into it. (Interruptions) That is what I want to say. That is what I want to tell immediately. Thereafter, Sir, the Prime Minister offered to refer the matter at the behest of the Chief Justice of India to one of the distinguished jurists, Justice Vidyalingam. As one who has been in the forensic field in the country, I have known far too well the scholarship, the erudition and the eminence of the jurists like Justice Vidyalingam. Sir, what we protested at that time and protested vehemently is this. Let it be clear. It was that the thinking of the Chief Justice of India and his acting as an adviser to the Prime Minister in this matter. Let the record be clear. He should not have been dragged into this. He should not have acted as an adviser to the Prime Minister in this matter. This was a stinking business, and in this stinking business, judiciary has no business to come anywhere near it unless in a proper manner, proper forum, proper enactment it went for their adjudication in their courts. They are supreme, and they can do whatever. That is number one.

Secondly, Sir, it is this for which I sought your permission. Justice Vidyalingam wrote to me to go to him,

to give my evidence and tell what I thought in this matter for his term.<sup>3</sup> of reference were very limited which were to determine whether or not I had made a prima facie case about the matter for being referred to a commission of inquiry. Sir, I wrote back to him saying this. This is very important, Sir. This would not have seen the light of the day. Therefore, I sought the permission. I wrote back to him that I had the highest regard for him and for his independence, but that I was fettered by two very serious considerations to appear before him. Referring to the May's Parliamentary Practice, I said that in respect of matters which had been debated in this House, I could not, without the permission of this House, go and give any evidence.

I also put it to him that the enquiry must be a public enquiry, because—I put it squarely to him—more than Mr. Kanti, I and my party would also be on trial to determine and see whether we were playing the same game which they had played or whether we are different. Days of careful work had gone into what we got here; it is not an irresponsible wretched witch-hunting. It is their prerogative.

Therefore, my submission, Sir, is that alone with the report which you would direct him to present here, if nothing else, my correspondence to Justice Vidyalingam should also be laid on the Table of this House. That is very essential. That is my submission.

**गृह मंत्री (श्री जल सिंह) :** मैं यह परवान करता हूँ कि यह रिपोर्ट, जस्टिस वड्यालिंगम की इस सभा के टबल पर रख दी जायेगी, जब आपकी इजाजत होगी।

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE (Maharashtra): Tomorrow.

SHRI ZAIL SINGH: It is not possible to lay it tomorrow. (Interruptions)

श्री जल सिंह : जब दूसरा सेशन बैठेगा तो तब रख दी जायेगी ।

श्री सभापति : आन्डरेबिल मिनिस्टर, आपको इजाजत दी जाती है कि आप वह रिपोर्ट हाउस के टेबल पर रखें । अगर आज नहीं रख सकते तो क्या यह कल हो सकेगा ?

श्री भा० दे खोबरागाडे : कल रखनी चाहिए ।

श्री सभापति : आप कब तक यह रिपोर्ट रख सकेंगे ?

श्री एन० के० पी० साल्वे : यह रिपोर्ट जरूर रखनी चाहिए फ्यूचर माइडेन्स के लिए ।

For future guidance it will be necessary that we decide that matter also once for all.

श्री सभापति : आप कब इसको रखने के लिये तैयार हैं ?

श्री जल सिंह : मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि जब अगला सेशन बैठेगा तो उसी रोज, फर्स्ट दिन, हम उसको रख देंगे, पहले ही रोज रख देंगे ।

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE: Why delay?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The report is in his hands. Why can they not put it without delay?

SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND (Punjab): Why delay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down Mr. Anand.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): If the Home Minister can supply a copy of it to the Press, he can place a copy on the Table of the Rajya Sabha also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. That is not necessary. The matter is

not that urgent that the House should sit till midnight to take a reading of that report. There will be time enough Mr. Home Minister, put it at your earliest convenience possible on the Table.

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE: Tomorrow, Sir.

(Interruptions)

श्री जल सिंह : सभापति जी, मैं आपके इस आदेश को स्वीकार करता हूँ कि जितनी जल्द पासीबल हो सके यह सदन की टेबल पर रख दी जाए । मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि कल मुमकिन नहीं है, इसलिए अगले सेशन का जो पहला दिन होगा उसी रोज रख दी जाएगी ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. (Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY: If he can supply a copy to the press, he can supply a copy to the Rajya Sabha. (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): What stands in the way of his giving it tomorrow? (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I say, judging it objectively, I think the Home Minister is not being unreasonable when he says that he will make it available on the first, opening day of the next session.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI LAL K. ADVANI): Mr. Chairman, Sir.

(Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY: He has given a copy to the press.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, ordinarily perhaps no exception could be taken to the Government's right to place a report on the Table of the House when it wants to, when it is convenient to it. But in this particular case, what really is shocking for the House is to see that a report appears in the press, a press agency report. It is not merely a newspaper reporting

but the UNI, a press agency, reporting it. Obviously leaked out from official quartern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute, Mr. Advani. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI SADASIV BAGAITKAR (Maharashtra): on a point of order.

-MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, what is the point of order?

SHRI SADASIV BAGAITKAR: The of order is, if the Home Minister thinks that it is not feasible to place it on the Table of the House tomorrow, will he assure us that this report will not be released to the press and debated before it is placed here, as it has already been done? Otherwise, before the House meets, the report will appear in the press.

श्री सभापति : आपके पास मकफी रहेगी वह रिपोर्ट प्रेस को नहीं जाएगी, वह पूछा जा रहा है ।

ज्ञानी जल सिंह : सभापति जी, मैं आपको भरोसा दिलाता हूँ कि वह सभा में आने से पहले कहीं प्रेस में नहीं जाएगी लेकिन . . . (Interruptions) जो प्रेस में चली गई है वह हमने नहीं दो है । वह कहाँ से और कैसे गई है, यह मैं नहीं कह सकता . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: On a point of order, Sir. Please allow me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. (Interruption). Just one minute. I am standing. Please sit down. I believe that the Members of this august House are mature enough to know that the reports leak out not from the Government to the press but the press has its own means of finding out.

SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND: On a point of order, Sir.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have had enough of this.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: No, Sir. I have got a point of order. Now you should allow me—

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. I think you should respect. (Interruptions). I am sorry, no speeches. I think you should respect the assurance given by the hon. Home Minister and I think I can conclude this matter on that note.

Now, we take up the next subject.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, kindly listen to my submission for two-minutes. . .

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Gujarat) : Sir, my party leader had not concluded his submission. He was in the midst of his submission. Please allow him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now proceed to the next item....

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, I have another point, not about this. I notice that in the Lok Sabha on the 2nd of February the report of the Gupta Commission on Maruti was placed on the Table of the House. But this House not been presented with that report even today \_\_\_\_\_

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are talking about another Commission's report. We have got plenty of commission reports.

The report you are referring to has been already placed on the Table of the House.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, please allow me a moment only. Don't allow me a minute but only a moment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no. (Interruptions)

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: You are not to talk to me. You address the Chair. Sir, please listen to me. I am rising in my seat and trying to catch your eye for the last fifteen minutes. I have got every right to put my sub-

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

mission before you. I have my right as a Member of Parliament you say you do not agree with my point, I can understand it. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kulkarni, you cannot accuse the Chair of not hearing you. I think you supply half the words in this House.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, my submission was this. I agree with the Home Minister when he says he can place the report on the Table of the House on the first day of the next Session. I would not have normally minded, but you have to protect our rights. When you have given a decision that the report appears in the press and when Parliament is in Session, I want to inquire from the Home Minister how that report has leaked out and whether it has leaked out or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have all gone into it over and over again. How it has leaked out to the press, they do not know nor do you.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, you have been Chief Justice of the Supreme court. Did your judgement ever leak out through your stenographer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I used to tell my stenographer, "Only you and I know it. And I know that it will not leak out from me. If it leaks out from you, you go the next day."

"SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Then, Sir, please tell us how it could have leaked out in this case. How could it have happened?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have finished with this topic. Now we will proceed to the next item of business. There is one more Special Mention. .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI (Punjab): Sir, we cannot proceed. The

Government has got to tell us how this leakage could have occurred. And why should they have to wait till the next Session to lay it on the Table of the House? Why cannot they arrange it to be laid on the Table tomorrow itself? The Home Minister has got to answer these questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Soni, we are having another interesting Special Mention by Mr. Yadav. . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: First we must know how this leakage took place. It is the Home Minister's job to find out and tell us.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please. There is no use shouting. Mr. Home Minister, please get up and make a final statement.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. The Home Minister wanted to get up, but three Ministers prevented him from getting up. . .

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is all over now.... (Interruptions) I won't hear anybody now.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no speech after the statement of the Home Minister.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, if you had listened to me, you would have saved yourself from lot of trouble. I can tell you why they have done this. The fact of the matter is that there is leakage. If we allow the Home Minister to conceal that report for the next two or three months, there will be elections in the

meantime in which they will misuse the report. If there is anything in the report, we must have it prior to the elections.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: We cannot ask the press as to how they got it because we believe in the freedom of the press . . . (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Everybody should sit down. Please sit down. I think, the House should proceed with the business now . . . (Interruptions)

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी (आंध्र प्रदेश) : यह रिपोर्ट प्रेस में कैसे आया है, किस तरीके से आया है, इसकी जांच गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से एग्ज्यूटिव की जाए कि यह कैसे आया है। इसकी एंशोरेंस देनी ही होगी, नहीं तो हाउस नहीं चलेगा। . . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Mr. Reddy.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): Mr. Chairman, you have not allowed me . . . (Interruptions). I walkout as protest.

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI: Mr. Chairman----- (Interruption Q) I walk out to register my protest.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: We are all walking out.

(At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please listen to me . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN (Uttar Pradesh): The report has been leaked out like this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please listen to me.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Unless it is leaked out, there should be no

difficulty in placing it on the Table of the House. It must be a distorted version of the report which has been leaked out.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: It will infringe the freedom of the press, if we inquire into how they got it . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you listen to me. When I am standing, I expect the hon. Members to sit down. Please sit down. I am making an announcement. (Interruptions) I am going to make an announcement. If this goes on, I will adjourn the House for one hour . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please adjourn the House.

SHRI B. D. KHOBRADE: Adjourn the House. (Interruptions), adjourn the House.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Chairman. Sir, it is not without reason . . . (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing more now.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: The Opposition will entirely co-operate with you. But let me submit why all the Opposition is feeling agitated about it. This is not the first time. Even in the past, sometimes we had a question in this House and early that morning, even before the question was replied, we saw the answer in the press and all Members have felt agitated about that and the Chairman has always pointed out that it was the responsibility of the Government to see that matters which were brought before the House were not leaked out to the press. (Interruptions). Here what has happened is that a very damaging report has appeared in the press. . . . (Interruptions) . . . which affects some individuals. Here, in this House, all sections of the House did not question the report. They merely asked you to place the Commission's

[Shri Lal K. Advani] Report on the Table (*Interruptions*) In fact, all of them wanted the Report to be followed up and now, without giving any reason, the Home Minister says that for two months or so or till the House meets next they are not going to give the Report to us so that whatever the people know is on the basis of this report that has appeared in the press. Whether it is right or wrong, we do not know and whether it is distorted or not, we do not know. Whatever the public will debate will be on the basis of this report only. Here, when the House has already decided to meet tomorrow, there is no reason whatsoever why the Home Ministry should not come out with the Commission's Report tomorrow. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHANDARI (Uttar Pradesh): The Report should be placed tomorrow. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; Sir, I have a submission to make . . . (*Interruptions*). Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have a submission to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. I am asking the hon. Home Minister to make a more precise statement. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE: No, sir. The Report must be placed to morrow morning. No question of any precise statement. The Report must be placed tomorrow morning (*Interruptions*).

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: Tomorrow, Sir, it must be placed to tomorrow morning (*Interruptions*)

ज्ञानी जैल सिंह : सभापति जी, स्पेशल-मेशन में कुछ कहना जरूरी नहीं है ताहम मैंने सत्कारयोग्य मेम्बरों का सत्कार करते हुए, उन के जज्बात को देखते हुए कह दिया और उस फंसले

को आप ने परवान कर लिया कि फस्ट डे आफ द नेक्स्ट सेशन रिपोर्ट रख दी जायगी। (/nterrwptions) गवर्नमेंट का इसमें कोई हाथ नहीं है, कैसे प्रेस में चला गया मुझे मालूम नहीं।

SHRI PILOO MODY: No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: No.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: No.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN (Tamil Nadu): No.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI; Sir, I protest against the Government's decision, against the Government's refusal to place this Report on the Table of the House, which is our right. In protest against this refusal of the Government, I and my colleagues walk out,

(At this stage, some hon. Members left the Chamber.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, before I walk out, I have a submission to make. It is not just a question of walkout. (*Interruptions*). I want to submit that I have not yet walked out. We have not yet walked out. We will wait for their reaction. Sir, why are we insisting that it may be placed The hon. Minister has not denied that it is not in his hands. Sir, we have read the report in the papers, A strange situation for Members of Parliament, when the House is in session, to read this thing in the Press, which is alleged to have been leaked out. Sir, suppose you write a judgment and you tell your stenographer, "It is between you and me". Suppose the Press succeeded in getting that judgment, would you not have considered yourself responsible for it? A vicarious responsibility at least. It has been leaked out from the sources where it is supposed to be kept in secret. Confidence has to be kept.

I presume the report came into the custody of the Government. What sort

of a custody is it, which cannot ensure secrecy? I congratulate the Pressmen for successfully getting this thing out . . . . (Interruptions) I am a journalist. This is our job . . . . (Interruptions) It is our job to get such things out. And it is their job to keep them secret. As a journalist I have done my job. Well, for this I deserve congratulations. As a Government . . . . (Interruptions) Therefore, Sir, I submit that the hon. Minister has not said that the Report is not true. I ask him, I put it to him through you, Sir, whether the report is correct. Can he deny it? (Interruptions) Must we wait for two months or one and a half months? Meanwhile, it is already circulating. There is black money. There is parallel economy. Blackmarketing in our politics has also come. Therefore, this Report will be blackmarketed. Am I to buy it in black-market? . . . (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our Press, fortunately, is a very vigilant Press, and it often gets hold of information long before it is made public, and I cannot criticise them. It is their job. (Interruptions).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am sorry for you. Since somebody has committed a wrong, has this wrong to be condoned? What is coming in the way of placing it on the Table of the House? . . . . (Interruptions) Why this arrogance? The hon. Minister is asking us to go out. Why this arrogance? They were here when the other Government was doing this thing. They justly fought. Now that they have gone over to the treasury benches, they ask me to go out? This arrogance, whether it comes from this side or that side, has to be resisted. You know very well, we have no axe to grind in this matter, because . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the protest against the action of the Government in not placing it earlier has been voiced quite loudly and effectively.

The Home Minister's assurance . . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Report is in their hands . . . . (Interruptions) Why is it not being placed? What is the reason for it? Can they deny it? They should have explained to you . . . . (Interruptions) This is the kind of thing with the treasury benches, no matter who sits there. I am very glad, when they came here, some wisdom dawned on them when the Janata Party people were behaving exactly like that. And they were with us. Now they are there . . . . (Interruptions) Therefore, Sir, I think we also launch our protest against it and we also walk out . . . . (Interruptions)

(At this stage, some more hon. Members left the Chamber)

SHRI VISHWANATHA MENON: Sir, when the House is in session, such an important news should not be leaked out. That shows the inefficiency of the Government or the unscrupulousness of the Government and others . . . . (Interruptions) Sir, my humble suggestion is that you have got a right to direct them. Tomorrow also there is a sitting. You should direct them to place it before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall take your suggestion and consider it.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: Sir, it is not that. You should give them a direction that it must be placed on the Table of the House because the House is sitting tomorrow. Sir, the thing was leaked out with the idea to be propagated when the House is not sitting. Now the House is sitting. They should have come before the House first. So, it shows either the inefficiency of the Government or the unscrupulousness of the Government. So, Sir, we are entitled to get it. My humble suggestion is that in your wisdom you should direct them that tomorrow morning



[Shri Viswanatha Menon]  
itself the report is placed before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN; I shall consider.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON:  
Sir, our humble submission is, whether this party rules or that party rules, there should be some decorum. We were fighting along with them against the Janata. But that is another point. *(Interruptions)* Now, they are behaving like the Janata Government. What is the sanctity? Either because of inefficiency or because of unscrupulousness, this thing has happened. So, Sir, I request you to give a direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question whether I can direct the Government to lay the report on the Table of the House earlier than has been promised is a matter which I shall go into. But I cannot tell you anything just now.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON:  
If they do not promise to place it on the Table of the House or you do not give any direction then we will also have to walk out. We walk out in protest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If everybody walks out, then everybody will walk out.

*(At this stage, some hon. Members left the Chamber)*

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir, I know the difficulty of the Government in placing the whole Report tomorrow. I appreciate it. You will also appreciate the sentiments of the Opposition. Sir, may I make a request to the Home Minister that though it will be difficult to submit the whole Report whether he is in a position to give a gist of the findings so that the House may know of it tomorrow?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not the gist. "We want the whole report.

SHRI RAMANAND YADAV (Bihar): Gist is never submitted to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Now, Mr. Ramanand Yadav—Special Mention.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI; Sir, what is the reply of the Government?

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have to make a submission.

**REFERENCE [TO THE ALLEGED  
MURDEROUS ASSAULT ON CON-  
GRESS(I) WORKERS BY CPI(M)  
SUPPORTERS IN WEST BENGAL**

श्री रामानन्द यादव (बिहार) :  
सभापति जी, 1980 के चुनाव में  
पश्चिम बंगाल में दिन दहाड़े 21 कांग्रेस  
समर्थक कार्यकर्त्ताओं की सी० पी० एम०  
के लोगों द्वारा हत्या कर दी गई।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी (आंध्र  
प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, प्वाइंट आफ  
आर्डर।

*(Interruptions).*  
श्री रामानन्द यादव : इससे पहले  
भी बंगाल में सी० पी० एम० फ्रंट के  
शासन में सभी लोगों को आतंकित किया  
जाता था ...

*(Interruptions)*  
श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : ऐसे  
कार्यवाही नहीं चल सकती।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : सभापति जी  
बंगाल में जहाँ सी० पी० एम० का शासन  
चल रहा है वहाँ चाहे जनता पार्टी का  
कार्यकर्त्ता हो, चाहे कांग्रेस आई का हो  
सभी कार्यकर्त्ताओं पर सी० पी० एम०  
समर्थकों द्वारा हमला किया जाता था  
और उन्हें आतंकित किया जाता था।  
उनके घरों पर हमले किये जाते थे।  
उनकी हत्याएं की जाती थीं जिनकी