

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : What I am asking is to be within the parameters of the Constitution, law and the rules which we have made for ourselves. Nothing more than that.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : All right, Sir.

It is with deep anguish that I am making these observations.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, let there not be an impression to go that we are trying to avoid discussing something which can be discussed. What I am saying is, all that can be discussed will be discussed; something more may also be discussed. But we shall have to be careful, because we are not dealing with only one case but we are dealing with many cases.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, I don't want to go on beating about the bush. You have given me permission. Now, let me make my submission. I will keep what you have said in mind.

MR. SPEAKER : That is right. Very Good.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : I will keep what you have said in mind and kindly permit me to say what I want to say.

MR. SPEAKER : Thank you.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, it is with deep sense of anguish that I am making this observation. It is never my intention, and never never be, to violate any of the norms of this House, any of the provisions of the Constitution, any of the conventions which this House has developed over the years about public affairs. But there are sometimes occasions when matters which transcend many things come before us, and we as human beings have to deal with it in this House and outside this House. I am making a pointed reference to the observation and the comment made by the Hon'ble Justice Jain.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, it is exactly this point on which I have cautioned you. Now, you are saying that a statement has been made by a Justice. It has appeared in the newspaper. I refer to your freedom. You do not know yourself but you say what it has appeared. If tomorrow, the Judge says that 'I had not made that statement or made a different statement', then what do we do in the Parliament?

SHRI K. RAMAMURTHY : It has appeared in all the newspapers three days back. So far, no denial has come.

Jain Commission of Inquiry into the conspiracy leading to the assassination of the Late Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Now, Sir, that is not the point.

SHRI JAGMEET SINGH BRAR : No denial has come from the Judge. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I have allowed you to express your views within the parameters in which you can.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : I am doing that. All right, I will express it in that parameter.

I am saying, Justice Jain is not saying. I am saying as a humble Member of this Parliament, who has the right to

stand before you.

I am saying that from all the circumstances that have come before the country so far, in this matter where an inquiry into the conspiracy leading to the assassination of the late Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi is going on, an impression is being created that for some reason or the other some people are interested that this inquiry should not be concluded as soon as possible in the judicial manner in which it was conceived.

Now, why should this happen, I do not know. There have been instances, Sir, where documents have not been placed before the Commission; there have been instances where certain specific files which were called for, were not available and in once instance — let it go on record before you, Sir — the Home Ministry of this country has filed an affidavit saying that the file concerning the constitution of the Verma Commission of Inquiry was sent at the direction of the Home Minister of India to the Private Secretary to the Prime Minister of India on 27th July, 1991.

Since then that file is untraceable. The Commission is not getting that file. In the last session the hon. Minister of State, Mr. Chidambaram was kind enough — he condescended rather — to enlighten this House about what is happening. He gave us a solemn assurance on the floor of this House that this matter shall be attended to and no complaint will now be forthcoming from the Commission that there is no cooperation and documents are not going. But that state of affairs is continuing. Again and again the same thing is coming forward.

Now what does one do? Either let us be very frank; let this Government — whoever wants to speak on its behalf — stand up in this House and say, yes, we are sorry that Rajivji was assassinated. Rajivji is dead and gone; keep quiet; that is the end of the matter. Has somebody got the moral courage to stand up and say that? If they have, let us see. If not, I think this House and this nation is entitled to know what is happening and why it is happening which is delaying the entire process.

On this, in all humility I would like to say that we are not prepared to listen to anybody else. The Home Minister has washed his hands off the whole matter because he is no longer dealing with it. If Mr. Chidambaram is called upon, he will speak of — first he was speaking of three months in August; now two months more have been added — five months. December was his target. But the point is, who knows the entire facts. From day on the responsibility — as per my reading of the situation, the constitutional parameters, the conventional parameters, the parameters that govern the conduct of this House — rests squarely on the shoulder of the Prime Minister of this country.

We want that you should request him, direct him to make a statement in this House giving a comprehensive picture of what has happened, what has not happened, why it has not happened because we want an assurance from the Prime Minister of this country that what is being done is correct and what is not being done, he is aware of it. If he is aware of it and it is being done very bad. If he is unaware of it — it is worse. Therefore, I seek your indulgence, humbly I make this

request to you, you must direct the Prime Minister to make a statement in this House giving the House comprehensive knowledge of this most unfortunate aspect that has flowed out of the most — I do not know what to describe it — an event which would affect, if we fail in our duty as citizens of this country, would besmirch the honour of this country, would besmirch the good name of this country that there here is a Prime Minister who was sacrificed, who was killed in cold blood and this nation is stumbling along and is not in a position to do anything. By whom? By those very people who ascended to seats of power literally on the martyrdom of this person. They are unable to determine and find out where the fault lies, who is guilty, who are the conspirators, why their faces are not being unmasked. We want to know, this House wants to know, this country wants to know and it wants to know it from no one else, but the Prime Minister of this country. Therefore I seek your indulgence that you should ask him to make a statement in this House.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Gobichettipalayam) : Mr. Speaker Sir, I want to draw the attention of the House...

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM (Salem) : There is no response, Sir.

SHRI JAGMEET SINGH BRAR (Faridkot) : Will you assure us that there will be a direction to the Government or to the hon. Prime Minister?

MR. SPEAKER : You should put questions to the Government, not to the Speaker.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM (Salem) : Sir, you represent the House.

...[Interruptions] ...

SHRI ARJUN SINGH (Satna) : But here the Government is absent.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Sir, Mr. Chidambaram had made a statement in the last Session giving certain assurances, clear-cut assurances. At least, the House is entitled to know and through this House, the country. Why does he say so? Certain Members have very strong feelings. Of course, the Prime Minister of a country was assassinated, a young Prime Minister. And then, if there is a feeling that there is no proper attempt to hold an inquiry or to conclude the inquiry and if files are being produced or not, I cannot say that personally because I am not aware of it. But Mr. Chidambaram, who has been assigned with this job in the Government did make a statement and therefore, it is his duty to come forward and at least tell us what the position is.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to go into the details of this subject. The question raised by hon. Shri Arjun Singh ji is a very serious one. This question has been raised in this House several times. The Prime Minister of this country has been killed in a pathetic and cruel way. Hon. Shri Arjun Singh has said categorically in this connection that he has lots of expectations from the Government. Several Ministers have made their statements in this connection, but the House is not satisfied with these statements, we are not satisfied with these statements I support hon. Shri Arjun Singh in so far as he

has said that this investigation is becoming a political game and these people have been speaking for the last five months, it appears to me that this investigation is not going to be over soon, this is trapped in complexities. People are going for giving their witness for giving an impetus to their political career. I do not level any allegation against anybody, but several Swamy and cheat and imposter are coming there. We will talk about them when I will get time. They are indeed very strongmen. He has got several disciples within and outside the country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, this investigation is looking like a detective novel and the investigation is acquiring a ludicrous tone. The assassination of a person holding the highest post is a matter of serious concern, this is not a good thing for this country nor for the future of this country. While expressing my agreement with hon. Arjun Singh ji I will request through you that Mr. Prime Minister should come here in person and clarify as to what is the progress of the investigation in regard to the date of investigation referred to by hon. Chidambaram. I do not think that the investigation is going to be completed within the stipulated time limit. This investigation should enquire seriousness, we should be successful in nabbing a real guilty, the leader of the house should take the entire opposition into confidence and then do the job, this is what I urge upon you.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question raised by Shri Arjun Singh ji and Somnath Chatterjee is relevant, Shri Chidambaram ji had given an assurance in this House that the investigation will get completed. Therefore, hon. Chidambaram owes responsibility to this House that he should apprise the House of it. The House will decide on this situation, because he had given his assurance before the entire House, therefore, he should not take this subject lightly nor we too, rather we should take it seriously. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, first you urge upon Chidambaram that he should apprise the House as to what is the situation of due date in December, and if he has got some compulsion then he should apprise the House of this fact also. This is what our request.

SHRI RABI RAY (Kendrapada) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Rajiv Gandhi ji was Prime Minister for five years, he served as leader of opposition for 11 months and so far as the allegation levelled by Shri Arjun Singh ji are concerned I just want to say that we have nothing to do with the infighting in the Congress....(Interruptions)

This House wants to know in the background of the statement made by hon. Shri Chidambaram ji with regard to the investigation into the assassination of Rajiv ji that the Government should spell out each and every thing about it. This is in the interest of the Government also. So I want to know about the situation in the progress of investigation, this is what I have to say.

[English]

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, I would humbly request you once again to kindly direct the Government, to request the Prime Minister to make a statement on the issue in the House because anything short of that, I do not think, can satisfy.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : It will be better if

Mr. Chidambaram makes the statement.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : We are not prepared to listen to Mr. Chidambaram. I am very sorry.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : It is only my submission. I do not want to quarrel with you...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARJUN SINGH (Satna) : I am not quarelling with any one.

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane) : We want to know from the Priliamentary Affairs Minister ...*(Interruptions)*.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : You please sit down.

[Interruptions]

DR. SATYANARAYANAN JATIYA (Ujjain) : Five years are going to complete *(Interruptions)* you have nothing to say *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : You sit down.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I think the representatives of the Government are in the House. They have heard the feelings and the statements of the Member. Have they anything to say on this?

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA) : As you have rightly observed, we have certainly taken serious note of the feelings that have been expressed in the House and will consider the matter. I had no idea about the progress that has been made by Mr. Chidambaram in this matter. But we shall certainly check it up and let you know about this. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, first we want your direction. *(Interruptions)* I want a direction from the Speaker and nothing short of that. ...*(Interruptions)*

12.37 hrs.

(At this stage, Shri Arjun Singh and some other hon. Members came and stood on the floor near the Table.)

SHRI JAGMEET SINGH BRAR (Faridkot) : He says that he is making note of everything. This is the kind of response that he is giving. *(Interruptions.)*

12.38 hrs.

At this stage, Shri Arjun Singh and some other hon. Members sat on the floor near the Table.)

MR. SPEAKER : If you go back to your seat, I will say something. If you want to come back after I say something, that is a different thing.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Let the Prime Minister say something about this.

[Translation]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla) : The Congress party should stage dharna not this side but that side...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV (Jhajharpur) : This grant is really may deprived of subsidy.

MR. SPEAKER : You sit down.

...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Well, Arjun Singhji, we can understand your feelings, and the feelings of the Members are not going to be different. I will say something, if you just take your seat. Later on if you feel like coming, I have no objection. But let me say something.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : We want your direction and the response of the Government.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall have to hear from him. I do not direct all the time. It is for the Government and for you people to respond to each other's view. I am not sitting here as a bandmaster guiding everybody. It is a matter between you and the Government. Why should you always drag the Speaker inside?

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Arjun Singhji, if you want to come back....

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I know it is not easy for you, I understand your position.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Let me say something; and then, if you feel like coming back, you can come.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : No. Not like this, Shri Arjun Singh. When you are sitting, I cannot do that, please.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Arjun Singhji, not like this please.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, you can expel me, if you like.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I would not expel you. That would be the last thing I will do. I would not do that.

...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR : (Gopalganj) Mr. Speaker Sir, I want to speak in this regard, you give me your permission to speak ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : If I say something now, I should not appear to be saying because you are doing this thing. If I say something, if my word has any meaning and weight, it should come freely, it should come of free variation from me and not because you are sitting here.

...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR : This is what I want to say. I associate Shri Arjun Singh also with me while

saying...(Interruptions) Just a minute, then I will be silent.

MR. SPEAKER : Then the issue gets prolonged.

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR : The way you and Arjun Singh ji have joined the issue by addressing each other with appreciable eloquence.

...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : He follows the spirit in which I said everything to the hilt.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR : I am speaking with a aggrieved heart. I do not want to make a mention of the death of a particular person or that of the Prime Minister of the country. I praise Arjun Singh ji more. When you gave an indication to him, he yielded to that. If I hold anybody responsible for this, then it is the Parliamentary Affairs Minister. Who do not have any understanding...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Why should you pass judgement against him?...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR : Had you understood it properly, then the elevation which you had attained while in this House, he was...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT) AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MALLIKARJUN) : Speak to somebody else. What are you saying...(Interruptions) You know all the things and you understand everything...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I have understood the spirit in which this matter has been raised and I have decided in my mind to deal with this in a particular manner. Even now, I can deal with this in a particular manner. But please go back to your seat and after hearing what I say, if you are not satisfied, then it is altogether a different thing.. But then if you sit here, I appear to be working under pressure which should not appear so and which is not correct. That means, we have feelings and we are not understanding the facts, but working under pressure, which does not look nice. That is why, please go back to your seats. Arjun Singhji, I am requesting you. I have said that you understood what I was saying. You were within the parameters. You now allow me to be within the parameters also.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI JAGMEET SINGH BRAR : Mr. Speaker, for the first time, we have come to the Well of the House as this is a serious matter...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Maybe we will be able to discussu this matter in the Chamber with you and come back and then I will say what I have to say. Probably, in this situation and in

this manner we should not discuss it. We may not be able to agree on certain things. So, I am adjourning the House now. And we may meet at 2 p.m. to resume the debate. Within that time, we shall discuss it in the Chamber.

1245 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the clock.

14.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at two minutes past Fourteen of the Clcok.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Mr. Speaker Sir, I would seek your permission to know as to whether the hon Prime Minister has listened to our appeal and would condescent to make a statement on this matter at any given point of time before tomorrow or tomorrow.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN : As the hon. Member expects, the Prime Minister has heard not from here but through the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and whatever statement can be made will be made.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : My question is very pointed. I dis not say that the statement will not be made. What I want to know is this. Can the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs tell us precisely whether the hon. Prime Minister will make a statement in the House or not?

SHRI MALLIKARJUN : I cannot say on that. I can say this much that a statement will be made on behalf of the Government....(Interruptions)

SHRI K. RAMAMURTHY (Krishnagiri) : There were so many statements from the Government. Even Mr. Chidambaram had made a statement. Everybody made a statement....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

DR. SATYANARAYAN JATIYA : This is the Case of the House. This issue should come to the House so that all people could know. This is really very serious....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, in all humility, I would say that this is not something which deserves this kind of a treatment. The hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs was present; the hon. Minister of State was present. We made a very simple and humble request that looking at the seriousness of the matter, a statement should be made by the hon. Prime Minister.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SEVERAL HON'BLE MEMBERS : The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs have come.....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : It won't make any difference So, this is what we wanted here. I want to know whether hon. Prime Minister will make a statement at his convenience some time by tomorrow.....(Interruptions)

VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Sir, we have discussed this matter in you Chamber as well as here. We regard this matter as a very serious matter and a statement will certainly be made by the Government on this matter tomorrow. So, immediately after the Question Hour, the statement will be made.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, in all humility, I would like to reiterate that this is not a matter in which a statement by any member of the Government would suffice. I do not want to go into reasons again and again because it is like begging the question and I should not be forced to do that and I have no intention to do it.

But if the seriousness is understood; the ambit is understood; the total import is understood, I think, it would be in the fitness of things - both consistent with the prestige and the sovereignty of this House and what the people of this country expect - that the hon. Prime Minister must come on record and tell the House and through to the people of this country about the real state of Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER : When will the statement be made? Tomorrow?

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Yes, Sir. The statement would be made tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER : Are you in a position to say who will make it?

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Sir, we will have to consult and decide about it.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, what convention Mr. Minister is following by speaking while sitting in his chair, whereas it is a very serious issue. All facts should come before the House.. (*Interruptions*)

DR. SATYANARAYAN JATIYA (Ujjain) : If this intimate talk goes on, then what can we know whatsoever you tell us also what to learn, what to understand. Whatsoever you ask us to do, we will do that... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I thank you very much. You, and all others as well keep it in mind.

[*English*]

I think, we have not been able to work and there are other matters which we should take up. Then, what Shri Arjun Singhji has raised is also important and it should be treated in the manner in which it should be treated. All the same, what has come before the House now is that a statement would be made by tomorrow. Probably, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs would like to discuss with his colleagues and others and the Government has to decide as to who is going to make the statement. We will know it tomorrow and even this matter could be taken up at that time also. So, today at least let us proceed with the business. Tomorrow, depending upon who makes the statement, you can express your views, the Government can also express their views if it meets with your approval.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, I am very embarrassed when you say, "if it meets your approval".

MR. SPEAKER : No, no...

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : I am no one to approve anything. I have said in a very humble way what I felt. It is neither my intention to stall the proceedings of the House nor hold up very important business that other hon. Members have. Then, in that case, you please ignore us. We will be sitting very quietly without making any noise and you kindly proceed with the business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER : No, no, Shri Arjun Singhji, we want to respect your feelings that is why I am seeking your approval. Please do not take it that way. Here we are not engaged in a wordy polemic between ourselves..

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, neither am I in a polemic frame of mind.

MR. SPEAKER : Let them consult each other and let them decide. At the last moment, at the spur of the moment, depending on the Prime Minister's appointments, engagements and other things, a decision will come.

[*Translation*]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to make an appeal. I think that if hon. Arjun Singh and his allies go to such an extent that the functioning of this House gets disrupted, this is not an ordinary matter. Hon. Arjun Singh was number two in this Government at a time. The political differences between his party and ours are at their own place, I do not want to go into these political differences, yet I will request to the treasury bench that they should think seriously as to what are the reasons which compelled a seasoned politician like Arjun Singh to go to that extent. When there was a statement during Zero hour, then we had thought that the members of the treasury bench might hold consultation among themselves and remove it then and there.

I feel sorry to see that a status quo prevails in probing of this incident and the Government is taking it as an ordinary incident. I do not want to go into the incident. The ex-Prime Minister was killed, and five years have elapsed since then, but the case has not been solved as yet. Meanwhile several new questions might have sprung up in which I do not want to go. One simple question is before the House. One very senior member is ready to go to this extent but the Government wants to evade by giving a general reply, therefore, I will like to appeal to the entire Government that if the government is in power today, then perhaps because of the assassination of its ex-leader, the country's ex-Prime Minister. You cannot find out such a simple solution to it by giving an assurance that a statement, will be made as may satisfy you. Cannot there be a separate meeting?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not an ordinary incident, but an extra-ordinary one. Then how this House will work? It is being investigated but what type of investigation is going on. Leave that aside. Who will settle this issue pertaining to the house, if not the Government or the leader of the ruling party/ Mr. Speaker, Sir, why to leave it for you to settle it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are our leader, please pardon me, do not take it otherwise, you are our representative and our symbol. If any impasse arises between the ruling party and opposition party,

then.

[English]

Speaker is not an umpire between the Ruling Party and the Opposition. Speaker, is not an umpire, Sir. I say it with respect to you. The resolution of an impasse between the Ruling Party and the Opposition is the responsibility of the Ruling Party principally.

[Translation]

As you are in power you should resolve it. I request that the ruling party should take it seriously and dispose of this case by making a statement on it. In this manner, how will you run the affairs.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just now have said to you that we consider this case as very serious one, and nobody should be apprehensive about it. We are carrying out the investigations and we are doing our best to pursue the matter further. When this was pointed out that it is being delayed, then a committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Chidambaram has been constituted and he speeded up the case also and efforts to this effect were made. As far as my understanding is concerned, I think that he had given an assurance to complete it by the end of December. Thereafter, many new questions have sprung up which have created apprehensions in the mind of people because we do not take it as. One unilateral issue, rather we consider it a multilateral one. Just as Jaswant Singh had said that we may have political differences. But everybody knows if such an eminent leader has been assassinated then this should be investigated thoroughly so as to ascertain who is responsible for this, why this happened, how this happened, whether there is any confusion or not? Two commission were set up for this and the both have done, their work but it is being delayed. There is no doubt that inordinate delay has taken place in this case. Now reasons of delay can also be advanced and definitely this will be done. We have said this several times on the floor of this House as well.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Then, what is the difficulty?

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Who is taking that prestige issue? ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : What is the difficulty? Two hours and 15 minutes have gone since the Question Hour has gone. We have been showing great concern because unfortunately the House had to be adjourned for four days during this Session and we decided to forego the Lunch Hour and we decided to sit one hour extra in the evening because of urgent business. I do not know whether the Government is serious in conducting this House. Was any discussion made during one hour and ten minutes that you allowed between the Government and you.... (Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : He has probably missed earlier part of my statement.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Now you are going

on the merits.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : We discussed the matter... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : We want to have the Prime Minister to make the Statement. (Interruptions) After all, it is a serious matter. They would have shown a proper response to the Parliament. Nobody can be above the Parliament. It should have been very responsive and graceful on the part of the Prime Minister. Therefore, I am requesting you that instead of the time of the House being taken for this, let us get on with our other very important work. I want to raise a very serious question. Do you know that today is 6th of December, or you want to suppress that also?

Today is the 6th of December. You must know the seriousness of this date. This is what we want to mention. Therefore, I would request the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to be graceful and accept the suggestion.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Sir, we have utilised every minute of this period when the House was not in Session in discussing and trying to sort out this matter.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa) : What came out of it?

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : That is what I am saying here. I have also requested various people who are connected with this matter and we will come before the House tomorrow, immediately after the Question Hour, and give you whatever information is in our possession and whatever our perception on this very serious matter... (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI BIBHU KUMARI DEVI (Tripura East) : It is not a question of one Prime Minister paying respect to the late Prime Minister. He has after all stepped into his shoes. So, if he makes a statement with regard to the late Prime Minister, it is not a prestige issue. (Interruption)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Whatever is possible, we shall certainly do it. There is no reluctance on our part. It is not being taken as a matter of routine or as a matter of prestige. Not at all.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I accept your statement.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : As far as this incident in Ayodhya is concerned, the hon. Members know that we do not want to suppress anything of that kind. If the hon. Members want to raise that matter, we will certainly respond to that. (Interruptions) So far as this allegation that we are trying to suppress the matter is concerned, I would like to say that that is not correct. I also want to assure you again that we will, with all seriousness, bring this matter before the Parliament tomorrow.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have kept mum on this issue for four and half years. If I do not speak today I will be doing injustice to the House. I seek your directive on the point that if a judge gives statement from any place can the proceedings of the House be interrupted on the basis of that statement? In case a

discussion takes place on that statement, whether the judge can become the subject of the discussion or not? Would you please give directive to discuss the functioning of this commission? These are the complexed questions which should be replied to before raising these issues. I feel that an enquiry should be conducted. I am sorry to say that the Members of the treasury benches given statements under pressure without considering its pros and cons.

Shri Chidambaram has said that this enquiry would be completed by December, 1995. Is it within the powers of Shri Chidambaram? The Hon. judge has been summoning new witnesses daily. The list of the witnesses is endless. None can tell when it will exhaust. I do not know. What reply Shri Chidambaram or the hon. Prime Minister would give tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when a discussion takes place in this House or outside, 5, 6 or 7 officers are served notices and orders are issued to conduct an enquiry against them. I do not know how does the Cabinet function but I know some of those officers. Shri Vinod Chand Pandey may have differences with some people but he is an honest and straight forward officer. Shri Narain is a good officer. I know Shri Gauri Shankar Vajpayee. They are all good and honest officers. If they had given their opinion on some issues, the right to take a decision vested with the political people. Then on what basis the notice was served to these officers? Be it the internal bickerings in the Congress or the attempts to build public opinion, the pressure is always there. The valuable time of this House should not be worsted on such issues. I have high regards for Shri Arjun Singh. He asked me if I was displeased with him. I said that I was not displeased but sad. He had been a member of that Cabinet for 4 1/2 years. Why did not he feel sad during these 4 1/2 years? When all these things are said, we must maintain the dignity of the House. It is not good to humiliate and hold the officers guilty. I am one of the guilty people. One of the leaders of the Congress Party gave the statement that I too am involved in the conspiracy. I have the satisfaction that both Shri V.P. Singh and Shri Narasimha Rao are also with us in the conspiracy. But will the things work in this way? Will such thing be discussed before the commission? Do the judges have the right to pass comments about anyone?(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : Who is the Chairman?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I will not name him? I will not say anything about him because Mr. Speaker will forbid me to name the Chairman of the Commission. But will the discussion be held regarding the Chairman of the Commission, as they have raised this issue just now? When all this will go on then all the hon. Members who have fortunately or unfortunately joined the treasury benches will be held guilty by those who are conducting the enquiry. This tradition will have to be stopped. I fail to understand as to why the Government is getting panicked. If it is so then why the hon. Prime Minister does not come forward with a clarification. Shri Somnath Chatterjee has rightly asserted that when the Government becomes weak and helpless everyone flies in the face of the Government. This question concerns not any particular person but the dignity of the nation. In a

Parliamentary Democracy, the Parliament is above all. I know that judiciary and the other columns of democracy are all powerful but ultimately decision of the Parliament prevails. This is what I think of the Parliamentary Democracy. If there is no Parliamentary Democracy, the judiciary will also not enjoy freedom. If someone does not understand it, then it is the duty of both the Hon. Speaker and the Parliament to make him understand it. This thing should be understood. We will feel obliged if while discussing these issues we keep the dignity of the House and the rules in mind.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to our hon. and seniormost colleague Shri Chandra Shekhar ji, who has put forth all the things in a proper background. I will not go into that since at the beginning you had asked me to speak in a restrained manner. I would not like to make any comment on what he has said in favour or against anyone since it is not our aim and today it is not the part of this discussion. It is a very common thing that a dead lock has come up on account of which the proceeding is not going ahead. We have cited some examples. Without levelling charges against anyone but my submission is that it is imperative that the hon. Prime Minister comes to the House to furnish information with regard to it to the Parliament and the nation. I have said nothing beyond it. I have not levelled charges against anyone. As far as the dignity of the nation is concerned, everyone, even with a little knowledge of Parliamentary democracy knows that if the Government loses its sovereignty than neither the Government nor any system will survive. Then only one thing can happen the dictatorship will come. If dictatorship is to be prevented then it is the duty of the every hon. Member present here irrespective of his post or position to uphold the sovereignty of the Parliament, not by means of words but by actions and set an ideal before nation. Therefore, my humble submission is that the hon. Prime Minister should come at his convenience to inform the Parliament and the nation in this regard. It is not my right. If you consider that while doing so I have gone beyond my limitations, then I do not want to stall the proceedings of the Parliament but my submission to you is only this much and perhaps it is for the first time in our Parliamentary History that a Member has sought permission of the chair to leave the House, and that too not at the instance of the presiding officers, so that the House may run. This much is my submission to you(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know, if any hon. judge gives an obiter dictum statement then, whether the discussion on that statement can be held or not and if the discussion is held, will the judge be discussed about or not? Please tell us this at first only then the proceedings will proceed (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is the basic question. A murder and an enquiry are two separate things. The question is whether you take cognizance of the basis of the proceedings of the House going on since today morning or not. Being the hon. Speaker of the House, I would like to know it from you.

MR. SPEAKER : You are on a very good point of order. The decision on that should come. My decision regarding the first part of your submission is that it is hundred percent alright that any constitutional authority should function within its limitations and if it is discussed outside, it will not be good. Therefore, I had not allowed him to speak on it. Arjun Singh ji had felt annoyed at it, even then

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : I did not feel annoyed at it, I have corrected myself.

MR. SPEAKER : You corrected yourself happily or angrily, when I asked you not to speak in that way then you retorted whether you were free to speak so or not. Whereupon I had said that you had every right to speak about that. I am happy that later on his submission was within his legal limitations. Had he gone beyond the limitations then I had to give relaxation in the record, but he did not do so. But time and again I feel that the things which should not be discussed here, should not be discussed outside as well. The discussion should not be held in the current session, all of us should keep it in mind, but we can not ask everyone to do so. Everyone acts within his limitations. We do not have the right to pass an order from here against anyone. Therefore, we keep mum and ask not to discuss it. It is upto the others whether they discuss it or not.

Now, regarding what has been said by Arjun Singh ji, I would like to submit that I think ten times before speaking about him since he himself speaks after a deep thought. Therefore I would not like to pass any comment so generally about him. My submission to him is that I will not be able to grant him the permission to leave the House. My request to him is that he has very well put forth his views. If I have understood Shukla Ji's statement then I think that he has not denied anything anywhere. Keeping all this in mind, I think that he should be present here. Tomorrow, we will see as to what is likely to take place.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : If I am not allowed to leave the House then I can take a seat inside.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit on the branch.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : No, no, where we were sitting, we were sitting silently.

MR. SPEAKER : Please, that it is not a cosy seat and does not suit you. Thank you very much(Interruptions)

14.30 hrs.

Re : 6th December, 1992 Ayodhya incident

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Sir, today is the anniversary of a day. We treat 6th December 1992 as a day of national shame in our country where the secular edifice of our country was deliberately sought to be dismantled by deliberately engineered criminal activity. We want to mention that date so that in this country which has a secular Constitution...(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura) : Sir, you have allowed him. They are shouting. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla) : It is more serious issue than this. Time should be allotted for discussion of the plight of the farmers in Uttar Pradesh. Whether anniversary is being celebrated that such a large influx of weapons from Madhya Pradesh is creating havoc for people...(Interruptions)

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota) : People are resorting to Dharana, Andolan and Satyagrah and they continuously...(Interruptions)

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani) : Advaniji is already here; he is a leader, he should speak whatever he likes...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : This attitude of intolerance...(Interruptions) Sir, I want to speak for two minutes only.

MR. SPEAKER : I will allow you.

[Translation]

If he is raising any important issue, let him speak. If you have to reply, you will also be allowed but please do not behave in this manner. This is House, if any Member wants to put forth his valuable point, there should not be any trouble. It should be replied properly.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, I am sorry that my friends from the BJP are showing such intolerance and this intolerance has resulted ultimately in the demolition of the Babri Masjid; intolerance about others' views, about others' commitments, about other people who are not following their own perception and this is not good for the country. They are very eminent representatives who can reply to us.

Therefore, we should observe this day as a day of national mourning. This is the time for introspection also and time for rededicating this country's resolve and commitment to the maintenance of secular democracy in this country which cannot be allowed to be compromised at any cost whatsoever. Therefore, Sir, we want to reiterate our complete faith in the secular structure of our country and that we should try everything that is possible to maintain that structure.

Here the Government made a reference to the Supreme Court under Article 143. We had repeatedly said that that was not the appropriate Article. What is the good of making this reference? Obviously, the Supreme Court could not take a decision for the purpose of giving an opinion on this. That was a very limited jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and what we had expected had happened and that had happened long time back. Now, there is only one method of getting the verdict of the highest court of this country and that is under Article 138(2) of the Constitution of India. But what is this Government doing? Why are these matters not being referred to the Supreme Court under Article 138(2) of the Constitution for resolving the disputes instead of keeping them alive in different places? This is high time that this should be referred to the Supreme Court of India under the appropriate provision invoking the appropriate jurisdiction of the court. But wonderfully this Government is trying to keep