

so that the syllabi, the programme for education all over must be similar, planned, co-related with our life and requirements. Students feel frustrated because after they come out of colleges, do not know where to go. They cannot get job because their education has not been connected with the job. You are also, helpless, You might have seen in the Labour Ministry's Report that lakhs and lakhs of educated students are on the employment register. That is why the frustration is there.

With these words, I would congratulate the Education Minister for having submitted this report of the UGC.

15.39 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: RESIGNATION OF JUSTICE D. S. MATHUR FROM THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE AFFAIRS OF MARUTI GROUP

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Home Minister,

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): On a point of order. Under Rule 372, when the statement is made by the Minister, the Members will not be allowed to put questions. We have given calling attention notice on this and the Speaker is already seized of the matter. It is, therefore, for consideration that when the subject matter is pending for the consideration of the Speaker, whether it is correct on the part of the Home Minister to make such a false statement and escape the responsibility. Sir, you must safeguard and protect the rights of the Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Deputy-Speaker has already allowed it.

श्री कलेश्वर मिश्र (बनारहाबाद) :
लकप्पा साहब ने जो आपत्ति की है कि
माननीय मंत्री जी सभर अपना कर्तव्य दे देंगे
तो उसके बाद जो उन्हें क्लेशचन करने का
प्रधिकार है, वह राइट बाल हो जायेगा। मैं
आप से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि मंत्री जी के कर्तव्य

1885 LS-10.

पर सदन में बहस की इजाजत भी का सकती है
ताकि सभी सत्य कार्यवाही में, बहस में,
हिस्सा ले सकें।

समापति नहोबय : यहाँ ऐसा नहीं है कि
जो भी बड़ा हो उसको परीक्षण ही जायेगी।
जिन्होंने यहाँ क्लेशचन करने के लिये लिख कर
दिया है, जैसे माननीय एस०एन० मिश्र और
माननीय बसन्त साठे, उन्हीं को मौका दिया
जायेगा।

They have already written. They will be given a chance, not all the people who get up.

श्री कलेश्वर मिश्र : प्रलय से नोटिस दे
कर बहस हो सकती है।

श्रीधरी बलबीर सिंह : बेयरमैन साहब
पहले इस बात का तो फैसला करें जो उन्होंने
एक बात कही है। स्टेटमेंट प्रती हुषा नहीं
धीर उन्होंने कहा "फाल्स स्टेटमेंट"।

समापति नहोबय : नहीं कहा है।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayan-
kul): On a point of order, Sir. This
matter has already been discussed in
the other House. Now, the Home
Minister is making a statement here..
(Interruptions.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can speak
later on; I will allow you. The hon.
Home Minister.

THE MINISTER OF HOME
AFFAIRS (SHRI CHARAN SINGH):
My attention has been drawn to cer-
tain observations made by some Mem-
bers regarding the resignation of Jus-
tice D. S. Mathur as the Commission
of Inquiry into the affairs of the
Maruti group of concerns.

It is not correct to say that any
documents required by the Commis-
sion were withheld by the Ministry of
Home Affairs, or that Government had
tried to influence the Commission in
any way.

In a recent publication an oblique
reference was made to a colleague of

(Shri Charan Singh.)

Justice Jagmohan Lal Sinha of the Allahabad High Court hinting to him about his elevation to the Supreme Court after the judgement. As there was reason to believe that the reference was to Justice Mathur, Justice Sinha was requested, in the public interest, to confirm whether such an incident had occurred. Justice Sinha has verified the incident as well as the impression he derived that Justice Mathur was conveying this information to him in a way which could not be dismissed lightly. When this was brought to the notice of Justice Mathur, he has confirmed that he did meet Justice Sinha and speak to him about some rumours regarding his elevation to the Supreme Court, but denies having done so in any manner which could be objected to. Justice Mathur has, in his letter of resignation, given his version of what happened. In view of the doubts which necessarily will arise in the public regarding this incident, Justice Mathur's resignation is appropriate. As Hon'ble Members are aware, Justice A. C. Gupta, a serving Judge of the Supreme Court, is being entrusted with this Commission of Inquiry on the same terms of reference Government are as equally anxious as the Hon'ble Members that the truth regarding the affairs of the Maruti Group should come out in full in the inquiry.

With your permission, Sir, I would like to add that although I did not want to place on the Table of the House the *four letters that have been mentioned in this statement of mine but when the hon. Members of the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha insisted on that, I placed a copy each of the *four letters on the Table of the House in the Rajya Sabha. I am doing so in the Lok Sabha as well. (Placed in Library See No. LT-762/77).

श्री स्वामिनन्दन मिश्र (बेक्सराय) :
चेयरमैन साहब, मैं माननीय गृह मन्त्री जी से

जानना चाहूँगा कि श्री जगमोहन लाल सिन्हा से जो माथुर साहब ने मुलाकात की वह किस मामले के सम्बन्ध में मुलाकात की? सीधे वह गये उनसे मुलाकात करने या किसी मामले के सम्बन्ध में बातें करने गये, और वह मामला कौन सा था जिस सम्बन्ध में माथुर साहब श्री जगमोहन लाल सिन्हा से बातें करने के लिये गये?

श्री चरण सिंह : वह मामला यह था, जो श्री राज नारायण जो ने इलैकशन पिटीशन श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के खिलाफ दायर का जो ।

SHRI VASANT SATHE: (Akola): I am sorry to hear from the hon. Home Minister. In this statement, he seems to be adding fuel to the fire.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : श्री मयूर का बयान जो उप चुका है इच्छाकारी में, उस पर जो चर्चा होगी ।

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Where it is But he is adding fuel to the fire. The question was about Justice Mathur's resignation from the Commission. In the report which has appeared in *Times of India*, it is stated that "he was reportedly of the view that the Commission would be enabled to discharge its functions effectively unless all relevant documents were handed over to it. Those documents include certain records available with the Central Bureau of Investigation. The Home Ministry was reluctant to part with the files pertaining to the Maruti affairs. It was apparently of the view that the Government should keep the files in its custody. Justice Mathur understood to have felt that the Commission should have in its possession all the documents pertaining to all the 13 specific charges. Mr. Mathur was also in favour of giving premature publicity to the working of the Commission as it might give the impression that the Commission was biased."

*The original words of the Minister of Home Affairs were "three letters".

The correction as printed above was sent by the Minister afterwards on that very day.

So the reported resignation was on the ground that Government was not co-operating with the Commission was not giving the files—not only this—was prejudicing the enquiry by giving premature publicity which defeats the justice. So, therefore, a judge, the man who has been the Justice, felt that he cannot carry on the work of the Commission and do justice. That is why, he resigned.

Now, what does the Home Minister's statement impute? It says that Justice Mathur's resignation was accepted or he was asked to resign because of an alleged conversation between him and Jagmohan Sinha and that he has denied. In your statement, the Home Minister says that when this was brought to the notice of.....

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: Will the hon. Member let me know whether there is a statement or a letter by Mr. Justice Mathur to which Mr. Sathe is referring or a mere Press report which has no basis?.... (Interruptions).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: On a point of order. This kind of statement that has been made by my friend, Mr. Sathe,—he has made certain remarks on the basis of the report which has appeared in the newspaper. Now, it will be very difficult for the hon. Minister to say whether these are facts or not unless those three letters, as has been promised by the hon. Minister, are placed on the Table of the House. This kind of a question or this kind of a statement will prejudice and will create an atmosphere which is not contrary to the statement that has been made by the hon. Minister. Therefore, may I request, on a point of order, that all these questions or remarks that the hon. Member wants to make should be reserved now. We will also get those letters which have been placed on the Table of the House in the Rajya Sabha. Only after that, this question should be raised. Otherwise, all the questions are irrelevant and it will

be difficult for the hon. Minister to reply. (Interruptions). We also want to know. (Interruptions). This kind of allegation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. There is no point of order at all. He is reading from a newspaper report. He is not saying that somebody was saying that or that there was a rumour and all that. He has come with a newspaper cutting here and he is seeking clarification from the Minister. It is for the Home Minister to reply. (Interruptions).

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I want to reinforce what my hon. friend, Mr. Samar Guha, has submitted to you. Unless we are in a position to read the three letters, we will not be able to make any kind of enquiry which would sound to be sensible, because, all the material seems to be contained in those three letters that have been placed on the Table of the House. It is only after a perusal of these three letters that we will be in a better position to put questions to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister should expect all these things. When he is coming here to make a statement, he should expect that this kind of thing will be asked here, and he should have come prepared for these things.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir I do not mind having a further discussion after we have seen these letters. I am not in the habit of jumping to wild conclusions on the basis of hypothetical argument in the Supreme Court: I am not in the habit of doing that. I am basing my arguments on this newspaper report where the report categorically, in terms, says that Mr. Mathur was not in favour of giving premature publicity to the working of the Commission as it might give the impression that the Commission was biased; Government was not cooperating with the Commission and, therefore, his resignation was in protest

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

against that attitude of the Government. This is what the report says. (Interruptions).

SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore): On a point of order, Sir. You are the protector of the dignity and honour of this House. Mr. Sathe is in the habit of taking out skin from cheese which is non-existent. He is very active doing the work of the caucus of the Congress.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order? There seems to be no point of order. Please sit down.

SHRI S. KUNDU: After the Home Minister has made the statement and has laid three letters on the Table of the House....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Home Minister is capable of answering him. Why do you bother? Please sit down.

SHRI S. KUNDU:....unless there is some fresh material which is not covered by these, Mr. Sathe should not be allowed to make reference to something published in a newspaper which is frivolous and irrelevant to the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Mr. Sathe may continue.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I do not mind the abusive remarks made by my friend in the House. (Interruptions) If I am serving the cause of any caucus, I can say that he is also a lackey of another caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may seek the clarification from the Minister.

SHRI VASANTH SATHE: You are not stopping them. (Interruptions).

जोधरी बलबीर सिंह (होमिबापुर) :
मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है। पहले मेरी बात सुन लें। सुनने के बाद कह सकते हैं कि मेरी बात गलत है या सही है।

अखबार में एक बयान आया। माननीय मन्त्री ने उसको काउन्सिल किया। जब के लेटर भी पेश किए। उस के बाद भी उसी अखबार

का रेफरेंस देते हुए ये बोल रहे हैं। यह बिलकुल गलत है। अगर इस अखबार के अलावा इन के पास कोई और काउन्सिली प्रूफ है या कोई और प्रूफ है तो उसको वे पेश कर सकते हैं। उसी अखबार का रेफरेंस देना बिलकुल गलत है।

समापति महोदय : कोई 'प्राइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर' नहीं है। आप बैठिए।

जोधरी बलबीर सिंह : कैसे नहीं है ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order in what you say; please sit down.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I think the Hon. Minister had stated even earlier, that he is going to hold the Judiciary of this country in high esteem,—if I am wrong you can correct me—but today he is denigrating a retired Justice of the Allahabad High Court by saying that he was responsible for having made some irresponsible remarks to his colleague, without verifying the facts from him. (Interruptions). I would like the Home Minister to clarify this: he says in his statement that when this was brought to the notice of Justice Mathur, he confirmed that he did meet Justice Sinha and speak to him about some rumours regarding his elevation to the Supreme Court, but denies having done so in any manner which could be objected to. Having got this explanation from Justice Mathur, to say further 'in view of the doubts which necessarily will arise 'in the public regarding this incident' means that you are casting aspersions on the integrity of the Justice while accepting his resignation. (Interruptions). I would like to know the reason for accepting his resignation. If you are going, through your statement, to impute certain motives to him and allege unjudicial and undignified behaviour on the part of Justice Mathur, it is not conducive to the respect of the Judiciary.

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: Mr. Satha has tried to make two arguments on the basis of a report in a Daily. This Daily is no doubt of all-India fame, but it is this paper alone which carries this report. And this report has no basis, in fact, whatsoever, nor does the correspondent allege anywhere in his report that he had a talk with Mr. Mathur or any other responsible person at all. It is a figment of his imagination and nothing else. Now, with your permission, I will leave it to the hon. Members of this House, how another hon. Member should mount an attack on a member of the Treasury Benches or a member sitting opposite, simply on the basis of a canard that appears in the press.

16.00 hrs.

The second point that the hon. Member tried to make is that I have cast aspersions on Mr. Mathur. This again has no basis, in fact, and I shall repeat the same words. I have said in my statement:

"Justice Mathur has, in his letter of resignation given his version of what happened. In view of the doubts which necessarily will arise in the public regarding this incident, Justice Mathur's resignation is appropriate".

'Is but appropriate', I should have said. Now, the public will weigh the version of Mr. Mathur against the version of Mr. Sinha. That is the point. It will raise doubts in the mind of the intelligentsia and the readers of the press, as to who is correct. The situation which would have developed would have proved very embarrassing to the Government. So, during the course of my conversation, with him, I suggested that it would be embarrassing for him also, but he did not take any hint from me. I wrote a letter to Mr. Sinha referring to what had appeared in a publication named "The Judgement" by Mr. Kuldip Nayar and drew his attention to a statement made in that book. This is a small letter and I will read it:

"My dear Justice Sinha,

Perhaps, it might have come to your notice that Mr. Justice D. S. Mathur has been appointed to hold an enquiry into the affairs of the Maruti Group. It is obvious that there must be complete public confidence in persons holding such enquiries and there should be no misgivings of any kind regarding the objectivity or impartiality of such an enquiry. In Kuldip Nayar's recent book, *The Judgement*, the following statement appears:

'A colleague on the Bench had told him that he expected him to be elevated to the Supreme Court after the judgement. Sinha merely looked at him with contempt.'

I have been receiving disquieting reports that the colleague of the Bench, referred to in the above statement was Mr. Justice D. S. Mathur. My colleague, Shri Shanti Bhushan, Law Minister has already spoken to you (Mr. Sinha) about this matter. I would be very grateful if you will kindly let me know all the relevant facts in that connection. It is needless to add that I am making this request only out of considerations of important public interest involved.

With kind regards."

He wrote back a long letter to me giving details of the meeting that Mr. Justice Mathur had with him on 23rd May, 1975 at his house. I will not read that letter; it is too long. Then, I sent that letter of Mr. Sinha to Mr. Mathur and Mr. Mathur in reply sent his resignation.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): It is a good thing, Mr. Home Minister, that you should change Mr. Justice Mathur. It is a good thing that the Home Minister took the trouble to try to verify the integrity of Mr. Justice Mathur from Mr. J. M. L. Sinha who had given the confirmation about his doubts about his eligibility to hold such an important position in his letter dated

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

9th July, 1977. You have laid it on the Table of the House. But I have my own ways and I would like to have the confirmation or otherwise from you.

* * *

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND (Chikodi): On what basis is he making all these allegations? ... (Interruptions). Will the hon. Member lay it on the Table of the House? Mr. Sathe was speaking on the strength of the press report. Now, let me know from the hon. Minister and from you on what basis he is making such wild allegations. Let him not do that... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, please do not make a speech.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No, no. You have allowed him 20 minutes.***

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: He is speaking from his own imagination.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: ***

Secondly, who is the person...

SHRI VASANT SATHE: On a point of order.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am not yielding... (Interruptions).

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Under Rule 353.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: He has no point of order.

(Interruptions).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You are in the Chair and you are the property of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When you raised a point of order, I heard you. Like that, I have to give him an opportunity also.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I will finish in one minute!

(Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to know as to who is the man who carried this message from Mrs. Indira Gandhi to Allahabad... (Interruptions). I want to know who carried this message from Mrs. Indira Gandhi to Allahabad. I want to know this.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: (Akola): Under Rule 353:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a Member against any person unless the Member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply:

Provided that the Speaker may at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the House or that no public interest is served by making such allegation."

Now the allegation was made against Mrs. Mathur and Mrs. Sinha without taking your permission and without asking you under Rule 380..

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: They are shedding crocodile tears. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is this, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu? Your behaviour is very bad. I am sorry to say this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You can say what you like. I have done what I..

There is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is none of your business. Please take your seat.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: There is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who are you to say? What is all this?

(Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Oh!
Shut up.

(Interruptions)

स्वाम्य श्री परिवार कल्याण मंत्री
(श्री राज नारायण) : मेरा विनम्र निवेदन
यह है कि चैयर को गुस्ता नहीं करना चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय : लेकिन जब मैं
प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर सुन रहा हूँ और आप
गड़बड़ करते हैं, तो गुस्ता करना ही पड़ता
है। जब एक माननीय सदस्य की बात मैं
सुन रहा हूँ और गड़बड़ एक भावनी करता
है, तो गुन्से से उसको सुनाना ही पड़ता है।
मुझे हाउस में डेकोरम और डिगनिटी मेन्टेन
करनी है।

श्री नरसिंह यादव (बनौली) : वार
वार आप इन्ही का प्वाइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर सुन
रहे हैं।

You are favouring. You should be
neutral.

(Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am on
a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him finish.
He has not finished his point of order.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want
to say something on his point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has not fin-
ished his point of order.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You can
listen to him also after this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will definitely
listen to him.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You can
listen to him afterwards.

When such a remark is made, Rule
380 says--

"If the Speaker is of opinion that
words have been used in debate
which are defamatory or indecent
or unparliamentary or undignified,
he may, in his discretion, order that
such words be expunged from the
proceedings of the House".

MR. CHAIRMAN: I uphold the
point of order raised by Shri Sathe.
Rule 353 is very very clear. What-
ever remarks he has made, please
expunge those remarks....(Interrup-
tions).

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND
MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK):
Mr. Chairman, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu
asked a question to the Home Min-
ister. It is for the Home Minister to
say whether it is correct or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only thing
is the point of order raised by Mr.
Sathe, which is, whether he sought
permission or not. He has not writ-
ten to the Speaker under Rule 353.
It is very clear that before making
any allegation against anybody he
should write a letter. He should write
to the Speaker as also to the Minis-
ter. He has not done this. It is
not allowed.

श्री राज नारायण : मैं आपसे विनम्र
निवेदन करता हूँ कि क्या आप हमें मेज
पार्लियामेंटरी प्रेक्टिस में यह दिखा सकते हैं
कि क्वेश्चन पूछते समय अपनी बात को
प्रसंग के रूप में कहने की चैयर से इजाजत
लेने की जरूरत है ?

सभापति महोदय : राजनारायण जी,
जो कुछ भी मंत्री जी ने कहा,
he has a right to seek clarification.
But he has gone out of that.

SHRI RAJ NARAIN: It is neces-
sary for the Member to take permis-
sion from the Chair at the time of
putting a question. He has done that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not a question at all.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, I am putting a definite categorical question with the permission of the Chair to the hon. Home Minister. (Interruptions). I would like to ask the hon. Home Minister about this. Is it a fact that he took the trouble of writing to Mr. Justice J. M. L. Sinha to get a confirmation about what has been alleged, in order to make sure that the Judge, who has been given such an important assignment in the country, has the integrity that is required of the job? I want to know whether it is a fact that Mr. J. M. L. Sinha, in his letter dated 9-7-77 had stated that on 23rd of May, 1975 after 10-30 P.M., Mrs. Mathur came to the House of Mr. J. M. L. Sinha. (Interruptions). Sir, I am asking a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us hear him.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to know whether it is a fact that in reply to the hon. Home Minister's letter Mr. Justice J. M. L. Sinha had confirmed that on 23rd of May, 1975, (that is, about 20 days before the delivery of judgment in Allahabad against Mrs. Indira Gandhi) after 10-30 P.M. Mrs. Mathur, wife of Mr. Justice Mathur, came to the House of Mr. J. M. L. Sinha* * *

AN HON. MEMBER: Let him ask a question.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am quoting a letter. I am in possession of certain information. You can confirm or deny this. My information is this. Mrs. Mathur came to the house of Mr. J. M. L. Sinha. He can deny it or confirm it. ***

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is a funny way of doing it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: ***

I also want to know the action taken against Mr. Mathur if my allegations are found to be correct and also the name of the person who carried the

message from Mrs. Gandhi at Delhi to Allahabad and whether the man has been identified. If so, what action has been taken against him. (Interruptions).

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, my reply to the question put by Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu is in the affirmative. He did go to the house of Mr. Sinha as Mr. Sinha has written to me in his letter during the week ending 23rd May. Now, who the emissary from Delhi was, I have not made any enquiry.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Please do.

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: I will consider his suggestion.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am seeking only a certain clarification on the statement of the hon. Home Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But, do not make any speech. You confine yourself only to seeking clarifications.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I want to seek a clarification from the hon. Home Minister. He has himself admitted that there was some dialogue with Shri Mathur by the Home Minister himself, and the Law Minister too talked to Justice Sinha and there, something happened in between it seems. It is very well known that the Law Minister is a very good and flourishing and practicing lawyer of the Allahabad High Court. And so, he knows all the judges naturally. He has gone to his home town and he has found some time to go there and talked to him. The Home Minister is also a very good man. I am only making a suggestion. (Interruptions). Everywhere it is seen that when new Members come they get training... (Interruptions). The point I am making is this. I am not attributing any motive. It seems that there was something that had happened in between. Here I am only seeking a clarification on how the whole episode started and what led to the resignation

tion of Mr. Mathur? The Law Minister talked to Mr. Sinha and the Home Minister himself had a dialogue with Mr. Mathur and even written letters. And then the Home Minister himself admitted that he made any hint to resign. It seems clear to me that he got him to resign. You can repudiate it if I am wrong. I am only seeking a clarification from the Home Minister. Not only he is very much concerned about it but we ourselves as also the country are very much concerned about this. You may be grateful to them because you are now sitting on the other side. You do not use your politicking in your allegation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ravi, you will kindly ask your questions.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: This country, everybody here in this Parliament is concerned about what happened. The credibility of the enquiry should not be lost if you go on changing everyday and politicking with these Commissions. It is dangerous and it will lose its credibility.

So, I want to know from the hon. Home Minister as to what has happened in between; what is the episode? Will he assure this House that he will not use this enquiry for politicking and for his own purpose?

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: What was the question about Mr. Mathur? I told him about the rumour that is circulating in Delhi and also amongst the Members of this honourable House. I told him that may be, this rumour has no basis. But, this statement that has appeared in the book written by a leading journalist is bound to carry a conviction with some of the people; maybe, somebody, if not all, on this side or the other side may put a question on the floor of this House.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Did you make an enquiry before appointing him as Chairman of this Commission?

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: I have not made any enquiry either through J.B. or anybody else. I knew that he was a very efficient Chief Justice of the

Allahabad High Court. That is all I knew. I hold that every Chief Justice who has served for some time whether on the High Court or on the Bench of the Supreme Court is an hon'ble man and a true man. That is all. With that assumption I made a request to him to accept this burden of going into the details and finding facts. Well, Mr. Sathe, believe me I have not till today read the book to which I am referring. Friends told me that such and such sentence has appeared in that book. So, I put to him and suggested it will be embarrassing to him and to the government also, whatever may be the facts. That is all. He said he would like to proceed with the enquiry. I spoke to him once more during the same conversation. Yet he will not take the hint. I expected him to say at once that if such are the circumstances, if there is such a statement in certain book and there is certain rumour about my impartiality, well I will not touch this matter with a pair of tongues. Instead he said it is all baseless. If the question is raised on the Floor of the House he will write to the Speaker stating all the circumstances and facts of the matter and we will request the Speaker to read out his letter to the House. I said perhaps there is no precedent of this kind. Perhaps the Speaker will not oblige you.' That is all. Then he went away. Then I wrote a letter to Justice Sinha. Justice Sinha wrote a long letter to me which is now before the hon'ble Members. I gave certain relevant extracts of the letter I wrote to Mr. Mathur and the implications of my letter were correct. Then he sent up his resignation. That is all that has happened.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN (Cannanore): Sir, this Commission of enquiry into the affairs of the Maruti Group of Companies has a chequered progress. The appointment of the commission was delayed. Then Justice Khanna was appointed. Now, Justice Mathur has resigned. Last time when I asked about the delay, the Minister got angry. Now, I would like to know from you whether there will be further delay in getting the final report

from the Commission because now a new judge has to look into the whole matter. Whether you will assure the House that a more speedy enquiry will be conducted and a report will be made available to the country as soon as it is necessary? Secondly, I would also like to ask that the Minister on the basis of a report which appeared in the book wrote letters and took the final decision but two days ago when the report appeared in *Times of India* which gave a completely different version from what the hon. Minister has said, he kept quiet. My question is why did he not deny the report *same day and put the record straight* because then there would have been little misunderstanding about the whole thing? If you do not get annoyed, may I ask you: Is it a result of after-thought that you are coming today and denying it. A report has appeared two or three days ago and there is every reason for the country to get worried about such a report because the matter is of supreme importance. Unfortunately, I must say that the Commission—whether it is an ill-fated Commission or not—has made a chequered progress, as I mentioned. Now, why did you not come to the House the same day and deny it with the same spirit? (Interruptions)

My question is: Why did you not come before the House and deny it when this news appeared in the press?

श्री चरण सिंह : सभापति महोदय, माननीय मित्र ने एक ही बात को कई बार बोहराया है कि जिस रोज़ खबरार से खबर निकली थी, उसी रोज़ क्यों नहीं घाये ? खबरार में एक बेदुनियाद खबर निकली, मैं नहीं समझता था कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के माननीय सदस्य इसका जिक्र करेंगे, लेकिन कल ही खबर निकली और कल ही राज्य सभा में जिक्र किया गया । आज धाकर मैंने बयान दे दिया । क्या आप चाहते हैं कि रात में मैं यहाँ आता ?

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Mr. Chairman, I have made it very clear to the

hon. Home Minister that a full discussion on this issue has to be held. The Members on this side are agitated over this matter and that is why we should have a full discussion on this subject. Anyway, the hon. Home Minister has realised the need to make a statement now. My friend, Mr. Chandrapan, has already stated that a deliberate attempt was made by the Home Minister to clarify the issue late. Here is a devastating statement made by Mr. Mathur. I do not know how the Home Ministry is functioning in this country. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: That point has already been made. Do not go into controversy.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: The point at issue is that when Justice Mathur was appointed, his repeated statement has appeared in the press which the country has come to know that the Ministry is reluctant to part with the files pertaining to the Maruti affairs and the Commission is not allowed to function freely. That means there must have been an interference. I do not know what kind of interference was there by the Home Ministry and for what purpose. I do not know the kind of master mind operating in the Home Ministry. We are all supporting the appointment of the Commission. We are not worried about that. But the master mind working in the Home Ministry is no less than the Minister, Mr. Charan Singh. How this devastating statement was made by Mr. Mathur? Would any reasonable Home Minister keep quiet, I do not know? Because certain documents were asked for. It is clear in the statement. A responsible person has made the statement. I am not questioning his integrity. You have got whole respect for judiciary. For a moment you come to power. You have to give respect to judiciary. Therefore, what are those documents that Mathur was persistently asking to have from the enquiry point of view? Will you kindly place the letter he wrote? What has he written to the Home Ministry or C.B.I. about such documents? Will you

kindly explain that position to this House and clarify?

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: There was absolutely no document which Justice Mathur asked for from the Home Ministry or the CBI which was refused. Whoever says so makes a deliberate mis-statement, not to say a false statement. Secondly, I should like to say, with your permission, only one sentence in reply to all that he has said: usually people judge others by their own standards... (Interruptions).

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I protest. I would never make a false statement as the Home Minister has made about the thinking about killing leaders... (Interruptions).

SHRI VASANT SATHE. The same remark was made by Mrs. Indira Gandhi against him... (Interruptions)

श्री मधु लिमये (बांका) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं गृह मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उन्हें इस बात का पता है कि जब से उन्होंने इस सदन में मासिक काबड और इमर्जेंसी को एक्सेसिज का जांच करने का विषय घोषित किया है, उसी समय से देश में गृह मंत्री जी और सरकार को बदनाम करने का बिल्कुल एक पडयत्न रचा जा रहा है। कल के प्रखबारों में जो खबर छपी है, उसके पीछे कौन है? (व्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह जनता पार्टी का इन्टर्नल पालिटिक्स है। (व्यवधान)

श्री मधु लिमये : यह इन्टर्नल नहीं है। यह इन्दिरा-संजय गैंग का पडयत्न है। और ये लोग इस गैंग का कितना समर्थन करते जायेंगे, उतना ही कांग्रेस पार्लियामेंटरी पार्टी कीचड़ में फसती जायेगी, मैं यह चेतावनी उन्हें दे देना चाहता हूँ।

यह पत्र-व्यवहार तो 8 जलाई से शुरू हो गया। कल जिस तरह के समाचार प्रखबारों में प्रकाशित किये गये हैं, उन से पता चलता है कि प्रखबारों में समाचार देने वाले प्रच्छी तरह जानते थे कि इसके पीछे क्या है।

श्री वसन्त साठे : अब आप प्रखबार वालों के भी खिलाफ हो गये ?

श्री मधु लिमये : इसमें प्रखबार वालों का दोष नहीं है। उन्हें जो खबरे दी जाती हैं, उन्हें वे छापते हैं। मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि प्रखबार वालों को गसत ढंग से झीफ करने वाले ये लोग कौन हैं, और इन्दिरा-संजय गैंग के साथ इन लोगों का क्या सम्बन्ध है, क्या इसकी जांच गृह मंत्री करेंगे और उसके निष्कर्ष सदन के सामने रखेंगे, क्योंकि समूचे देश में इस गैंग के द्वारा प्रचार किया जा रहा है कि जनता पार्टी की सरकार से सहयोग न करो, यह सरकार चलने वाली नहीं है, फिर इन्दिरा का राज धाने वाला है। इस तरह की अफवाहें उड़ायी जा रही हैं। इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या मंत्री जी इस मामले की पूरी जांच करके सदन को अवगत करायेंगे और इस पडयत्न का पर्दाफोड़ करेंगे ?

श्री चरण सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय मधु लिमये साहब का जो सुझाव है, मैं केवल यह कह सकता हूँ कि उस पर गवर्नमेंट विचार करेगी, कोई वायदा करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्ता (दिल्ली सदर) : सभापति महोदय, जब से होम मिनिस्टर ने अपने जवाब में कुछ बातें पहले प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में कही हैं तब से मेरे मित्र होम मिनिस्टर से बहुत नाराज हैं और किसी न किसी तरह से, चाहे वह गलत हो या ठीक हो, होम मिनिस्टर पर और इस पार्टी पर आक्रमण करना उनका उद्देश्य बन गया है। लेकिन उनको याद यह मालूम नहीं है कि होम मिनिस्टर इस ए हार्ड नट टु क्रैक। साठे साहब ने जो बात कही कि जुडिसियरी के बारे में जनता पार्टी के मन में कितनी इज्जत है तो यह होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने स्पष्ट कर दिया, सारे पत्र सामने रख दिए जिससे स्पष्ट हो गया

[श्री कंबर लाल गुप्ता]

कि हम जुडिशियरी को बहुत इज्जत की निगाह से देखना चाहते हैं ।

अब साठे साहब ने एक बात कही कि उस अखबार के खिलाफ कार्यवाही क्यों नहीं की ? मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमने कल आफ ला रेस्टोर किया है इसलिए अगर प्रेस ने कोई गलत बात हीम मिनिस्टर के संबध में छाप दी तो भी हमारी सरकार उसके खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही नहीं करती यह एक बहुत बड़ी बात है, जिस पर हमें गर्व है और यह इस बात की निशानी है कि जनता पार्टी के शासन में समाचार पत्रों को पूरी आजादी है कि वे चाहे किसी के बारे में भी लिखें और चाहे वह गलत भी हो तब भी हम उसके खिलाफ कार्यवाही नहीं करते ।

मैं माननीय मंत्री से जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब से मैं कमीशन देश में बँटे हूँ तब से यह एक भावना देश में पैदा होती जा रही है कि यह सरकार कुछ साफ्ट है, इन कमीशनों के बारे में जितनी कड़ी कार्यवाही चलनी चाहिए वह नहीं चलाई जा रही है । कुछ अफसर उनके साथ मिले हुए हैं और कुछ अखबार के लोग भी मिले हुए हैं ऐसा मझे मालूम हुआ है । इसलिए जो कार्यवाही तुरन्त होनी चाहिए और कड़ेपन के साथ होनी चाहिए उसके बारे में यह इम्प्रेसन होता जा रहा है कि वह नहीं हो रही है और सरकार साफ्ट है इस मामले में । तो क्या गृह मंत्री महोदय देश को स्पष्ट पतायेंगे कि जो कमिटेमेंट इस सरकार का और हमारी पार्टी का है कि जो दोषी है उनको सजा दी जायेगी, उसमें किसी प्रकार की रियायत नहीं बरती जायेगी, उसे वह पूरा करेंगे और क्या इस बारे में देश को विश्वास दिलायेंगे ? इस इम्प्रेसन को कि सरकार साफ्ट है दूर करने के लिए वह क्या कर रहे हैं ?]

श्री बल्लभ साठे : अब आप यह कह दीजिये कि कमीशन के पहले ही सजा दे दीजिये । तत्सली हो जायेगी ।

श्री बल्लभ सिंह : यवाब तो बरअसल मुझे बही देना चाहिए जो साठे साहब तयबीज कर रहे हैं । अगने देश का मिखाफ इतना बिगाड़ दिया है कि रूल आफ ला का सवाल रह ही नहीं गया है । सब लोग यह आशा कर रहे हैं जो साठे साहब और उनकी पार्टी ने उदाहरण पेस किया उसी पर जनता पार्टी भी अमल करेगी । लेकिन जनता पार्टी के सदस्यों को चाहे कितना ही गुस्सा आये, चाहे उन्हें कितना ही रोष हो, और चाहे उन्होंने देश की कितनी ही बर्बादी होते हुए अपनी आँखों से देखी हो, तब भी यदि बिचार करेंगे तो वह भी मुस सें सहमत होंगे कि रूल आफ ला को हमने रेस्टोर किया है, उसको एवालिश करने का सवाल नहीं है और कायदे और नियम के राज में हमेशा देर लगती है क्योंकि डेमोक्रेसी का और प्रिसिपल आफ नेचरल जस्टिस का तकाजा यह है कि दूसरे आदमी को मौका दिया जाय अपनी बात कहने का । वही अदालत है, वही जस्टिस है, वही रूल आफ ला है । इसलिए बड़े से बड़े मुखालिफ को भी और यह जानते हुए भी कि उसने देश के साथ बड़ी से बड़ी गद्दारी की है और वह किया है जो इतिहास में न हुआ हो, हम बिना मुकदमा चलाए और बिना उस को अपनील का मौका दिए जेल में नहीं डालेंगे ।

अब मैं एक ही सेन्टेन्स और कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह फर्ज है हमारे सारे दोस्तों का कि वे लोगों को एपूकेट करें कि इसमें देर लगेगी । अगर हम भी वही करें जो कि इन्दिरा जी ने किया तो हम सें और उन में कोई फर्क नहीं रह जायेगा ।

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN (Bada-gara): Maruti has been used as a whip for a long time. I have no objection to it. It was used by my distinguished friends before the elections and it has been successfully used after the election results were announced. I had also hoped that it is a very necessary and desirable thing that the govern-

ment had come forward with the commission of inquiry because we wanted to clarify these matters. For that we on this side have no objection whatsoever.

Personally, I have always wanted that the affairs around Maruti and the dynastic messiah should be cleared once and for all so that the political life in this country can be clean. We are absolutely one with you in that.

But what I am worried about is the way the Home Minister and the Home Ministry are going about it. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta spoke about the impression of softpedalling. That impression remains in this country on the one hand and on the other hand, there is an impression of illegality and wrong procedure being followed. The Commission of Inquiry Act, particular sections 5 and 5A, prohibit any parallel enquiry. I would like to know whether Justice Mathur had raised this specific question whether the Home Minister had ordered the CBI to go into certain questions which have been covered by the terms of reference of Justice Mathur. Would the Home Minister also give us an assurance that whatever may be his present level of relationship with the Prime Minister or other colleagues in the Cabinet, the interne-cine warfare that has started in this Cabinet is not reflected in the attitude to this commission? Would he give that assurance?

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: So far as the government is concerned, it has made it clear beyond doubt that the commissions of inquiry are themselves free to regulate their procedure.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I asked a specific question whether it is a fact that Justice Mathur had complained.

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: There was no complaint whatsoever from him.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Whether you have instituted any CBI enquiry into anything covered by his terms of reference.

SHRI CHARAN SINGH: No.

श्री जनेरकर लिख : सभापति जी, मैं आपके जरिए गृह मंत्री जी से तीन सवाल सफाई के तौर पर जानना चाहूंगा। चूकि मावति के कागजात के बारे में चर्चा चल रही है तो क्या यह सही है कि पिछले चार महीनों से यह भ्रमवाह है कि बहुत से कागजात उस सम्बन्ध में नष्ट किए गए हैं? क्या जितने जरूरी कागजात मावति कम्पनी के सम्बन्ध में चाहिए वह सब के सब मंत्री जी के पास आ गए हैं? क्या यह सही है कि जब इन्दिरा गांधी 1 अक्टूबर रोड प्रौर सफदरजंग रोड का बंगला छोड़ कर गईं तो उस बंगले के प्रहाते में बहुत से जले हुए कागज के टुकड़े पाये गये। मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री जी इसके बारे में जवाब दें, क्योंकि बहुत भयानक तौर पर यह भ्रमवाह फैली हुई है—गहर में प्रौर देव घर में।

दूसरा प्रश्न—चूकि जज पर दबाव डालने की बात चल रही है, तो क्या सर्वोच्च न्यायालय के जज साहब का भी बयान कहीं न कहीं प्राया है कि भ्रष्टरक्ष रूप से इस मुकदमे के फसले के बारे में उन पर भी दबाव डाला गया था?

तीसरा प्रश्न—क्या महाराष्ट्र-टाइम्स की इस खबर की तरफ माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान गया है कि इस समय कांग्रेस का काकस तो खत्म है, लेकिन संजय-साठे साठगांठ चल रही है?

श्री चरण सिंह : माननीय मित्र ने चार सवाल किये हैं। जहां तक आखिरी सवाल की बात है—माननीय साठे प्रौर संजय की साठगांठ चल रही है—मैं माननीय साठे के खिलाफ़ ऐसा कोई बडयंस मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। वे केवल अपनी झूटी करते हैं, चाहे वह संजय के हक में हो या दूसरे के हक में हो। (अवकाश)

श्री बसन्त साठे : मैं अपनी इयूटी करता हूँ, आप अपनी इयूटी करते हैं ।

श्री खरब सिंह : दूसरा सवाल यह था कि जब माननीय इन्दिरा जी कोठी छोड़ कर दूसरी जगह गईं तो उनकी कोठी के अंदर के अन्दर जले हुए कागज के टुकड़े थे या नहीं थे । मैं तो उस सड़क से कम निकलता हूँ, पैदा भी नहीं जाता हूँ, इसलिए इसका मुझे इल्म नहीं है । हाँ, सफ़ाई कर्मचारी से इसका इल्म कर सकता हूँ । लेकिन कोई तहकीकात मैंने इनके बारे में नहीं की है और मेरे पास पुलिस की भी कोई इस प्रकार की रिपोर्ट नहीं आई है ।

इनके जलने की बात मैंने सुना है या नहीं सुना है—मैं ठीक नहीं कह सकता, क्योंकि कागजात, दस्तावेज और फाइल जलने की खबरें इधर-उधर से आती हैं, कानों से पड़ती रहती हैं, उनमें कितनी सच्चाई है, मुझको मालूम नहीं है । मुझको इतना जरूर मालूम है कि मार्गट कम्पनी के कारखाने की या जो उनकी इमारत है—उसकी तलाशी एक बार सी०बी०आई० ने ली थी, उनके कागजात भी देखे थे । उनको अपनी मुआमलात के मुताल्लिक जैसे “किस्सा कुर्सी का”—उनकी तहकीकात के लिये वहाँ जाना पड़ा, ता जो जरूरी दस्तावेज होंगे उनको अपने कब्जा में कर लिया होगा । इससे ज्यादा मुझे मालूम नहीं है ।

यह बात ठीक है कि टाइम्स आफ इंडिया, जिममें माधुर साहब के मुताल्लिक खबर निकली थी शायद परशों नियुक्ति थी । उसमें एयर साहब के मनासिक्त भी खबर निकली थी कि जिस वक्त स्टे की एप्लीकेशन उनके खरे-तजवीज थी, उनके पास फोन आया था । मैंने यह रिपोर्ट पढ़ी नहीं है, लेकिन मैंने सुना है । कल उन्होंने उस रिपोर्ट के सिलसिले में एक सम्बा बयान दिया है । मैंने उन्को पूरा नहीं पढ़ा है, लेकिन पहले

दिन की खबर का उसमें चिक था । उसमें उन्होंने एक एक-दो बातों की तरदीद की है—“अगर आप ऐसा नहीं करेंगे, जजमेंट मुआफिक नहीं देंगे तो आप और आपकी धर्मपत्नी का जीवन खतरे में पड़ सकता है ।” तो उन्होंने कहा है कि यह जो रिपोर्ट में लिखा है कि मेरी धर्मपत्नी का जीवन खतरे में पड़ सकता है—मेरी धर्मपत्नी अब है ही नहीं, इसलिए वह केवल मेरे ही मुताल्लिक था । ऐसा मैंने पढ़ा है, लेकिन मैंने बहुत जल्दी में पढ़ा था । लेकिन उससे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि वह तस्लीम करते हैं, एडमिट करते हैं कि उनके पास फोन इस सिलसिले में धमकी का आया ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have had enough of discussion on this. We will now go to discuss the Report of the University Grant Commission.

16.55 hrs.

MOTION RE. REPORT OF UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION FOR 1975-76—cond.

श्री हरिकेश बहादुर (गोरखपुर) : मान्यवर, विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग के बारे में अपनी निश्चित धारणा यह है कि इस आयोग को पुनर्गठन करना चाहिये और इस आयोग में किसी ऐसे व्यक्ति को होना चाहिये जो देश का बहुत ही एमीनेन्ट एज्यूकेशनिस्ट हो । आज जो इसमें माननीय अध्यक्ष हैं, उनके बारे में माननीय सदस्य श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र जी ने अपने विचार व्यक्त किये हैं । यह बड़े शर्म और खेद की बात है कि उन्होंने अपनी धर्मपत्नी को जबाहरमाल नेहरू यूनिवर्सिटी के हिन्दी विभाग में नियुक्त करवाया जब कि जो बेलिक क्वासीफिकेशन हिन्दी में होनी चाहिये थी, वह उनमें नहीं है । उन्होंने न हिन्दी में एम० ए० पास किया है और न ही हिन्दी में पी० एच० डी० किया है । यदि