

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

Vayalar Ravi, the product of youth cult, should take punishment that the House may bestow on him.

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K BRAHMANANDA REDDY): Sir, according to information furnished by the Delhi Administration Kumari Farida was admitted into the Irwin Hospital for treatment at about 1-10 p.m. on 24th February, 1975. When she was examined by the police on the following day, she stated that she was present at about 12-30 pm in the bazar Chitli Qabar and while she was going to her house she received a gun shot injury. According to the medical opinion, there were no charring marks on her wounds nor any burning marks on her clothes and the wound on the person was caused by a distant range shot. Kumari Farida was discharged from the hospital on 17-2-75, but she left the hospital on 19-2-1975.

The reference to her having been in the hospital for two days in the course of my observations on 19-2-75 was inadvertent. I am sorry for this. The reference occurred when I was seeking to correct the impression caused by other speeches that Kumari Farida had been shot dead at point blank range in her house. For instance Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu had stated "Farida is maimed for life". Similarly he stated "one girl was shot dead". "The police climbed the 2nd floor and fired at point blank range at Kumari Farida who was stitching". Similarly, another Hon'ble Member of the House Shri Ibrahim Sulaiman Sait had stated "when they killed the girl whom I referred to earlier." It was in the above context that I tried to place the facts before the Hon'ble Members of this House. It was never my intention to mislead the House. All that I endeavoured to do was to correct the impression in regard to the material facts that the girl was not really dead that she was not shot at from

a point blank range and that she was not shot at inside the house. Whether the hospitalization lasted for two days or a few days, the material point I tried to make was that after a short time she had left the hospital.

According to information received by me a letter signed by Kumari Farida on 23-2-1975 and addressed to S.H.O. Jama Masjid was delivered to the Police Station on 24-2-1975. As stated in that letter it was sent by Kumari Farida through her brother Shri Gulzar. She herself did not go to the Police Station as stated in the letter referred to by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu. A translation of the letter dated 23-2-1975 (original in Urdu signed by Kumari Farida) is laid on the Table of the House [Placed in Library. See No LT-9156/75].

The allegations in the above letter have been made by Kumari Farida 21 days after the incident and are contrary to what she told the police in the hospital on the date following her admission for treatment i.e. 3-2-1975. The allegations are, however, being investigated.

13.40 hrs.

#### BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE FIFTY-THIRD REPORT

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K RAGHU RAMAIAH): I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-third Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 10th March, 1975."

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, I have given notice of an amendment to this motion. Please permit me to say a few words before you put it to the vote of the House. I have also written to you.

In this report of the BAC—I must very distinctly pronounce it; otherwise, PAC and BAC get mixed up—para 4, sub-para (ii) reads as follows:—

“No discussion on No-Day-Yet-Named Motions or under Rule 193 may be provided.”

Some Opposition leaders—I am only one of the humble members of the Opposition—have signed a letter and sent to your good self stating their full disapproval of this proposal of the Government. Therefore, this cannot be accepted. We should continue to have, as before, discussions under rules 184 and 193 twice a week throughout the Session, and Half-an-Hour Discussion also should be taken up as before.

I have also mentioned in the Business Advisory Committee that, on the basis of the ruling given by the hon. Speaker in Mudgal's case and on the strength of the ruling given by the Chair on 31st May 1967, the Prime Minister is under an obligation to bring a motion against Mr. Tulmohan Ram for appropriate action by the House for the misconduct which has been established *prima facie* and which Government has admitted. I gave this notice on the 24th February. 20 days have passed. She has not only not acknowledged receipt of the letter but she has done nothing about it. They are flouting the directions of the Chair.

I have also given a notice for a comprehensive discussion on Maruti because we have not discussed this after December 1972 and the Prime Minister, in Lucknow, only some time ago, had stated that she would not object to any probe by anybody on the Maruti issue. We have got now plenty of materials on the gross financial irregularities and misuse of office by the Prime Minister. I am talking of not only Maruti Limited but also the Maruti Heavy Vehicles

Ltd. buying over unassembled components of UPCC which has defrauded the exchequer to the tune of Rs. 1½ crores—assembling those and selling them at a much higher price. There are 101 things being covered. If this House cannot discuss the conduct of the Prime Minister, it is better that we stop functioning in the Opposition here. You may decide to throw us out. They may approach you to say anything they choose to. But that is of least concern to us. We want a debate on Maruti and the Prime Minister's conduct. These are important. About Mr. Tulmohan Ram, there has been the failure of the Leader of the House in bringing before this House a motion as required by the ruling which has come from the Chair. It was mandatory on the part of the Prime Minister to bring a motion on Mr. Tulmohan Ram.

श्री मधु लियये (सांका) : उस प्रस्ताव को अभी वोट के लिए रखा जा रहा है। यदि यह पास हो जाएगी तो वो प्रायोरिटी में आने दें उनका क्या होगा ? आपके कानून के आधार पर तुलमोहन राम के बारे में मेरा नोटिस है। उनका क्या होगा ? यह तो दूर चरण निमंकंडूट की प्रायोरिटी के बारे में है। यह प्रायोरिटी में आने है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता हूँ। जो कहना था वह कह दिया था।

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): Before the hon. Minister replies, I would like to make a constructive suggestion. We should try to follow rules. Sir, instead of giving priority to items of State subject, which cuts no ice, like agriculture, education, social welfare, irrigation, we should concentrate ourselves on the list of

[Shri B. V. Naik]

priorities of the Central subjects with which we are concerned. (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Shri Dinen Bhattacharyya has totally denied that he agreed to the suggestions made by Shri Raghu Ramaiah. This is also another attempt to mislead the House. Shri Dinen Bhattacharyya is here.

**SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH:** May I submit, first of all, that this practice not to take up any of these motions until the Finance Bill is passed has been there for most of the years. That is the first point. The intention is to see that more time is allotted for Demands-for-Grants and they are not guilleted. That is the whole principle. This proposal has been put before the leaders of Opposition whom I invited informally as I always do every year. I have got the minutes here. This is one of the items on which all the opposition parties have agreed informally. (*Interruptions*) I believe, these were circulated also; I have to check it up. It was made very clear there.

Apart from that, this matter came up before the Business Advisory Committee. Their report is also there. It is very unfair on the part of Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu to take this occasion and go on attacking the Prime Minister and mentioning so many things which are individual items of discussion

On that also, I have made it very clear time and again that as far as Maruti is concerned, this has been discussed again and again in this House and we are not prepared to find time for this. He has made it a political issue. I am very clear on that.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** After December, 1972, there has been no discussion.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** And you are not prepared to find time for

Tulmohan Ram's case. My impression is that you are condoning misconduct and misdemeanour.

**SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH:** Regarding Tulmohan Ram's case, the Hon. Speaker has ruled that it is open to the House to discuss. Where it is the most appropriate time in this case, it is for us to decide is my interpretation. It will be advisable to have this discussion only after the criminal proceedings are over.

I submit the report of the Business Advisory Committee for approval of the House. (*Interruptions*).

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now, the question is:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-third Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 10th March, 1975"

*The motion was adopted*

13.54 hrs.

**MATTER UNDER RULE 377  
ANNOUNCEMENT OVER AIR ABOUT  
SHRI MOHAN DHARIA'S  
RESIGNATION**

श्री मधु लिमये (वाका) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं नियम 377 के तहत श्री मोहन धारिया के इस्तीफे का, और उस का वर्णन आल-इधिया रेडियो ने जिस प्रकार में किया, उस का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ।

हमारे सविधान के अनुसार मंत्रियों की नियुक्ति राष्ट्रपति, प्रधान मंत्री की सलाह पर, करते हैं। आर्टिकल 75(2) में कहा गया है :

"The Minister shall hold office during the pleasure of the President."