

mation about the qualities popular in the importing countries and the ruling prices as also the sources of supply so that the competition can be planned accordingly. Due weight should be given to foreign specifications in the Indian grading system so that production of pepper of lower pungency becomes possible in the country. The requirements for meeting the export demand for high pungency pepper are small and could be met without difficulty. The two main considerations in encouraging production should be the yield and quality acceptability for the bulk of the export market. In view of the demand from certain countries for processed pepper products, the economics and possibility of exporting them should be examined.

As far as cardamom is concerned, the Commission feels that infestation by *Katze* disease is responsible for low yields and that urgent steps are necessary to control this disease by uprooting all the affected plants. It has suggested, that the Cardamom Board should undertake a survey of the plantations so as to assess the area infested with *Katze* disease. The area under replantation programme should be stepped up substantially. Suitable packages of practices for adoption by the small farmers need to be devised. The system of growing cardamom as a mixed crop with arecanut and pepper in protected valley locations should be adopted. Efforts should be made to evolve denser varieties of cardamom for export to the Scandinavian countries. Attention should also be given to the manufacture of processed products of cardamom. If the economics of these products is found favourable, the countries to which these products could be exported should be indentified.

12.51hrs.

STATEMENT BY MEMBER RE.
NEW FRIENDS COOPERATIVE
HOUSE BUILDING SOCIETY

MR SPEAKER: Now, Shri Vajpayee to make a statement under direction No 115.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): On this, I want to make one submission. I had given a privilege motion on this and I was advised by the Secretariat to bring it up under Direction No. 155. Then, later on, of course, I have been ruled out. I would like to get one minute, if you would so please.

MR SPEAKER: Now, Shri S. M. Banerjee.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I just want to tell you something important.

I have got some additional information, very serious information, which indicates that perjury has been committed by the Lt. Governor, and the House has also been misled. In the case of one particular member—I take full responsibility for this statement—the Lt. Governor had taken the initiative to write to the Co-operative Society to give her land. She is Mrs. Shakuntala Masani who is a great friend of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. I have got documentary evidence to produce before the House. I take full responsibility for this statement that the Lt. Governor had written to the Co-operative Society to give her land. I have got the documents in my possession. If you want, I can lay them on the Table of the House. I have got the original documents. Kindly have a look at this. See what is going on.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no; not at this time.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर):
अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य जो मामला

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

बता रहे हैं, वह बाद में प्रकाश में आया है। इन बयानों के बाद आपको इस विषय पर बहस का मौका देना होगा।

श्री शशि भूषण (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे पास जनसभ के पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर्स को लिस्ट है, जिन्होंने प्लाट लिये हुए हैं। इसकी पूरी एनक्वायरी होनी चाहिए और इस पर डिसकशन होना चाहिए।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The Lt. Governor should have been suspended then and there...

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: rose—

MR. SPEAKER: Kindly sit down please I have called Shri Vajpayee I think the facts he is going to give are identical.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): You have called me. Let me make a submission.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am producing the original documents which will show that the Lt. Governor has committed a serious perjury and the Minister has misled the House. Kindly have a look at these.

MR. SPEAKER: These documents are not to be produced on the spot so abruptly. I am not permitting you.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Let there be a high-power inquiry into this Since...

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : गृह मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री श्री राम निवाम मिर्घा ने 10 अप्रैल, 1974 को सदन में "न्यू फ्रेंड्स को-ऑपरेटिव हाउस बिल्डिंग सोसाइटी" के बारे में एक वक्तव्य दिया।

यह खेद का विषय है कि उन्होंने कुछ महत्वपूर्ण तथ्यों को सदन में छिपाया है,

और कुछ तथ्यों को तोड़ मरोड़ कर पेश किया है।

(1) श्री मिर्घा ने यह बताया कि सोसाइटी द्वारा जो 50 नये सदस्य बनाये गए उनमें 34 न तो सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं और और न सरकारी कर्मचारियों के निकट सम्बन्धी हैं। किन्तु उन्होंने यह नहीं बताया कि शेष 16 सदस्य कौन हैं ?

मैंने 9 अप्रैल को यह कहा था कि सोसाइटी द्वारा अवैध और अनियमित रूप से भूमि आवंटित किये जाने में जो उच्च पदस्थ व्यक्ति सम्मिलित हुए हैं, उनमें केन्द्र सरकार के गृह सचिव श्री मुखर्जी, विदेश व्यापार के संयुक्त सचिव श्री मकलानी, गृह मंत्रालय के अतिरिक्त सचिव श्री अशोक मेन, लन्दन स्थित भारतीय हाई-कमिश्नर श्री बी० के० नेहरू, विदेश मंत्रालय के सचिव, श्री बी० सी० त्रिवेदी, श्री के० बी० लाल, आई० पी० एस० और श्री बी० मुखर्जी, आई० सी० एस० हैं। इसके अतिरिक्त मैंने यह भी बताया था कि नये सदस्यों में श्रीमती मोहिनी गिरी, डा० एम० एम० पाठक तथा श्री नरेश कुमार गुजराल भी शामिल हैं। अब पता लगा है कि डा० पाठक और श्री नरेश कुमार गुजराल ने वे प्लाट छोड़ दिये हैं।

श्री मिर्घा ने इसका खण्डन नहीं किया, किन्तु इसकी पुष्टि भी नहीं की। यह तथ्यों को दबाने और सदन को गुमराह करने का प्रयास है।

(2) श्री मिर्घा ने कहा कि सोसाइटी द्वारा 102 व्यक्तियों की 'बेटिंग लिस्ट' का मामला भी अदालत के सामने है। यदि राज्य मंत्री यहीं रुक जाते तो मैं समझ सकता था, किन्तु उन्होंने यह जोड़ कर अपने को कठिनाई में डाल दिया कि "दिल्ली प्रशासन ने सर्वोच्च न्यायालय में कहा है कि इस सोसाइटी के बारे में लेफ्टीनेन्ट गवर्नर द्वारा स्वीकृत कोई बेटिंग लिस्ट नहीं है।"

सर्वोच्च न्यायालय में दिल्ली विकास अधिकरण के सेक्रेटरी ने भी एक हलफनामा प्रस्तुत किया है। दिल्ली विकास अधिकरण दिल्ली प्रशासन का एक भाग है। दिल्ली के उपराज्यपाल विकास अधिकरण के अध्यक्ष हैं। उसके सेक्रेटरी ने अपने हलफनामे में जो कुछ कहा है वह श्री मिर्घा के कथन की धृष्टिजाय उठा देता है। उनके हलफनामे का अन्तिम पैरा इस प्रकार है —

The old management of the Society had submitted a waiting list of persons to the Delhi Administration in December, 1966. The list was signed by two officers of the Delhi Administration and is on record.

जुलाई, 31, 1967 को लैण्ड एण्ड बिल्डिंग विभाग के सेक्रेटरी श्री आई० के० मुरी ने 'वेटिंग लिस्ट' प्राप्त होने की सूचना देते हुए सोसाइटी को लिखा —

"I am desired to make it clear that list of members submitted with your letter under reference has been treated as final and no change in that list can be made without prior written permission of the Administration and no change will be allowed in the list already submitted to this administration."

इतना ही नहीं। मेरे पास उपराज्यपाल श्री बालेश्वर प्रसाद द्वारा 26 जनवरी, 1974 को सोसाइटी के अध्यक्ष को लिखे पत्र की प्रतिलिपि है जिसमें उन्होंने सोसाइटीको 60 नये मेम्बर बनाने की स्वीकृति दी है। पत्र में उपराज्यपाल महोदय ने लिखा है —

"However, if some members on the approved waiting list of some of the cooperative House Building Societies in South Delhi are offered to you for membership by us, these will have to be accommodated by your Society."

प्रश्न यह है कि यदि अन्य हाउस बिल्डिंग सोसाइटियों की वेटिंग लिस्ट होती है तो फ्रैंड्स सोसाइटी की 'वेटिंग लिस्ट' क्यों नहीं हो सकती। जहाँ एक वेटिंग लिस्ट के 'एप्रूव्ड होने का सवाल है, यह मुद्दे सारे घोटाले पर पर्दा डालने के लिए उठाया गया है। सरकार बताये कि 'एप्रूव्ड' सूची में उसका क्या मतलब है। उसे कौन एप्रूव करता है ?

श्री मिर्घा कहते हैं कि सहकारी समितियों को यह परिपाटी नहीं है कि मेम्बर बनाने के लिए कोई सार्वजनिक सूचना दे। क्या मैं उनमें पूछ सकता हूँ कि बिना सार्वजनिक सूचना दिये दम्पियों की भर्ती छद्मचार, पक्षपात, तथा भाई-भतीजावाद को कैसे रोका जा सकता है ?

हम न्यू फ्रैंड्स सोसाइटी के मामले को ही लें। सोसाइटी के चेयरमैन ने 26 जनवरी, को गणराज्य दिवस के पावन पर्व पर— यहाँ हमें स्मरण रखना चाहिये कि सार्वजनिक छुट्टी के दिन, केवल दिल्ली के उपराज्यपाल ही काम नहीं करते, सहकारी समितियों के कार्यालय भी खुले रहते हैं, यद्यपि कानून से सभी दफ्तरो का बन्द होना जरूर है— नये मेम्बर बनाने की इजाजत मांगी। उन्हें उसी दिन इजाजत मिल गई। 28 फरवरी को 60 नये मेम्बर बन गए। इन्हें कैसा पता लगा कि सदस्यता खाली है। क्या उन्हें बताने के लिए सोसाइटी के चेयरमैन सदस्यता फार्म लेकर घर घर घूमें ? क्यों उन्हें सिर्फ केन्द्र सरकार के ऊंचे अफसरों के ही घर मिले ? इस सम्बन्ध में डा० जयजीत सिंह ने अपने हलफनामे में जो कुछ कहा है वह बड़ा रोचक और रहस्योद्घाटक है। उनके शब्दों में —

"Since there was no approved waiting list for the enrolment of new members there was no other alternative for the Managing Com-

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

mittee but to select such persons of eminence, quality and character, as would in its judgment, improve the neighbourhood of the colony"

Persons of eminence, quality and character

क्या अर्थ है इन शब्दों का ? क्या समाजवाद का दम भरने वाली सरकार को यह कसौटी मान्य है ? क्या 'क्वालिटी' और 'करेक्टर' का एकाधिकार भारत सरकार के सचिवों, सयुक्त सचिवों और आई० सी० एस० अफसरों ने ही ले रखा है ?

13 hrs.

श्री मिर्धा का यह कथन भी अशुद्ध है कि सदस्यों का भर्ती

"is a matter within the purview of the management of the Society."

कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटीज हल्स 1973 के अनुसार नये सदस्यों की भर्ती सोसाइटी की जनरल सभा कर सकती है, अन्य कोई नहीं ।

किन्तु इस सोसाइटी को मैनेजिंग कमेटी ने नये सदस्यों की भर्ती का फैसला किया है । यह कमेटी उपराज्यपाल द्वारा नामजद है । कमेटी के 9 मई 1973 में से 3 मई 1973 को बैठक की सूचना तक नहीं दी गई । डा० जगजीत सिंह ने अपने विगोधियों को बाहर रखा ।

श्री मिर्धा ने इस तथ्य पर भी प्रकाश नहीं डाला कि दिल्ली प्रशासन ने फरवरी, 1967 में सहकारी समितियों द्वारा नये सदस्य बनाने पर रोक लगा दी थी और नये सदस्य केवल प्रशासन की पूर्ण अनुमति के पश्चात् ही बनाये जा सकते हैं ।

सरकार बताये कि यह नियम बनाने का क्या कारण था ? यह भी स्पष्ट होना चाहिए

कि दिल्ली प्रशासन ने कौन सी कसौटियाँ निर्धारित की हैं जिनके आधार पर सोसाइटी को नये सदस्य बनाये जा सकते हैं ? क्या इस मामले में उन कसौटियों का पालन किया गया ?

अभी तक यह साफ नहीं है कि नये सदस्य बनाने की इजाजत देने का अधिकार उपराज्यपाल को ही है या डी० डी० ए० के चेयरमैन को ? डा० जगजीत सिंह का पत्र डी० डी० ए० चेयरमैन को लिखा गया है, उस पर ऊपर "कान्फिडेंशल" भी लिखा है, उपराज्यपाल को नहीं । डी० डी० ए० कार्यालय इन्द्रप्रस्थ इस्टेट में है जब कि उपराज्यपाल का राजनिवास राजपुर रोड पर है । दोनों के बीच 6-7 मील का अन्तर है । 26 जनवरी को सोसाइटी के चेयरमैन द्वारा लिखा गया पत्र इतनी दूरी तय करके उसी दिन राज्यपाल की टेबल पर कैसे पहुँचा ?

क्या किसी अन्य सोसाइटी के मामले में उपराज्यपाल ने इतनी फुर्ती से काम लिया ? क्या उनका यह दायित्व नहीं था कि नये सदस्यों की भर्ती की अनुमति देते हुए देखते कि उनके नामों की सिफारिश करते हुए सोसाइटी ने नियमों तथा परिपाटियों का पालन किया है या नहीं ? क्या उन्होंने सदस्यों को नामावली स्वयं देखी या आश्चर्य मूक कर दस्तखत कर दिए ? यदि उन्होंने सूची देखी तो क्या यह बात उनके ध्यान में नहीं आई कि उसमें उनके ही एक रिश्तेदार तथा उनके स्पेशल असिस्टेंट की पत्नी के पते ठीक नहीं लिखे हैं ? क्या इससे उनके मन में कोई सन्देह पैदा नहीं हुआ ?

उपराज्यपाल ने सारी सूची को विकास प्राधिकरण की आवश्यकताओं के लिए क्यों नहीं भेजा ? यदि उसी दिन स्वीकृति नहीं दी जाती तो कोई आसमान तो नहीं टूट जाता ।

श्री मिर्छा ने कहा है कि सोसाइटी द्वारा 60 नार्मों की सिफारिश की गई थी, किन्तु केवल 5 व्यक्ति मैम्बर बनाये गये। ऐसा क्यों हुआ ? डा० जगजीत सिंह ने सर्वोच्च न्यायालय में जो हलफनामा दिया उसके अनुसार 25 जनवरी को 60 नये मैम्बर बनाये गए। बाद में उन्होंने दूसरा हलफनामा दिया कि कुछ सदस्यों ने प्लाट लेने से इन्कार कर दिया इसलिए सदस्य संख्या 50 रह गई। प्रश्न यह है कि जो लोग प्लाट लेना नहीं चाहते थे उनको सोसाइटी ने सदस्य बनाना क्यों तय किया ? क्या यह सच है कि जिन लोगों ने इन्कार किया उनमें दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल वार्डपोरेशन के कमिश्नर श्री टम भी है ? क्या यह भी सच है कि उन्होंने प्रालोचना के भयसे अपना नाम वापस ले लिया ?

श्री मिर्छा इस प्रश्न पर सर्वथा मौन है कि राजधानी में भूमि हड़पने के इस काण्ड के बारे में, जिनमें अनेक उच्च पदस्थ व्यक्ति फसे हुए हैं, केन्द्र सरकार क्या करने जा रही है ?

क्या केन्द्र सरकार की जिम्मेदारी उप-राज्यपाल के आचरण की ठीक ठहराने वाले तथ्य प्रस्तुत करने तक ही सीमित है ?

मेरी मांग है कि सरकार उन सभी सरकारी अफसरों के विरुद्ध कार्रवाई करे जो गलत ढंग से जमीन देने और गलत ढंग से उसे प्राप्त करने के दोषी हैं।

दूसरे, सरकार को समस्त गृह-निर्माण सहाकारी समितियों के गठन, उनके संचालन प्लाट देने के उनके नियमों तथा प्रक्रियाओं का पुनर्विचार कर ऐसे कदम उठाने चाहिए जिससे न्यू फ्रीहोस सोसाइटी जैसे गोलमालों की भविष्य में पुनरावृत्ति न हो।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That day I raised a privilege motion. You

may kindly look into the records. There it is stated that he should be allowed to make a statement under Direction 115. Now, after....

MR SPEAKER: When was it?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I shall give you the date. Your Secretariat knows about it.

MR. SPEAKER: This matter has already been mentioned by Mr. Vajpayee.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Some new facts had come to light and are in his possession. I could not include them in this statement.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall see the new facts which you are going to give.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Thank you.

श्री शशि भूषण (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि इस सोसाइटी के सम्बन्ध में काफी नये फेक्ट्स अखबारों में छपे हैं, इसलिए हम भी चाहते हैं कि इसके ऊपर डिस्कशन हो।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप की नोटिस मेरे पास नहीं आई है।

श्री शशि भूषण : कल दूंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी जिन की मेरे पास नोटिस आई है उनका तो मैं देख लूंगा। जिनकी नोटिस हो नहीं आई है उनके लिए मैं कुछ नहीं कर सकता।

अगर आप ऐसा करे कि सब का सुन कर जवाब इकट्ठा ही बना लें तो अच्छा होगा। यह मैं आपको मशविरा दे रहा हूँ। क्योंकि वाजपेयी जी के बाद वह और कुछ बातें रखेंगे।

गृह मंत्रालय तथा कानूक विभाग में
राज्य मंत्री (श्री राम निवास मिर्धा) :
बाजपेयी जी ने जो अभी पढ़ा वह पहले
आपको भेज दिया गया था और उसका
अनुवाद मैंने तैयार कर लिया है ।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: My submission is slightly different. I gave a Privilege Motion and the observations of the Chair on that was he should be allowed to make a statement under Direction 115. In the List of Business, I do not find that. Will you kindly permit me...

MR. SPEAKER: You want to make a statement just now?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I need your observation. I will give fresh material and you may kindly allow me.

MR. SPEAKER: Just now? If fresh material is given, I will examine it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I will give notice today with additional facts.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Sir, this is a statement under Direction 115. I have given a Calling Attention Notice. In the other House, this subject was discussed. I am told.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is going to be a Calling Attention Notice, why should the Minister make a statement at this stage?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अब
काल अटेंशन से काम नहीं चलेगा । मिनिस्टर
साहब के पास जो फेक्ट्स हैं वह रख दें ।
फिर बाद में इस पर चर्चा कराएँ ।

MR. SPEAKER: You want to have Calling Attention, and besides Calling Attention, statement under Direction 115?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No, Sir.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Sir, Mr. Vajpayee has already made a statement. To this, the Minister may give whatever replies he has. After that, if there are certain additional facts, which are in possession of men like Mr. Bosu who want to place them before the House, the best thing would be to give notice under Rule 193 and have a full discussion on that.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bosu, why are you so impatient when I say I am going to see that?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to draw your attention to another matter, in regard to the price of these plots. If you are a genuine cooperative society member, you pay Rs. 50,000. But, outside, it is Rs. 1,25,000.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Sir, before I make the statement, I would like to refer to a suggestion that has been made regarding a discussion on the subject. We are perfectly willing to submit to a discussion and have a regular discussion. But my difficulty in having that discussion, as also in making this statement, is that all the matters that have been raised are being contested, very seriously contested, by one party or other in the court. So, within the ambit of that, I am making the statement and, if that discussion is allowed to be held within that ambit, we are perfectly willing to a discussion.

Sir, in the statement made by me on the 10th April 1974 I had indicated that the matter relating to the new Friends Cooperative House Building Society was pending before the Supreme Court and that most of what had been stated by Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee earlier had been alleged in certain affidavits filed before the Court. As the issues were *subjudice* had made it clear that I had to confine

myself to the factual position. This constraint still continues.

Shri Vajpayee now says that in presenting the facts on the 10th April 1974 had suppressed certain important facts from the House and distorted certain other facts. Sir, I respectfully deny this. I shall make my submissions regarding points mentioned by him in his statement.

Shri Vajpayee says that I stated that 34 out of the 50 new members were neither Government servants nor were they their near relations and accuses me of not having stated who the remaining 16 members were. It should be obvious from the context that the remaining persons could only be either Government servants or their near relatives. There was, therefore, no suppression of facts.

Shri Vajpayee has referred to his earlier statement about certain persons who, according to him, have been benefited by the society through irregular and illegal allotment of the land. He then goes on to accuse me of not having refuted or confirmed his statement. Sir, this is one of the allegations before the court and I do not see how I could have said anything in regard to such allegation when the matter is *sub-judice*.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Whether the name of the Home Secretary is there or not is a question of fact, not an allegation. Let him deny or confirm it.

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: Shri Vajpayee has referred to what I had stated about the waiting list of 102 members. The hon'ble member seems to think that there is a contradiction between what I said and what is stated in the affidavit filed by the Secretary of the DDA, and the Administration's letter of 31st July 1967. Sir, what I stated on the last occasion is factually correct and what I had stated was that the Delhi Administration had submitted to the Supreme Court that there was no such waiting

list having the approval of the Lt. Governor. The reference was merely to the submission made by the Delhi Administration to the Court. The question whether there is any contradiction between the submission made by the Administration before the court and the affidavit and the Administration's letter is, of course, one to be considered by the Court.

Shri Vajpayee has raised the point as to what is meant by the term "approved" list and wants to know the procedure for approving the waiting list. He has also stated that the concept of approval has been raised to suppress the bungling. Sir, a claim has been made in this case before the Supreme Court that there was an approved waiting list maintained by the society in 1966. This has been strongly contested by the other party. The questions raised by Shri Vajpayee are thus before the Court I would, therefore, like to refrain from saying anything in the matter at this stage, except to deny the innuendo.

Shri Vajpayee has asked the question that if it is not the practice of cooperative societies to give public notice for enrolment of new members, how could corruption favouritism and nepotism be checked? Sir, what I stated before the House was the factual position as to the prevalent practice. Whether such practice leads to corruption, etc. is a matter of opinion about which I would not like to enter into any argument.

Shri Vajpayee has made certain statements regarding the action taken by the Lt. Governor with reference to the society's request for permission to admit new members on a holiday. In my previous statement I had referred to the affidavit and counter-affidavit bearing on this issue I do not, therefore, wish to say anything further on this.

The next point raised by Shri Vajpayee is whether the President of the society went from door to door with the membership form to inform the new members. He has also referred

[SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA]

to certain portions of the affidavit filed by the President of the society. Obviously, I cannot answer for the President of the society.

Shri Vajpayee says that I was not correct in saying that the enrolment of members is within the purview of the management of the society. According to him, enrolment of new members can only be made by the general body of the society and not by others. Sir, the factual position is that under the Delhi Cooperative Societies Rules 1973 and bye-laws of the society, the Managing Committee is competent to admit new members.

As stated by Shri Vajpayee, the Managing Committee of the society has been nominated by the Lt Governor. But he goes on to state that three out of the nine members of the Committee were not informed of the meeting at which the Committee decided to enrol new members and that the President of the Managing Committee kept the rivals away. These are also among the allegations in the proceedings before the court and will be considered by the court.

Shri Vajpayee says that I did not throw light on the fact that the Delhi Administration had, in February 1967, imposed restrictions on enrolment of new members by the cooperative societies and that new members could be enrolled only with the prior permission of the Administration. He also wants me to clarify the reason for framing such rules and the basis on which societies are permitted to enrol new members. Sir, this is also a matter which will come up for consideration by the court. As such it will not be appropriate for me to say anything more at this stage.

Shri Vajpayee has also raised the question as to how the letter written by the President of the society reached the Lt. Governor on the same day. He has also raised the question whether it was not the responsibility of the Lt. Governor to see, at the time of according permission for the enrol-

ment of new members, whether the society had complied with the rules and conventions while recommending the names and whether he had scrutinised the list. The hon'ble member has further raised the point as to why the list was not referred to the Delhi Development Authority for investigation. All these points have been specifically raised before the court in the proceedings and the court will go into these and give a finding or decision. It is not appropriate for me to say anything on this.

Shri Vajpayee also wants to know the reason why the society decided to enrol certain members who were not interested in buying the plots. Sir, what I had stated was that of the 60 names recommended by the society, only 50 persons were ultimately enrolled on 28th February 1974. This statement is factually correct. It is not for me to say why certain members declined or did not get plots.

The next question raised by Shri Vajpayee is whether Shri Tamta, Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Delhi was one of those who declined to accept the plots and whether he withdrew his name for fear of criticism. It is true that Shri Tamta's application for membership was accepted but according to available information no plot was offered to him because he had indicated his inability to pay the price of the plot in less than three months.

Shri Vajpayee has stated that I had been silent on the point as to what action Central Government propose to take in regard to this matter. Sir, I would submit that the question of taking action against any person does not arise at this stage when the whole matter is *sub-judice*. My endeavour has been only to present the factual position and not to justify or slur over the conduct of anyone.

Shri Vajpayee's suggestion that the working of all House Building Societies should be reviewed is beyond the scope of the present statement. How-

ever, I shall convey it to the Ministers of Agriculture and Works and Housing for such action as they may consider necessary.

13.20 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (THIRTY-SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

RECOMMENDATION TO RAJYA SABHA TO APPOINT MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): I beg to move:

"That this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do appoint five members of Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee on the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India in the vacancies caused by the retirement of Sarva-Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi, Ajit Prasad Jain, Ram Niwas Mirdha, C. D. Pande and Bindeshwari Prasad Singh from Rajya Sabha and do communicate to this House the names of the members so appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

MR. SPEAKER.: The question is:

"That this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do appoint five members of Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee on the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India in the vacancies caused by the retirement of Sarva-shri Jaisukhlal Hathi, Ajit Prasad Jain, Ram Niwas Mirdha, C. D. Pande and Bindeshwari Prasad Singh from Rajya Sabha and do communicate to this House the names of the members so appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, I have given notice...

MR. SPEAKER: I have nothing before me. Mr. S. M. Banerjee. I

am not permitting any one except Mr. S. M. Banerjee. Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, you cannot force yourself on me like this. I am not allowing you. How can you suddenly get up and raise any matter like this? I have called only Mr. S. M. Banerjee. You cannot coerce the Chair. You cannot force me. I have allowed already one motion. As for the others I will see if they are within the competence of this Parliament to be brought. You suddenly come up and bring something here; I have no time to examine while I am conducting the business of the House. I receive hundreds of such Motions and I must study them.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am very responsible..

MR. SPEAKER: You are n responsible at all. You try to coerce the Chair, which I refuse to accept. I can see whether this particular Motion should be sent to Home Minister or not. I cannot give you an off-hand reply. You cannot force me. You cannot force me to just throw it on to him, without myself first being satisfied about it. I will examine whether it is within the proper jurisdiction of this Parliament or not.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Meanwhile, let the Home Minister collect the information.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot give any ruling I will have to examine. If there is anything for him, I will ask the Home Minister about it. If the Home Minister is not concerned, I will not ask him. I will have to see that. (*Interruptions*).

Please do not interrupt me while I am conducting the proceedings You say something when I am sitting here. I have to conduct the proceedings. At present no matter is before me. I will never get exercised. You also do not get exercised. Everything is being shown as being exercised. You are showing that you are very much exercised. I know it and you know it. You