

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Madam, I have no objection. Let them discuss it among themselves and thereafter, we can discuss it because I do not want to hustle the whole thing. But, at the same time, I am not opposed to having an internal discussion and thereafter, whenever they feel during the course of the day, it can be discussed because I do not want that it should become necessary for the Government to repromulgate the Ordinance. That is the only point because of which I would like to have their co-operation.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): We will cooperate. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Everybody is going to cooperate. Now, Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta. (Interruptions) Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, what is your Division Number? (Interruptions)

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ मौम अफजल (उत्तर प्रदेश): मैडम ... (व्यवधान)

श्री محمد افضل عرف م - افضل :-
ميدم - ... "مداخلت" ...

उपसभापति: अभी मैंने आपका नाम नहीं पुकारा है। आप क्यों बोल रहे हैं ... (व्यवधान)

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ मौम अफजल: मैडम, एक मिनट ... (व्यवधान)

श्री محمد افضل عرف م - افضل :-
ميدم - ایک منٹ ... "مداخلت" ...

उपसभापति: नहीं, जो नाम मैंने बुलाया है पहले, उनको बोलने दीजिए।

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ मौम अफजल: मैडम, मैं उनके बोलने से पहले कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ।

श्री محمد افضل عرف م - افضل :-
ميدم - میں ان کے بولنے سے پہلے کچھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں -

उपसभापति: क्या कहना है ... (व्यवधान)
नहीं, वह कुछ नहीं है। गुरुदास जी, आप बोलिए।
... (व्यवधान)

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ मौम अफजल: मैडम, ... (व्यवधान) आपको यह बात कहना चाहते हैं ... (व्यवधान)

श्री محمد افضل عرف م - افضل :-
ميدم - ... "مداخلت" ... آپ کو
یہ بات کہنا چاہتے ہیں ... "مداخلت"

उपसभापति: नहीं, आप नहीं कह रहे हैं, उनका नाम पहले है। श्री गुरुदास दास गुप्ताजी।

श्री मोहम्मद अफजल उर्फ मौम अफजल: मैडम, मैं आपके माध्यम से यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब वजीरे आजम साहब जवाब दे चुके हैं तो क्लेरी-फिकेशन पूछने का क्या फायदा है? ... (व्यवधान)

श्री محمد افضل عرف م
ميدم - میں آپ کے ہادیسم سے یہ بات
کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب وزیر اعظم صاحب
جواب دے چکے ہیں تو قلمی فیکشنس پوچھنے
کا کیا فائدہ ہے ... "مداخلت" ...

Clarification on the Statement by Minister Gian Prakash Committee Report

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, it is really very interesting to find the hon. Prime Minister in the House, listening to our discussion, may be, for the first time. Such great importance is being given by him to the discussion that is taking place in this House. Otherwise, this House has always been considered not only as a Second Chamber, but also as a second-rate Chamber. I take the presence of the hon. Prime Minister as a sign of departure. The point, Madam, is: Is the Government seriously interested in having a discussion and formulating a national policy and approach with regard to corruption in high places and abuse of power and restoring accountability in the system which is unmistakably disappearing at a rapid pace? If the Government is really interested in having a discussion on the issue, then, Madam, I believe it should have acted in a much different way. There could have been a debate and discussion, and the discussion could have been fruitful, if all the papers and the Report had been made available to us. From the very fact that the papers and the Report have not been made available to us. I am constrained to believe that there is an attempt to hold up, and, Madam, if I may use the word, an attempt to cover up. There is a much

greater danger today in this country than the problem of corruption. It goes without saying that there have been a number of swindles, a number of scandals, a number of cases of massive corruption, a number of cases of unprecedented misuse of power by the people holding important positions in the Government and the Administration. I am constrained to say that this is a Government which lacks in determination, which lacks in direction in dealing with the problem of corruption and the abuse of power. On the other hand, Madam, I believe that we need formulation of a national approach, we need formulation of a national initiative to halt the process of degeneration. Since I am constrained to believe that the Government is not interested in having a free and fair discussion, my first question is: Is the Government honest? Is the Government sincere? If the Government is sincere and honest, why is it that the Minister, who had been named in the Report, as has been referred to, has not resigned on this basis? The very fact that the hon. Minister held responsible by the Report, referred to in the Statement, has not resigned or has not been dismissed is a singular, all powerful proof of lack of sincerity and purpose on the part of those who matter in the country.

SHRI GHUFRAN AZAM (Madhya Pradesh): In your opinion.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Yes, in my opinion.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA (West Bengal): That is the opinion of the country.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, therefore, the point is: Is not the Government without a direction? Is not the Government without a determination? Is the Government without a purpose? Is not the Government moving in a directionless path? Madam, I am constrained to say that this is a Government which is playing hide-and-seek with the Parliament and the Parliamentary system. When the country has lost not less than 700 crores of rupees, when the common people have lost money because of the high price of sugar, when the country has seen the election results in a number of States in which the leading political party has lost elections, is it not the proper and appropriate time for the Government ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI K. M. KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, is he asked to seek clarifications or to make a speech?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Gurudasji, you confine yourself to the subject and raise the matter relating to the country at some other point of time.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, I hope you are the hon. Chairperson to take note of whether I am

speaking appropriately or inappropriately; whether I am violating any norm or not, it is for the hon. Chairperson to decide.

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra): You are violating.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, therefore, I believe that the statement, which has been issued yesterday, is a miserable expression of dishonesty of purpose. ... (Interruptions) ... I formulate the question. Why doesn't the Government place the Report on the Table of the House? Why does the Government hold back the information? Why is it that we have to come across newspaper statements made by a number of retired officials and also by Mr. Antony saying that this issue had been taken up with the Prime Minister's Office? This limitation on our information really puts a limitation on the dimensions of the discussions which is taking place today. Therefore, I wish the limitation be withdrawn, there should be no hold-up and the Government should place before the House all the documents related to the massive fraud which has taken place.

Madam, is it not true that the statement stated that there was no *mala fide* intention? This is the statement made by Bhuvanesh Chaturvedi, the most hon. Minister of State, looking after the work of the Prime Minister's Office. Is his statement honourable? Has he made an honourable statement? Is it consistent with the facts? I am not in power, Madam. Am I in power, Madam? (Interruptions) ... Madam Deputy Chairperson, am I in power to refer to the Report and quote a passage? The Report says that whenever the Government flawed in taking a decision on sugar import, there was a rise in the international price of sugar. The international traders were regularly getting information about the trends in decision making. What else could have been a proof for the colossal loss? (Interruptions) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, please be brief.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: My question is: How has the Government come to the conclusion that there was no *mala fide* intention when the Committee that looked into the problem had made a categorical statement that the decision or deliberation or the nature of the discussion was leaked to the international lobby of sugar barons? Therefore, there was a *mala fide* intention. There was a criminal conspiracy. (Interruptions) ...

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA (Punjab): You ask your question. (Interruptions) ...

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Madam Deputy Chairman, we are not students of Political Science. (Interruptions) ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : When the Government is found to be wanting, ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please put your question.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : ...it is for the hon. Members to come to the aid of the Government because, after all, it is our own Government, the Government of the country as a whole.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, if you confine your self to the question, then, I am sure, you will get an answer. If you make a speech, you may not get an answer. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : I am totally confining myself to the question. My question is: How has Mr. Chaturvedi come to the conclusion that there was... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): He has got three more pages, Madam.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Madam, my question is: How has Mr. Chaturvedi come to the conclusion ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI : Which Chaturvedi? You point out by name.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : My point is: How has Mr. Chaturvedi come to the conclusion that there was no *mala fide* intention? (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Madam, I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*) ... Madam, I am on a point of order, (*Interruptions*) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Just one minute. What is it?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : My point of order is that there cannot be a repetition. He has already said that. You can stop him from repeating the same again and again.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : May be, he is pricking the other Chaturvediji because he was earlier the CAG.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Madam, my point is: How has Mr. Bhuvanesh Chaturvedi, the hon. Minister, made such a miserable statement that there was no *mala fide* intention when it was made clear by the person who made the Report that regularly the proceedings and the nature and trend of the discussion in the CCP were being leaked out? Therefore, I hold this Government responsible for leaking out these things to the barons of international sugar lobby to enable them to earn profit. You have colluded with the domestic sugar lobby. You have colluded with the international, multinational, sugar

lobby. Madam, it has been stated that the Prime Minister's Office did not know of it. I would raise this question: How did you come to the conclusion that the Prime Minister's Office did not know of it? My third question is: How was the Prime Minister's Office not aware of it when the minutes of the CCP were sent to the Prime Minister's Office? All the minutes had been sent to the Prime Minister's Office. The movement of the prices of essential commodities including sugar used to be regularly monitored by the Economic Intelligence Agency and the reports of the Economic Intelligence Agency were regularly sent to the PMO and to the Principal Secretary of the Prime Minister's Secretariat. Lastly it is also true that the Prime Minister's Secretariat has a cell to look after the market conditions of the country. Therefore, putting these three points together, my question to the hon. Minister is: How has he made such a statement that the Prime Minister's Office never knew of it? Madam, four Ministries have been indicated—Food, Agriculture, Commerce and Finance. The entire Government is under a cloud of suspicion. My next question is: Is it true that somebody in the Prime Minister's Secretariat is closely connected with the person who has made the Report? Is it true that somebody in the Prime Minister's Secretariat picked up friendship and has commercial transactions and regular communication with the person who drafted the Report? If it is so, then there has been a deliberate attempt to shield the Prime Minister's Office—I am not speaking of the Prime Minister individually, I am speaking of the Prime Minister's Office. It is because of this connection and because of this common interest that the Prime Minister's Office did not take action and this connection did not get reflected in the Report. Lastly, my question is: If the Government is serious let it take action immediately. Is the Government interested in taking action against the official? If the previous Cabinet Secretary gave wrong information, let us proceed against him. If the Food Secretary has colluded, we can proceed against him. If the Principal Secretary of the Prime Ministers Office has failed to recognise this as a conspiracy, let us take action against him. Is the Government ready? Therefore, it is in terms of these connections of the Government that its *bona fides* will be judged. That is why I take this statement as a dishonest statement, a statement of collusive manipulation and a statement that has totally distorted the facts a statement aimed at shielding the most important people, some of whom are unfortunately allowed around the Prime Minister of the country, Mr. Narasimha Rao.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Chimanbhai Mehta.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैडम मेरा नाम ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I know it has happened. Mathursahab's name was first, but then he said that Mr. Sikander Bakht will speak. I will call him at an appropriate time.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : सिकन्दर बख्त साहब की अलग स्थिति है, उनकी लीडर आफ अपोजीशन के नाते अलग स्थिति है, तो मेरा नाम इतना पीछे मत डालिए ।

उपसभापति : आपको मालूम नहीं है कि मैंने नाम कितना पीछे डाला है तो आप कैसे कह रहे हैं कि इतना पीछे डाल रही हूँ ?

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : दो सदस्य तो बोल चुके हैं ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Next is you, after him. I have to put it in the proper place.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : आप नाम आगे डाले या पीछे, लेकिन कुछ तो न्याय कीजिए ।

उपसभापति : माथुर साहब, मैं आपको बताऊँ कि क्योंकि सिकन्दर बख्त साहब लीडर आफ दि अपोजीशन है, इसलिए मैंने एक्स्ट्रा अलाउ किया है वरना हमारी जो प्रथा है इस हाउस की उसके मुताबिक तो एक पार्टी से सिर्फ एक ही सदस्य बोलता है ।

श्री० विजयकुमार मल्होत्रा (दिल्ली) : यह तो क्लेरिफिकेशन है और इसमें तो जितने नाम दिए गए हैं, सबको बुला दीजिए ।

उपसभापति : नहीं आपको शायद पता नहीं है कि इस हाउस की यह प्रथा है कि क्लेरिफिकेशन के ऊपर एक पार्टी से सिर्फ एक ही सदस्य पूछता है ।

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal) : Madam, what about my name

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Your name is there. I cannot announce the list in advance. It is entirely my prerogative and I have a right to look after the list. If you don't trust me, it is up to you.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat) : Madam, I am not going to make a speech. I want to put specific questions on the sugar scandal and corruption, in general, because it flows from this statement. Parliament has been discussing for days about this sugar scam. The statement is here. May I put a question to the hon. Minister ? If there is nothing *mala fide* and if you are so sure about it, would you hand over the entire investigation to a sitting Supreme Court Judge? One party may allege something against you. Another

party can conclude something else. So, why don't you appoint a Supreme Court Judge to investigate into the matter and get a clear cut verdict on this issue? One scam or the other is happening in our country. Parliament has been discussing this since the last two years and I get myself involved in this discussion against my desire. Why don't you give this authority to Lok Pal? Let them take care of everything. Why do you waste the time of Parliament which has to do so many other things? But we are mainly discussing about scandals. The Prime Minister is here. He is prepared to come under the jurisdiction of Lok Pal. Let him say that the Bill is coming positively in the next Session so that we don't waste time, so that scandals do not become a major issue in elections; let there be some other issues as well : Now it is obvious that the Cabinet Committee on Prices knew about the shortage of sugar in December, that is, six months before the imports took place. It is Mr. Saifullah, the then Cabinet Secretary....

उपसभापति : नाम मत लीजिए ।

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA : I will not mention the name. According to him, ... (Interruptions)

विपक्ष के नेता (श्री सिकन्दर बख्त) : सदर साहिब, यह कुछ ऐहतियात की बात हो वहाँ तक तो ठीक है लेकिन इस तरीके से नाम मेशन करना रूलस के खिलाफ नहीं है ।

شری سڪندر بخت : صدر صاحب
یہ کچھ احتیاط کی بات ہو وہاں تک تو ٹھیک
ہے۔ لیکن اس طریقہ سے نام میشن کرنا
رولس کے خلاف نہیں ہے۔

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is our tradition. Generally, we don't take names. So, why should we unnecessarily change our practice?

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT : But it is nothing against the rules.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am saying that nobody's name should be there.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA : Madam, according to him the PMO was informed about the December meeting of the Cabinet Committee on prices. With all humility, I would like to know whether the Prime Minister was not informed even though the PMO was informed. It is because I don't want anyone to become vulnerable in such matters. I would like

to know whether the Ministers read newspapers at all. Are the newspaper clippings placed before them? When everybody in the country knew about the shortage of sugar, how is it that the PMO was not aware of this shortage? On this question, I am prepared to be gullible. But how can you make the whole country gullible? Therefore, taking in to consideration the fact that the people are not going to believe that the PMO was not aware of this situation, they have to think that newspapers are not being read by the Ministers that newspaper clippings never come to them and that they keep themselves totally out of the picture due to various factors and reasons. Now, a very important question is, why it is that Mr. Kalp Nath Rai himself opposed the import of sugar in December when he was aware that there was shortage and when the entire country was saying that the Minister was in collusion with the sugar lobby. Well, for the sake of propriety, because he opposed the import of sugar when Mr. Antony demanded it, should he not resign? If he does not resign, why should not his resignation be asked for? I don't want to remind you of our tradition, of Jawahar Lal Nehru, Deshmukh, Krishnamachari and other people. When the whole country is on fire and when one Minister was clearly indicted, what is wrong in getting him out of the Council of Ministers and setting an example?

Madam, the PAC had prevented the Food Corporation of India from importing the sugar. But the PAC had not prevented the import of sugar. The FCI may not import. Others may import. But why should Mr. Kalp Nath Rai oppose import of sugar by anybody, for what reason? Was it pertaining to the agriculturists? If it was so, it was the job of Mr. Balram Jakhar. Mr. Rai is the Food Minister. He is not the Agriculture Minister. And would sugar grow within three months? Could it be crushed? Could we meet the shortage of sugar within that time? He says that we can produce more sugar. It was not possible. They knew it. It implies questions of reasonable doubt. I am not saying that he is the final culprit. He can have a chance. He is also demanding an enquiry by a Supreme Court Judge. It is very good that he is also demanding for it. But in the meanwhile, let him come out of his Ministry. This is the minimum that he can do.

Mr. Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi, the Minister has made a mistake in affirming in the statement that there is no *mala fide* in this mess. I have given the facts. But on what basis did he come to the conclusion that there is no *mala fide*, particularly

looking at the circumstances and the December shortage being reported by everybody, the country knowing about it, the international traders knowing about it, the sugar lobby knowing about it and money being minted? It is not correct on the part of Mr. Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi to say that there is no *mala fide*. I know Mr. Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi very well. He is an honourable Minister and I don't want to make any sarcastic remarks against him. But he has wrongly concluded and exonerated his colleagues who are also involved in this issue.

Thank you, Madam.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : महोदय, मैं ज्यादा लम्बा समय नहीं लूंगा, लेकिन पिन पोंट सवाल करना चाहूंगा। जिस समय प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने इस कमेटी की घोषणा की थी उसी समय सदन में विपक्ष के सभी लोगों ने अपना संदेह प्रकट किया था कि रिपोर्ट नहीं आएगी। मैंने स्वयं भी यह सजेस्ट किया था कि अच्छा यही होगा कि ज्ञान प्रकाश जी क्योंकि शुगर मिल मालिकों से संबंधित हैं, वह स्वयं इस जिम्मेदारी को स्वीकार न करें। एक संदेह जो हम लोगों ने किया था कि रिपोर्ट केवल लीपापोती करके प्रधान मंत्री की सरकार और कुछ मंत्रियों को बचाने के लिए की गई है, यह रिपोर्ट उस तथ्य को सिद्ध कर रही है। हमारे संदेह बिल्कुल सत्य थे और सत्य सिद्ध हुए हैं। इसलिए पहले तो प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि आपने जिस समय टर्म्स आफ रिकॉस तय किए उसमें आपने जिम्मेदारी फिक्स करने की बात क्यों नहीं कही? जिम्मेदारी फिक्स न करने की बात को टर्म्स आफ रिकॉस में देकर सीधी बात थी कि आपने क्यों ज्ञान प्रकाश जी को आदेश दिया कि आप जिम्मेदारी फिक्स मत कीजिए केवल एडमिनिस्ट्रिव के बारे में कहकर समाप्त कीजिए। इसलिए यह संदेह कि आपका उद्देश्य ही पहले संदेह-युक्त था, यह बात सिद्ध होती है। मैं स्पष्ट चाहूंगा प्रधान मंत्री जी से कि आपने टर्म्स आफ रिकॉस लिमिटेड क्यों रखे और ऐसा रखने का क्या कारण था?

दूसरे, ऐसा लगता है कि शायद कच्ची-पक्की रिपोर्ट के बाद उसमें परिवर्तन किए गए। नहीं, तो, ज्ञान प्रकाश की रिपोर्ट, कहा गया है कि वह रिपोर्ट 5 अक्टूबर को दे दी थी, मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या रिपोर्ट को किसी भी स्टेज पर प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के कार्यालय से, किसी मंत्री ने, किसी अफसर ने देखा या नहीं देखा? मेरा संदेह है कि यह मिलीभगत है। रिपोर्ट लिखी गई, तैयार की गई और बाद में लीपापोती करके कैसे ठीक किया जाए, प्रधान मंत्री के सरकार के किसी व्यक्ति के साथ सलाह करके उसको उलट-पुलट किया गया, यह मेरा दूसरा संदेह है।

प्रधान मंत्री की सरकार के किसी व्यक्ति के साथ सलाह करके उसको उलट-पुलट किया गया, यह मेरा दूसरा संदेह है। इसके लिए चतुर्वेदी जी, प्रधान मंत्री जी से तो मैं नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन चतुर्वेदी जी हमारे मित्र हैं, कम से कम वे ईमानदारी से सच बताएं। हम जानते हैं कि आप सच बोलते हैं लेकिन झूठ की आड़ लेकर सच बोलते हैं तो सचवाई के साथ बोलिए कि क्या आपने रिपोर्ट या किसी और ने देखी थी या नहीं देखी थी? मेरा अंशज है कि अगर देखी थी तभी आप मुस्कुरा रहे हैं। देखी थी।

दूसरे, यह मेरे सामने रिपोर्ट है। अब क्योंकि मेरे हाथ में है और आपने कहा तो नहीं है सिकन्दर वख्त साहब ... (व्यवधान) ...

उपसमाप्ति : आपके हाथ में तो कुछ भी हो सकता है ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : मैं कह रहा हूँ कि मैंने रिपोर्ट पढ़ी है और उसमें देखा है, उसके आधार पर कह रहा हूँ और जो कुछ हमारे चतुर्वेदी जी ने बयान दिया है जिसको उन्होंने समरी कहा है। कल 168 पर जब डिमकेशन आया तो कहा गया कि समरी रखा जा सकती है लेकिन यह समरी नहीं है, यह तो इनका वक्तव्य है। तो समरी और वक्तव्य को एक मानने को तैयार है तो यह कहना कि यह रिपोर्ट है, मैं कहूँगा गलत होगा, वह कहना आपके लिए गलत होगा। रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि प्रधान मंत्री के कार्यालय को बताया जाता रहा। रिपोर्ट में यह कहा है कि पुराने, फॉर्मर जो कैबिनेट सेक्रेटरी थे श्री जफरुल्ला साहब, उन्होंने यह कहा कि मैं सारी रिपोर्टें प्राइम मिनिस्टर कार्यालय को भेजता रहा। अगे कहते हैं कि मेरी जिम्मेदारी यह नहीं थी कि मैं प्रधान मंत्री को बताऊँ यह जिम्मेदारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर के जो सेक्रेटरी है, उनकी जिम्मेदारी थी लेकिन रिपोर्ट में कहते हैं, "I am sorry to say that I do not accept this point of view". क्या प्रधान मंत्री, उनका कार्यालय इस बात से सहमत है कि यदि जफरुल्ला साहब अपने आप को बरी करना चाहते हैं तो बरी है जब कि ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेटी की रिपोर्ट कहती है कि वे इस बात से सहमत नहीं हैं। यदि कोई और मन्त्री आदमी होता तो मान लेता कि उनको शायद सरकार के काम करने का ढंग मालूम नहीं है लेकिन ज्ञान प्रकाश बड़े ओहदे पर रहे हैं, ऑडिटर जनरल रहे हैं। सरकार कैसे काम करती है, यह उनको पूरा ज्ञान है। इसलिए उन्होंने डाइरेक्टरी एन्टेन्स कर दिया है कि अगर कैबिनेट सेक्रेटरी जफरुल्ला साहब को जानकारी थी तो उनका कर्तव्य था कि प्रधान

मंत्री को बताते। क्यों नहीं बताया? इसकी जानकारी किसको है? अगर आपको, प्रधान मंत्री जी, बताया नहीं तो आपके जफरुल्ला साहब की जिम्मेदारी है या आपके सेक्रेटरी की जिम्मेदारी है। दूसरे, यदि जिम्मेदारी है तो जफरुल्ला जिम्मेदारी के लिए आपने क्या किया है? और यह मुझे स्मरण है, उस समय ... जिसे जिनेश जा रहे थे। उस ... या कि प्रधान मंत्री जाते-जाते कह गए हैं ... इकम दे गए हैं तो इसका मतलब कि आपने ... था। अगर मालूम था तो आपने पहले ... कारी में आया है कि आपने ... में एक मीटिंग की ... तो मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप किसी कमेटी, ... इस संबंध में उपस्थित थे अथवा नहीं थे ... होकर, मेरे साथ अन्याय मत करिए। जितना ज्ञान लोगों को समय दिया है उतना ही मुझे भी चाहिए। ... (व्यवधान) ... तो मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से कहूँगा स्पष्ट करना कि उनको इसकी जानकारी फर दी? कैबिनेट सेक्रेटरी ने दी? दी अथवा नहीं दी? नंबर दो, क्या किसी मीटिंग में उपस्थित थे या नहीं थे? यह मानना कि उन्होंने उस मीटिंग को प्रिसाइड किया था, यह कहाँ तक सच है, कहाँ तक सच नहीं है? यदि सच है कि आप किसी मीटिंग में उपस्थित थे तो प्रधान मंत्री महोदय, आप और आपकी पूरी सरकार इस जिम्मेदारी से बरी नहीं हो सकते। इसलिए मेरा सुझाव है कि मंत्री महोदय अब आप इस पर पूर्ण डालने की कोशिस न करें। एक सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज के द्वारा इसकी जांच करवा ले।

अब इस वक्तव्य पर जानें हैं। वक्तव्य कॉन्ट्राडिक्शन से भरा हुआ है। पहले पार पर आप कहते हैं, "Motives for deliberately delaying decisions have been imputed and it has been said that some beneficiaries of the inflated import prices have made money at the cost of the country. Similarly, releases were manipulated to jack up prices and allow extra profits to mill owners".

यह आपका वक्तव्य है।—

"Similarly, releases were manipulated to jack up prices and allow extra profit to mill owners."

यह आपका वक्तव्य है और आखिर में कहते हैं कि कोई मिलाफाइड नहीं है। क्या मतलब है? अगर रिपोर्ट में कहा ... है और कॉन्फिडेंसली ज्ञान ... कहा गया है तो आभिरकार आप इस ... पढ़ते हैं कि किसी ने घपला नहीं किया है। इसी प्रकार से

The report has also identified administrative lapses.

समझ में आता है।

After all the exercises have been completed suitable action will be taken.

वह आपने एक्शन लिया है, वह सिर्फ इतना ही है कि क्या-क्या एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की जिम्मेदारियां थीं, कमियां थीं। मानता हूँ, कमियां दूर कर लीजिए। लेकिन जब आपने स्वीकार किया है कि मोटिव थे और जैसे यहां पर चेंटर है, कॉन्फिडेंशियलिटी का, वह कॉन्फिडेंशियलिटी जब भंग हुई है तो वह किसकी जिम्मेदारी है। जिम्मेदारी किसी न किसी की तो है, किसी न किसी ने तो लीक किया है।

मैंने तो अखबार में पढ़ा है, मैं नहीं जानता कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने दूसरे सदन में क्या जवाब दिया, लेकिन छपा यह है कि वह आकर कुछ करेंगे। क्या करेंगे? यदि आशवासन दे कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज के द्वारा इन्क्वायरी होगी और सारी कॅबिनेट में जिस-जिस पर संदेह हो सकता है, उनकी जांच की जाएगी, मैं स्वीकार कर लूंगा लेकिन यदि ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेटी की रिपोर्ट जैसे पूर्व नियोजित ढंग से लीप-पोतो करके सारे देश की आंखों में धूल झोकने के लिए रखी गयी है, वैसे करेंगे तो देश स्वीकार नहीं करेगा। इसलिए मैं बहुत ही विनम्रतापूर्वक प्रधान मंत्री की सेवा में निर्दिष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि आपके ऊपर भी संदेह है, श्रीमन्। आज संदेह लोगों के मन में है। लिहाजा अच्छा होता कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जापान के प्रधान मंत्री की तरह घेरे में न फंसे। मैं चाहूंगा कि आप सुप्रीम कोर्ट के किसी जज से इन्क्वायरी करवा लीजिए, उसके बाद हम आपकी बात को मानने को तैयार हैं।

उपसमापति : श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय ...

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : लेकिन खेद यह है कि जिन लोगों के ऊपर केस बना है, एन्टी को आपने हटा दिया, बाकी को बनाए रखें। तो मेरा संदेह है कि आप लीप-पोतो न करें और हम लोगों की मांग को स्वीकार कर लीजिए कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज के द्वारा इन्क्वायरी करवा कर...इस्तीफा तो छोटा-मोटा...कह दिया, कल्पनाय राय बेचारा मर जाएगा। मर जाए, मुझे कुछ लेना-देना नहीं है लेकिन बड़े-बड़े और जो बैठे हैं, उनके ऊपर भी कार्यवाही कीजिए। एक छोटी-सी किसी हस्ती को मार करके आप कह दें कि मुजरिम नहीं है। इनसे क्या होता है?

The entire Cabinet is in doubt.

श्री सत्यप्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसमापति जी, 17 जुलाई 1994 को प्रधान मंत्री के प्रिंसीपल सेक्रेटरी की ओर से एक विज्ञापित प्रका-

शित हुई थी जिसके अन्तर्गत श्री ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेटी की नियुक्ति हुई थी। उसमें कहा गया था कि एक माह के अंदर प्रधान मंत्री के पास रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत की जाएगी और यह रिपोर्ट 5 अक्टूबर, 1994 को प्रस्तुत की गई।

5 अक्टूबर से लेकर आज तारीख हो गयी, 20 दिसम्बर, ढाई-पोने तीन महीने हो गये, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस रिपोर्ट को पाने के बाद क्या कार्यवाही की? मैंने आज समाचार पत्रों में पढ़ा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कल कहीं कहा है कि उनको एक सप्ताह का समय दिया जाए और उसके बाद, दोनों सदनों के सदस्यों की राय सुनने के बाद वह कार्यवाही करने पर विचार करेंगे। मेरे इस प्रश्न का उत्तर प्रधान मंत्री जी दे सकते हैं कि इन ढाई-पोने तीन महीनों में प्रधान मंत्री जी क्या करते रहे क्योंकि जैसा कि ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि कैबिनेट कमेटी ओन प्राइसिस, खाद्य मंत्री, नागरिक आपूर्ति मंत्री और तत्कालीन कैबिनेट सेक्रेटरी, इन लोगों ने मिलकर प्रधान मंत्री जी के नोटिस में या मंत्रिमंडल के नोटिस में चीनी की कमी के संबंध में उनका ध्यान नहीं आकर्षित किया। मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा, विशेषकर प्रधान मंत्री जी से कि ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेटी के जो उद्घरण हैं, वह सही हैं कि गलत हैं क्योंकि ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेटी ने संघे-संघे यह कहा है कि सिवाय मंत्रिमंडल और प्रधान मंत्री को छोड़ करके बाकी सब लोग इस संबंध में कहीं न कहीं जिम्मेदार हैं, उनका उत्तरदायित्व है। तीसरे, जो खाद्य मंत्री और खाद्य सचिव, उनकी आपस में मत-भिन्नता थी और इसके लिए चीनी के आयात के मामले में इन दोनों में विरोध-भास भी था। और नवम्बर 1993 से लेकर अप्रैल 1994 तक यानी करीब-करीब 6 महीनों तक यह विवाद चलता रहा कि चीनी का आयात किया जाय या न किया जाय। इस बीच में देश की जो साधारण जनता है, जिसको खुले बाजार में चीनी खरीदनी पड़ी, करीब-करीब 19.50 रुपये-20 रुपये किलो तक उसको चीनी खरीदनी पड़ी और रिपोर्ट में भी कहा गया है कि इसके फलस्वरूप, कीमतों में अतिरिक्त वृद्धि से केवल मिल-मालिकों को ही फायदा हुआ। मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ—रिपोर्ट में यह उदरण है, श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी जी ने खुद अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि चीनी में अतिरिक्त वृद्धि से केवल मिल-मालिकों को फायदा हुआ मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इससे किन-किन मिल-मालिकों को फायदा हुआ और जितना इन मिल-मालिकों को फायदा हुआ वह धनराशि क्या है? कहीं आता है कि 4 हजार करोड़ तो कहीं आता है, 3 हजार करोड़ और कहीं आता है, 5 हजार करोड़ है। इस मामले में सफाई होना चाहिए कि जिन जिन मिल-मालिकों को इससे फायदा हुआ है उनको कितना फायदा हुआ, पूरी धनराशि क्या है?

सीसरा, रिपोर्ट में इस बात का उल्लेख किया गया है कि चीनी को आयात करने के निर्णय में हुए विलम्ब की वजह से जो कीमतों में वृद्धि हुई उसका एक कारण गोपनीयता का अभाव था। तो यह जो गोपनीयता के अभाव के कारण, कॉन्फिडेंशियलिटी के अभाव के कारण, सीनेसी के अभाव के कारण हुआ है यह गोपनीयता किस प्रकार से भंग हुई, इसका क्या कारण था ? इसके संबंध में प्रधान मंत्री जी स्पष्ट करें।

चौथा, प्रश्न यह है कि इस संबंध में सारा मंत्रिमंडल और विशेष रूप से प्रधानमंत्री का कार्यालय, जो प्रधानमंत्री के नेतृत्व में, प्रधानमंत्रियों जी की दिशा-निर्देश में कार्य करता है, वह संदिग्ध हो गया है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रधानमंत्री जी, अंतरात्मा की बात अपनी जगह पर अलग है, लेकिन मेरी मांग है कि सारे मामले की सफाई तभी होगी जब कमीशन आफ इन्क्वायरी एक्ट 1952, जांच आयोग अधिनियम 1952 जो है, उसके अन्तर्गत सुप्रीम कोर्ट के किसी जज से सारे मामले की जांच कराई जाय। मेरी मांग है कि इसकी घोषणा आज ही प्रधान मंत्री जी को करनी चाहिए। यह मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि जब ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेटी नियुक्त हुई थी तो उस वक्त सदन में भी और बाहर भी अलग-अलग स्थानों से इस पर आपत्ति की गयी थी और उस समय भी यह मांग की गयी थी कि कमीशन आफ इन्क्वायरी एक्ट के अन्तर्गत इसकी न्यायिक जांच होनी चाहिए। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि न्यायिक जांच बिठाने में प्रधानमंत्री जी को क्या आपत्ति है। शक की सुई, ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेटी रिपोर्ट में भी प्रधानमंत्री कार्यालय पर गयी है जो कि प्रधानमंत्री के दिशा-निर्देशन में कार्य करता है। इस कार्यालय पर शक की सुई घूमी है। मैं यह जानना चाहूँगा की आखिर यह किस की जिम्मेदारी है जो ढाई महीनों तक वहां पत्रावलि पढ़ी रहो ? एक मंत्री है, रामेश्वर ठाकुर, उनके बारे में भी है कि उन्होंने 17 दिनों तक, 20 दिनों तक फाइल पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं किए। आखिर ढाई महीनों तक प्रधानमंत्री जी को अंधकार में क्यों रखा गया ? ढाई महीनों तक यह बात प्रधानमंत्री के नोटिस में, जानकारी में क्यों नहीं लायी गयी ? आखिर लोगों को जो भुगतना पड़ा है इसकी जिम्मेदारी प्रधानमंत्री जी किस के ऊपर डालने जा रहे हैं ? इसके पीछे कोई औचित्य नहीं है जो प्रधानमंत्री जी को ढाई महीनों तक अंधकार में रखा गया। इसलिए मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी से चाहता हूँ कि इसका वे उत्तर दे। भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी जी अगर इसका उत्तर देंगे तो मैं उससे संतुष्ट नहीं हूँगा। 17 जुलाई की विज्ञापित में साफ लिखा हुआ है कि इसकी रिपोर्ट प्रधानमंत्री आफिस में नहीं दी जाएगी, प्रधानमंत्री के आफिस में किसी मंत्री को नहीं दी जाएगी

बल्कि सीधे प्रधानमंत्री को दी जाएगी। इसलिए मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी से ही इस संबंध में उत्तर चाहता हूँ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Dr. Biplab Dasgupta.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Madam, let me frankly admit at the outset that I am very much confused. I was one of the first to rush to the Library when I heard that the report had been placed in the Library. I have gone through it. I have taken notes and I have it on my computer. When I see the statement given by Mr. Chaturvedi or even the comments by the Prime Minister which have come out in the Press, I see nothing common between the two. I was wondering whether the Government has one report for the Library and another, on the basis of which the statement has been given. There are no similarities between the two. For instance, when I read the report last night, I found it clearly and precisely points the needle of suspicion towards the Food Minister Mr. Kalp Nath Rai. I am coming to it later. But, even by assuming for the sake of argument that the Minister is not corrupt is right, there is no *mala fide* about it. I find no justification for allowing this Minister to continue in this position until now, two and a half months after the report was submitted. For instance, the Report implies that this scam involves six thousand crores of rupees. It gives a calculation that one rupee increase in the market price means 70 crores of rupees per month for the sugar industry. It means if we make the calculations for one year, it comes to Rs. 750 crores. If we take into account the price rise from October—November to May, when it was around Rs. 20, even if you put that increase at Rs. 8, this amounts to exactly Rs. 6,000 crores. This amount of money, this Minister has allowed the sugar industry to loot. The Report also says very categorically that the Minister is entirely responsible for the sugar crisis. He is entirely responsible and nobody else. It exonerates the Food Secretary. The Food Secretary was blamed by the Minister on the floor of the House saying, 'He is responsible for every thing', 'has been motivated'.

All the foul mouthed things were said here. But now the Report says that the Food Secretary had nothing to do with it and put the entire responsibility fairly and squarely on the Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is ... (Interruptions).

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : After this kind of allegation, which has come against the Minister, how can the Minister continue in office ? Now the suspicion is certainly against him because the Report says that the Minister missed no opportunity to frustrate any idea of importing sugar. Why ? It says on page 91 ... (Interruptions) ...

even after a note was given to him, he took 18 days ... (Interruptions) ... Madam, why? The Report also says that the Minister constantly wanted high prices for sugar industry. He thought the prices were low. He was quite happy to raise the price to Rs. 20. Now the question is: Why did he want the high price for sugar when it was at the cost of the Indian consumers to the extent of Rs. 6,000 crores, the amount which has been mentioned? The Report also says that the Minister repeatedly wanted to curtail the allocation of sugar to the public distribution system and again and again in his various notes and various statements, he stated that we should curtail the consumption of sugar. He wanted to curtail whatever little sugar was available for an average Indian consumer. And quite forcefully he insisted on that. The Report says had it been accepted the prices would have gone upto Rs. 20 and it would have been a disaster to the Indian consumers. The Report also says—this has not been mentioned by anybody else — on page 95, paragraph 6.4, that the Minister had shown favour to one or two sugar mills. (Interruptions).

The Minister showed favour to one or two sugar mills.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not there now.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Please, consult your Report. The Minister showed favour ... (Interruptions) ... The Report specifically says that he showed favour to one or two mills in releasing sugar. It is mentioned in this Report. Why did he show favour? In order to justify his case, he also gave concocted figures of sugar production. He gave figures that were different from those given by the various State Governments and different departments. He cooked his own figures to justify his own position of not having imports. Can any normal person, with minimum administrative knowledge do this? So, the major suspicion is directed towards this Minister. If that is the case, why the Prime Minister has waited for such a long time, it defies my understanding. It also put the entire Ministry under a spell of doubt. I find it very unusual that the Prime Minister is not asking the Minister to submit his resignation letter which is the parliamentary practice all over the world. The Prime Minister is going in a round about way to secure his resignation. Why is he not asking some of his Ministers to resign? The Prime Minister.... (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : Madam, this should be expunged.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : When the Prime Minister is in the House, the Cong-

ress Members are very vocal ... (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What did he say?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Madam, I am repeating what I said. What I said is this: Rather than asking the Minister to resign directly which is the prerogative of the Prime Minister—he should have done it directly—rather than doing it that way, he is going in a round about way.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Just a minute.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : He is going in a round about way of collecting the resignation letters from different Ministers and then putting pressure on Kalpnath Rai to resign. Why should he do that? (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Dasgupta, just a minute. You confine yourself to the subject matter.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : I am confining myself entirely to the subject matter.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Just a minute. What the Prime Minister is doing, what he is not doing regarding his Cabinet, that is his prerogative. You have no business to talk about it. You don't mention that.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : I find it very odd, Madam. ... (Interruption) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You don't mention it.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : ... the Prime Minister is not doing what is normal. He is going in a round about way.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Kerala) : We are also concerned.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please. I am not allowing. You cannot substantiate.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Madam, I can substantiate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bip-lab Dasgupta, anything which you say, you should be able to substantiate it. You do not know these things. You are just referring to the newspaper reports. If you can substantiate it, all right.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : It has amply come out in the newspapers. Then, Madam, the Prime Minister also has to take the responsibility of a few other things. For example, the Report categorically says that the Ministers in his Government are irresponsible. They do not want to take the responsibility, according to page 84, para 5.4 of the Report. The

Ministers do not want to take the responsibility. They pass on the buck. And it particularly mentions several Ministries—Finance, Commerce, Food, Civil Supplies, and Agriculture. The question is: Why do they pass on the buck? Is he heading a Government where no Minister is responsible, no one takes an overall view for the betterment of the country? This is the question which I also raise with the Prime Minister.

Lastly, Madam, this Report tries to say that the Prime Minister had no knowledge, neither the Minister of Food, nor the Minister of Supplies, nor the Cabinet Secretary, nor the Secretary to the Prime Minister brought it to his knowledge. It also says, as somebody has already mentioned, it seems that those who are working in the Prime Minister's Office do not read newspapers. They do not even watch television. But, as far as Mr. Antony is concerned, he has categorically stated that at least twice he did go to the Prime Minister, he did tell him, "Sir, this is the problem. Please do something about it." Madam, there is a report in the 'Statesman' today....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Put the newspaper down. Don't read it.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: All right, Madam. This report very categorically says. ... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is quoting, it is all right.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: The Prime Minister has to contradict me whether Mr. Antony has not sought his intervention, and had also raised the question of PDS with him twice during this period. and Mr. Antony, in his replies to the queries to the Gian Prakash Committee, has given this reply which could be found from the Report itself. The Minister has given the reply that he did bring this matter to the knowledge of the Prime Minister. So, the Prime Minister cannot say now that he had no knowledge of the matter. Even if we assume that he does not read newspapers, even if we assume that his ministerial staff is so incompetent, so inefficient and so ignorant that they did not bring this important matter to the notice of the Prime Minister, even if we assume this, after this personal intervention and correspondence by the Minister concerned which is given in the Gian Prakash Committee Report itself in the form of replies by the Minister, a photograph of which has been published in the 'Statesman', Madam, I demand from the Prime Minister a categorical answer to this question whether it is right or not that the Prime Minister was informed but he did not take any cognisance of the issue until we raised this matter in the House. Lastly, I would like to say this. We have

had enough of these scams in the past. Why should there be so much of hush-hush in respect of this report? Why should they cover up? This is what we find when we look at the way it has been handled, sitting on the report for two-and-a-half months, not taking any decision and bringing the matter to its logical end, i.e. sacking the Minister involved in this corruption. Instead of doing this, the whole thing was prolonged and instead of placing the report on the Table of the House, only certain number of copies of the report was kept in the Library and the matter was not brought to the knowledge of the public in general. I think it is a shameful and dishonourable thing. This Government should have to answer all the questions raised on this matter. At the end of it, if they are not able to satisfy us, this Government must go.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (हरियाणा): महोदया, मुझे एक प्रिविलेज का प्रश्न उठता है, इसमें आप मुझे इजाजत देंगी?

उपसभापति: कौनसा प्रिविलेज?

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: महोदया, प्रिविलेज का प्रश्न यह है कि ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेट्री की रिपोर्ट से संबंधित दो दस्तावेज सरकार ने अलग-अलग समय पर संसद के सामने रखे हैं। एक तो वह स्टेटमेंट जो कल उन्होंने 19 तारीख को श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी जी ने राज्य सभा में रखा और एक भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी जी ने ही लोक सभा में एक अतिरिक्त प्रश्न के उत्तर में लिखित वक्तव्य दिया। वह दोनों दस्तावेज आज इस समय मेरे हाथ में हैं। ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Madam, I would like to know whether a notice of privilege had been given to the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sushmaji, have you given notice? (Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Without giving notice, a motion of privilege cannot be raised in the House, Madam, ... (Interruptions)

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Without giving prior notice, she cannot raise a matter of privilege. (Interruptions)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: अभी-अभी यह बीच में से उठा है, इसलिए मैं फौरन आपसे परमिशन मांग रही हूँ। ... (व्यवधान) महोदया, प्रिविलेज का प्रश्न उठाने की परमिशन मांगी जा सकती है। अगर आज यह बहस खत्म हो गई, महोदया, तो उस प्रिविलेज के कोई मायने नहीं रह जायेंगे। इसलिए वह जरूरी नहीं है कि हर चीज लिखित में की जाए, मौखिक अनुमति भी मांगी जा सकती

है । (व्यवधान) जब मैं आपको कंटैक्ट बताऊँगी तो आप स्वयं मानेंगे कि हाँ यह प्रिविलेज का मामला है । (व्यवधान)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : Madam, the House can take notice of a privilege motion at any point of time, *suo motu*. (Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala) : No. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : Prior notice should be given. (Interruptions)... All of a sudden, it cannot be raised, Mr. Jaipal Reddy. (Interruptions)

SHR VAYALAR RAVI : She cannot do like this. The rules are very clear in this. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : Without giving prior notice to the Chair, it cannot be raised here. (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGDISH DESAI : Madam, how can it be done?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : We cannot allow this. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will deal with this.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : Madam, how can you allow her to speak?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will deal with it. I know the rules. I will deal with it. (Interruptions)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : महोदया, इसमें नियम, उप नियम देखने की जरूरत ही नहीं है। आप सर्वोपरि सर्वशक्तिमान हैं। महोदया इस मामले में आप सर्वशक्तिमान हैं, जब पीठासीन होती हैं, आपको कोई नियम देखने की जरूरत नहीं है। जब मैं आपको कंटैक्ट बताऊँगी, तब आपको पता लगेगा (व्यवधान) महोदया, यह दो दस्तावेज मेरे हाथ में हैं और इन दोनों दस्तावेजों के बीच मैं इनकी भारी असंगति है, इतनी डिसक्रिपेंसी है कि मंत्री महोदय के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज का मामला बनता है। मैं आपको पढ़ कर बताना चाहती हूँ (व्यवधान) महोदया, जब मैं आपको पढ़ कर बताऊँगी तभी आप डील कर सकेंगी । (व्यवधान) ... मैं आपको बताती हूँ । ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : सुषमा जी, आप लिखित में तो चेन्नई साहब को प्रिविलेज दीजिए ।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : तब यह बेयानी हो जाएगा । आज अगर बहस खत्म हो गई तो इसके कोई बाधने नहीं रहेंगे । इसलिए मैं शौखिन रूप

से आपकी अनुमति माँग रही हूँ । (व्यवधान) महोदया, इस दस्तावेज में सरकार ने कहा है (व्यवधान)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : Madam, on a point of order. The time of the House cannot be wasted like this. (Interruptions) She should have gone to the Chairman in the morning and given notice. (Interruptions). She cannot the House to ransom. We cannot allow this. (Interruptions).

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : मैडम, आप सुनकर रुलिंग दे दीजिए । अगर मामला नहीं जचता तो सुनकर रुलिंग दे दीजिए । आप सुन लीजिए । (व्यवधान)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : Madam, the procedure laid down must be followed. Offhand, she cannot get up and raise a matter of privilege. (Interruptions). There is a procedure in the rules (Interruptions). The hon. Member should follow the procedure. (Interruptions).

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : मैडम, अगर आप को सुनने के बाद यह लगे कि मामला नहीं चलता तो मैं आपकी रुलिंग माँग करके बैठ जाऊँगी, लेकिन आप मेरी बात सुन तो लीजिए । (व्यवधान)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : Madam, you should quote the rule in regard to privilege motions. Notice has to be given to the Chair in advance. (Interruptions). She is going on speaking. (Interruptions) ... Nobody is stopping her from raising it provided she had given prior notice. (Interruptions)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : इतनी भारी असंगति दोनों दस्तावेजों में है (व्यवधान) हमें गुमराह करके चले गए (व्यवधान) गंदन को गुमराह करके चले जाते (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी : (पश्चिमी बंगाल) मंत्री महोदय द्वारा एक सदन में एक बात कहना और दूसरे सदन में दूसरी बात कहना (व्यवधान) कंट्राडिक्टरी है । (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : महोदया, आप मेरी बात सुनकर जो रुलिंग देंगी उस रुलिंग को मैं शिरोधार्य करूँगी पहले आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिए । (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : सुषमा जी, पहले मेरी बात सुनिए, अगर आपको लगता है (व्यवधान) इससे पहले भी हाउस में प्रिविलेज के मामले उठे हैं, मगर उसका

कुछ प्रोसीजर है। अगर आप को लगता है कि जो स्टेटमेंट हाउस में आया है उसमें और जो प्रश्न का उत्तर दिया है उन दोनों में कोई अंतर है.....
(व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : बहुत ज्यादा अंतर है।

उपसभापति : और आप समझती है कि वह अंतर है तो आप प्रिविलेज का नोटिस दे دیجिए।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : तो मैं दे रही हूँ, मौखिक रूप से नोटिस दे रही हूँ। यह कहीं नहीं लिखा है कि लिखित नोटिस ही दिया जाएगा.....
(व्यवधान)...

श्री जगेश देसाई : आप हाउस में नोटिस नहीं देख सकती हैं.... (व्यवधान)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what I am saying. What are you talking? I don't understand. It is the same thing which I am saying. There is no need for it to come from the benches also. I am saying exactly what Mr. Jagesh Desai is saying. But let me handle it. Or, I can go to my chamber and Mr. Jagesh Desai can take the seat and handle it: I have no problem about it. I am trying to say to her, for your knowledge also, that if she feels and if there is a privilege and if there is a discrepancy in the answers, in her opinion, she is in her right to move a privilege motion. But she has to give it in writing to the Chairman. I will take instructions from the Chairman and I will report to the House. But why don't you people understand that I am doing it? The question is put to the Chair and not to the Member. But, unfortunately, every time three, four members get up and say something, and my voice is not heard. I have to deal with it. So let me deal with it in a proper order, please.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : भंडम, मैं मौखिक नोटिस दे रही हूँ। आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिए।
(व्यवधान)....

उपसभापति : आप लिखित नोटिस दीजिए, उसके बाद चेयरमैन साहब जो कहेंगे, वह करेंगे।

श्री सिकंदर बख्त : सदर साहिबा, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ बहुत कुछ वह हो रहा है जोकि नहीं होना चाहिए था। यहाँ रिपोर्ट नहीं रखी जाती, सायबेरी में रखी जाती है। इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ कि आखिर सुन लीजिए। सुनने में क्यों स्कावट डाल रहे हैं? कहाँ तक आप अपने गुनाहों पर पर्व डालते रहना चाहते हैं? हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि आप लिखकर नोटिस दे देंगी, आप इनकी बात सुन लें।

नित्यादिकेश "श्री सिकंदर बख्त" :-

सदर صاحب - मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ

बहुत कुछ वह हो रहा है जोकि नहीं होना चाहिए

तथा - यहाँ रीपोर्ट नहीं रखी जाती। लाबरी

में रखी जाती है - इस लिये मैं कह रहा हूँ

कि अफेयर्स बिजनेस - सुनने में क्यों स्कावट

डाल रहे हैं - कहाँ तक आप अपने गुनाहों

पर पर्दे डालते रहना चाहते हैं - हम यह

कहना चाहते हैं कि आप लूक कर नोर्स रीड

की - आप इनकी बात सुन लें -

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : भंडम, यह जो स्टेटमेंट कल दिया गया है, इस स्टेटमेंट में सरकार ने कहा है कि

"That this report identifies the requirements of the situation that arose, administrative lapses in handling the situation, and he recommends some steps that should be taken to handle similar situations if they arise in future."

यानी कल का स्टेटमेंट यह कहता है कि ज्ञान प्रकाश कमेटी ने इस सजेक्ट से डील करते समय एक तो उन कारणों की समीक्षा की है, जिन कारणों के कारण यह चीनी संकट पैदा हुआ। दूसरे उन कमियों की तरफ ध्यान दिलाया है जोकि स्थिति को संभालने में दिखायी दीं और उसके बाद समिति ने कुछ सिफारिशों की है। इन तीनों बातों का जिक्र जो लिखित उत्तर है वह तो करता है, लेकिन यह स्टेटमेंट केवल कारणों व सिफारिशों का जिक्र करता है और वह प्रशासनिक कमियों वाला पूरा-का-पूरा पैराग्राफ नदारद है इसमें से। वह पूरा पैराग्राफ नदारद है, जहाँ यह कहा गया है कि कैबिनेट सेक्रेटरी, फूड मिनिस्टर, सिविल सप्लायज मिनिस्टर....
(व्यवधान).... ने प्रधान मंत्री को अंधेरे में रखा वह पूरा पैराग्राफ नदारद है। ... (व्यवधान)...

SYED SIBTEY RAZI (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I stand on a point of order on a matter of procedure ... (Interruptions)... If you have permitted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have not permitted.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : वह इसमें से क्यों नकार दे है ? मेरा आरोप है कि चूंकि प्राइम मिनिस्टर इस स्टेटमेंट के बाद यह निष्कर्ष निकालना चाहते थे कि किसी ने ... (व्यवधान) ...

उपसभापति : प्लीज बैठिए, बैठिए । आप बैठिए ।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : किसी ने बदनियती नहीं की । इसलिए यह पूरा पैराग्राफ नकार दे है । वह पूरा पैराग्राफ इसमें से निकाल दिया गया है । ... (व्यवधान) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I can't permit it now. Please sit down.

चैयरमेन साहब के सामने पेश करिएगा । प्लीज बैठिए, बैठ जाइए ।

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJARAL (Bihar): Madam, I am on a point of order.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : निकाल दिया गया है क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री जी नहीं चाहते थे । अगर वह पैराग्राफ आता तो बदनियती साबित हो जाती । क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री को अंधेरे में रखने के पीछे किसी की नियत 'सद्' नहीं हो सकती, वह नियत 'बद' ही होगी ।

उपसभापति : बैठिए, बैठिए न ।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : चूंकि यह निष्कर्ष निकालना चाहते थे कि बदनियती किसी ने नहीं की ... (व्यवधान) ... किसी ने नहीं की, इसलिए वह पैराग्राफ निकाल दिया गया है । ... (व्यवधान) ... इसलिए यह प्रिविलेज नोटिस दिया है आपको । ... (व्यवधान) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It should be in proper order.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL : On a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to find out about the lunch hour.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL : I am on a point of order. Give me half a minute, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will give you two minutes, but please wait for one minute. I should seek the permission of the House whether we are having the lunch hour or we are dispensing with it. So we have to discuss that first before I allow anybody to speak.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL : Give me half a minute by the watch.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the House so agrees, we can dispense with the lunch hour.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL : Madam, let me raise a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will permit you, Gujral Saheb, but let me finish one business.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL : I am on a point of order, Madam. It is important. My point of order is very simple, and it is that the hon. Member here has quoted some para, and it is our privilege and requirement that you let us know whether what she has told us, that there is the para, is true or wrong.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not know.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL : If it is wrong, the Government must tell us ... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : When the reply comes, if they don't tell us, then you can raise it. If that is the point of order, when the reply is given by the Government ... (Interruptions)

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL : I allege that he is misleading the House. Let him say that he is not.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam, my point is simple. Here the procedure we follow is of clarification. The clarification is going on. If there is any error in the answer, they can seek clarifications. Under the Rules of Procedure, a privilege motion can be moved only under Rule 187. No Member has any privilege either on that side or on this side to say that he is on a privilege motion.

Madam, the point raised by Mr. Gujral is very simple. If there is a doubt, a clarification can be sought, and it can be answered, but not in the middle. It cannot be expected ... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have told ... (Interruptions) Please. I have told, I have told ... (Interruptions) Please let me first find it out.

No ... (Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI : No privilege, no. You cannot raise it. ... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am not allowing anything, please.

SHRI MOHAMMED AFZAL alias MEEM AFZAL (Uttar Pradesh)*

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ :*

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR :*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am not allowing you. Please sit down ... (Interruptions) ...

No, no, I am not permitting any-

thing. ... (Interruptions).

My mike is not working. My mike is not working.

... (Interruptions)

No, I am not. I am not giving you permission. I am not giving you permission ... (Interruptions)

I am not giving you permission ... (Interruptions)...

Listen. Order, please.

Sushmaji, one minute, I am not permitting you to lay anything on the Table of the House. If it is already a part of the record, it's a part of the record. You say so. I do not know it. I will not give you permission now.

*Not recorded.

You have raised an issue of privilege. You can move it to the Chairman. Let the Chairman take a decision. I will inform the House about it.

But, first I have to ask the House whether we are dispensing with the lunch hour.

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

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How are we going to finish it? They have to go to the Lok Sabha also for a discussion. ... (Interruptions)

No. You can go and have lunch. Let others speak. ... (Interruptions)

Mr. Venkataraman, please be brief.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATARAMAN (Kerala): I request that it may be had after lunch. I am asking for it. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI MD. SALIM: They will do wrong things, and should we suffer? ... (Interruptions)

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATARAMAN: Madam, after lunch.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am taking the sense of the House, please. I am trying to find out the sense of the House. Those people who have to answer have to be here. There is the same discussion in the other House also. At three o'clock we will be having it here. Since in the past also we have dispensed with the lunch hour, there is no need to be so agitated about it. Those who want to go and have lunch, are most welcome to do so and come back, but let those who want to work, including me, work here.

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): Madam, we want to listen to all the points ... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please listen to Mr. Venkataraman. Mr. Salim, what is the problem?

SHRI MD. SALIM: Madam, we are hungry.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Go and have your lunch and come back.

SHRI MD. SALIM: But why should we suffer?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Never mind.

SHRI MD. SALIM: For the wrongs done by them why should others suffer? (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you think the matter is so important postpone your lunch. (Interruptions)

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATARAMAN: Madam, sugar should not be bitter. It is already bitter.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Why not discuss it after the lunch hour?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, we are discussing it now and finishing with it.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATARAMAN: Madam Deputy Chairman, my apprehension is that under the pretext of skipping the lunch hour, I should not be hustled. That is my humble request.

The intention of the Government in placing the Report in the Library is that most of the Members will not go there and read it. (Interruptions) So, having gone through that, they are fully aware of the fact that all the ins and outs will be known to them. That is why the pathetic cry of the Minister is there under paragraph 7. I invite your attention to this. "As hon. Members have become aware of the contents of the Report and it might not be necessary for me to detain them here." He says: "You are well aware of the scam, you are well aware of the pointing out of the persons who are concerned." Therefore it is the 'clothed plea' 'do not wash the dirty linen here'. That is what I could presume. That is what I could read out.

Much has been said by the Minister in his statement. I invite your attention to that in paragraph. ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venkataraman if you put the questions, you may finish early.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATARAMAN: That is why I said I should not be hustled. Members have spoken for 12 to 15 minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two wrongs can never make one right. So, you please be brief.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Madam, it has been stated that though the report has pointed out, it has not pinpointed the persons who are responsible for this scam or muddle. I am sorry to say I have a doubt as to whether the Minister has gone through the report at all. Either of these two must be true. Either he has not read the report or he wants to shield the people who are there by putting this comment and also very ineffective statement before the House.

Madam, their intention in not placing the report here is that any reference to the pages will also be doubted. Yesterday, you asked some questions: "How do I know it is there in the report?" But anyway you have to believe the Member's statement. If the Chair has any doubt, it can be verified by sending for the copy and it can be verified from that.

Now, I invite your attention to the fact that the gap of 15 lakh tonnes of sugar was there and had been pointed out so and identified as early as in November. It is contained on page 90. On 7-11-1993, the Food Ministry had given the notice and then the report was prepared to the effect that sugar should be imported. But it is very clearly stated at page 91: "The Minister is not in favour of imports. Ways should be found out to increase production of sugar and to control its consumption so that import is not necessary." That is the view of the Minister in spite of preparations and in spite of the fact that there was going to be a gap in demand and supply and there was no supply. So, you must import. So, initially the Minister had put a jack. It again came up for consideration in March. The proposal of the Ministry was approved by the Minister in January, 1994. I want the dates to be remembered by the Chair. Members have already pointed out, but anyway, in my own way. I am pointing out.

The proposal of his Ministry, even though approved by him, came up for consideration on 9th March, 1994. In 1994, the Minister vehemently opposed the sale. Therefore, are we to understand that he has made up his mind and not to import the sugar for various considerations. It has been pointed out squarely that the Minister is responsible.

Now, I invite your attention to a fact that the Food Minister was stoutly against the import of sugar and always rejected an option to meet the shortage of sugar. As a result of this, a decision was taken sufficiently in advance to import the sugar but no expeditious steps were taken by him, STC and MMTC in this regard. He did not take up the matter with the Commerce Minister. During this period the price of sugar was shot up. He did not

even take up the matter with the Prime Minister. It has also been stated in the report that no efforts were made to ensure the import of sugar to reach the country so that the consumer was not affected. Therefore, it has been clearly pointed out that the Food Minister alone and his Department were responsible. What was the observation about the Ministers? The Ministers were acting as separate Maharajas. I am putting it in my own way. They have not mentioned in the report the Ministers as Maharajas. But I will read out the report.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot expand the report.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Madam, that is why I said, it is my view because some Members may rise and say, "No, no, he has not compared the Ministers with Maharajas". Now, Maharajas are no more there in our country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't read the report.

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदया, नेता सदन बैठे हैं और ट्रेजरी बेंचस खाली हैं, सारी।

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: I am not reading from the report. But let me enlighten ... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venkatraman, may I point out one thing? We are constraint of time. You have read the report. I think that you ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Madam, I am already feeling hungry. So, let me complete.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am also feeling hungry.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Madam, I have to place the facts. If there is hindrance, how can I do it? Kindly don't interrupt me.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Venkatraman ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, you are not a Minister. Why do you interrupt?... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venkatraman, you say that you have read the report... (*Interruptions*)... Just a minute. Please sit down. I know you are feeling hungry; and all of us are feeling hungry... (*Interruptions*)... That is no problem. (*Interruptions*)... Please sit down, don't interrupt me. You have ready the report, now formulate your questions.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN : I am putting my questions to the Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I hope that you have read the statement made yesterday, and you have had enough time to go through it. Now, please don't read from the report because we have no time. You put questions, on the basis of what you have read.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN : I know that it is hard to swallow a bitter pill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am not bothered about that. I am ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN : I am putting it, as a matter of fact. Madam, the Food Minister and the Food Secretary were pulling in different directions. Was it not a fact? The Commerce Minister was not having co-ordination with the Food Minister. Was it not a fact? The Finance Minister has refused to give subsidy. He was pulling in some other direction. According to the report, all these people have not informed the Prime Minister about the situation. What was the Min'stry doing? Were the Ministers co-operating with the Prime Minister or were they pulling in eight directions involving the Prime Minister? As suggested by some Members it has been strongly rumoured ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : In Parliament ... (Interruptions) ... He is talking about rumours.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN : You have not yet become the Minister. Why do you intervene? Madam, I would like to know wheher it is a fact that the Prime Minister was being threatened by the concerned Minister who was squarely held responsible for this situation. In that event, what more inquiry do you require? Therefore, I want to know ... (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Narayanasamy, please sit down. (Interruptions).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : Irrelevant points are raised ... (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Narayanasamy, if you interrupt, it takes more time. If you do not interrupt, we will finish quickly. (Interruptions).

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : The hon. Member has got sufficient experience Rumours outside ... (Interruptions).

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu) : The Special Action Committee ... (Interruptions).

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN : Madam, I am only posing questions. Why is Mr. Narayanasamy interrupting? ... (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You don't look at him.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATRAMAN : Therefore, is it not a fact that the Minister concerned, who has been pinpointed, who is squarely responsible for the ill-gotten wealth of the mill-owners, is threatening the Prime Minister? There is a strong suspicion. Also, we have gathered information. Therefore, I request that it should be clarified because it is in public interest. Above all, my friend has been talking about tradition. I want to say one thing. Lal Bahadur Shastri was the Railway Minister. Something happened somewhere in the Railways. And he resigned. Therefore, I make this request. Because all these people are pulling in all directions, let the Prime Minister resign.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, ... (Interruptions). Mr. Bommai, I have to announce one thing. We have the tradition of allowing one Member from each party, not two or three from each party. I have the names of Mr. Samadani from the Muslim League, Mr. Swaminathan Mrs. Renuka Chowdhury. These are the from the AIADMK, Mr. Jagmohan and names of the different people I have. Already I have covered most of the parties in this House. Only these four remain. We cannot go on like this because everybody would like to put questions. (Interruptions). Just one second. It is not a convention that the Chair has formed. It is a convention evolved by the House only. That is what I am putting before the House.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT : Madam, Mr. Bommai is the head of a party. Therefore, I request that he may be allowed. (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Like that, everybody is the head of a party. (Interruptions). Then there are other people who want to speak. Mr. Ashok Mitra wants to speak. How can I say 'no' to him?

SHRI ASHOK MITRA (West Bengal) : Madam, you allow him and allow me as well.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I must have some parameters and rules which I should stick to. If you want the discussion to be over now, it should be over. Mr. Samadani, do you want to speak on this subject?

SHRI ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI (Kerala) : Yes Madam, I want to make it very brief. I do not question the integrity of

any of the Ministers of the honourable Cabinet. But one thing is clear. The shadow of suspicion is cast upon the image of public life and the Government. So, the need of the hour is to save the political life, public activity, from the disaster of moral degradation. That is the greatest need of Contemporary politics. Madam, this is not related to the Government or the ruling party alone. It is related to each and every political party, to Parliament, to public activity, to everything related with social work. This is an issue related to the excellent aims that are associated with democracy. People are fed up with misgovernance and corruption. So, my humble request is that the hon. Prime Minister must come forward to establish once again that he is not in favour of the erosion of values in politics but he is in favour of upholding principles. The people expect morality from their leaders. It is to be noted that among the so many things contributed to the recent election success in Andhra Pradesh and one important factor is that the people voted in favour of prohibition. So everywhere, we can see that the people are not against morality in politics. But they are in favour of morality in public life. Hence our duty is to establish that we are against selfish, self-seeking and that morality and sanctity are the foundations of public life. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please put your questions.

SHRI ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI : My question is a simple request that the hon. Prime Minister must come forward to act accordingly and to take action if it is needed to prove that the political parties are not the political parties of circumstances, but the political parties are the political parties of principles. That is very important. It is a matter of honesty and integrity and character which is something lofty, sublime. Now, the Government is going to conduct another enquiry and whatever may be the result of that enquiry. (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI MIRA DAS (Orissa) : Madam, he is making very valuable suggestions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : But he is not putting his questions. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI : Madam, I am concluding. The presence of character as a political power is the greatest necessity of today. Otherwise, we are going to be doomed if we are building our Parliamentary democracy on the SHAKH-E-NAZUK the tender branch of immortality it will be very difficult for us to go forward to progress and lead the coun-

try to its future. Here, I am reminded of a couplet and I quote :

“जो शाख-ए-नाजूक पे आशियां बनेगा
वह नापाएदार होगा ।”

It means, if we are building our nest on a very tender branch—that is the moral degradation—then it will be producing disastrous results with these words. I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu) : Madam, the report has brought out administrative lapses. In para 7, five points have been given as the reasons for the sugar scandal. The statement has also brought out the general impression that some people have been benefited and made money because of the administrative lapses. The Opposition is saying that somebody should be responsible and is requesting the Prime Minister to fix responsibility and take action. But, as per the statement of the former Cabinet Secretary, the Prime Minister was aware of the situation then and there and as usual, he did not take timely action to avert the deteriorating situation. The Minister of Food, Shri Kalp Nath Rai, who is responsible for the Ministry, is also accountable and should suffer a penalty. He cannot escape by throwing the blame on the officials for administrative lapses. Only the Minister is accountable to Parliament and not the officials. Action can be taken against the officials but action should be taken against the Minister. The point is that no action has so far been taken against anybody. We have the fear that as everybody escaped in the Bank Scam, everybody will escape in this Scam also. During the period of Pandit Ji, Lal Bahadur Shastri, who was the then Railway Minister, resigned when there was a rail accident in Tamil Nadu even though he was not directly responsible for that accident. He was only accountable to Parliament. Unlike that, Mr. Kalp Nath Rai, even though he is accountable, has refused to resign. In para 11 of the statement, it has been clearly stated that the report does not investigate any issue of loss or lack of integrity. When the Committee has not investigated this aspect of integrity, how can the Prime Minister absolve Mr. Kalp Nath Rai of not having any malafied intentions?

Finally, on behalf of my party, I may like to say that action should be taken immediately against Shri Kalp Nath Rai and he should be removed from the Ministry and should not be allowed to save his face in the proposed reshuffle, which I understand the Prime Minister is contemplating.

A judicial inquiry should be conducted into the losses. It should also examine the integrity of the Minister and the officials engaged in the scam. Thirdly, the judicial

inquiry should be conducted into the losses of about Rs. 6,000 crores and it should also find out where the money has ultimately landed. After the judicial inquiry, criminal proceedings should be initiated against the culprits and the money should be recovered. We are also unhappy that the Prime Minister, by not taking prompt and early action, has allowed the situation to deteriorate and made the country to lose money and the people to suffer. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI JAGMOHAN (Nominated) : Madam, I will be very brief and I will not repeat anything which has been said earlier. ... (*Interruptions*) ... I was saying that I would not like to repeat what my colleagues have already stated. My queries are very straight and simple. First, does the whole affair or the statement also not show a very poor state of administration, a very poor state of decision-making, a very poor relationship that exists between the civil services and the political heads? This is the first point. Secondly, is it not a fact that in all the allegations that we hear these days, in all the scandals and in all the allegations that are made, one common factor in all these scams and allegations is the faulty process of decision-making? whether it is disinvestment or whether it is some other scam, it is a faulty method by which the Government is functioning. That is the issue. Does the Government propose to attend to this fatal flaw in the present system or not? The third point which I wish to make is, the hon. Prime Minister has said that there is no *mala fide* intention on the part of any Minister or anyone, particularly on the part of a particular Minister—I do not want to go into whether this is a correct assessment of the situation or not, but the fact remains that if huge losses are caused to the exchequer, someone is responsible administratively. According to the Government Servants Conducts Rules, even if the decision is *bona fide*, I cannot take a reckless decision. I cannot take a decision which leads to inefficiency, losses and so on. I am accountable for that, and under the Government Servants Conduct Rules, I will be proceeded against. Therefore, I do not understand how by merely saying that there is no *mala fide* intention, you can escape the responsibility of running the Government in an efficient way.

Then the other point is, you have now appointed some sort of a Committee of officials to look into the recommendations which Mr. Gian Prakash has made. I mean, you are handing over the thing to the same people whom you are also accusing of having caused this problem by way of the lack of coordination, lack of decision-making and poor state of things. Is it not a fact that all the things that are happening today are due

to the poor decision-making, the poor relationship that exists between the civil servants and the politicians, and the general climate of, what I say, culture of corruption, callousness and confusion? And this is only one of the small by-products of that overall culture of confusion, callousness and corruption. So, I would say these are the five points on which the Government must like to enlighten us when it replies. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have finished all the names party-wise. Now I have some other names. If I call all of them, then it will take so much time. Mr. Chaturvedi is there, Mr. Bommai is there. Then there are many more names.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI (Orissa) : Madam, may I make a submission with all politeness? I belong to a Party which is certainly existent. There are Independents. I want everybody to participate. I never asked, I never intervened. For the first time, on an important issue I am seeking your permission.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bommai, there is no problem but ... (*Interruptions*). ... Mr. Biplab Dasgupta, let me handle him. I do not need your support. I know him much longer than I know you.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI : I have never intervened in a very important issue.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It was not about you alone. I was only trying to put on record the tradition we have in the house. Now, if we, on special consideration, do not follow that tradition, it should not become a precedent for the future. That should not be.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI : I do agree.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That is why I said so. It is my duty also to let the House know what our procedure is. I will permit you. I will permit Mr. Chaturvedi and Mr. Ashok Mitra also. But please be extremely brief.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI : I will be very brief.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA : Are you allowing him? Then you will allow everybody, I take it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : If you want to speak, I will permit you. (*Interruptions*) ... See, Mr. Bommai is a senior Member. If two or three people take two or three minutes, it is not going to make matters different.

SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA (Assam) : If you are making an exception, it is all right.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is only in this case I am making such an exception because he has requested. Let us get over it. At least the business should get over. The impediments should go away so that we can run the House and it should not become a precedent. That is the only thing.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI : Madam, Deputy Chairman, the sugar issue has not come for the first time. There was a report of the public Accounts Committee. The Committee had submitted a report on the avoidable extra expenditure on import of sugar when Vajpayeeji was the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and it was placed on the Table of this House on 27-4-1993. On this report, the Government had given an Action Taken Report wherein the Government had given certain assurances to the Committee to avoid such a situation of shortage of sugar in future. The things which need to be done had been mentioned in chronological order—in which month the Directorate of sugar should find out whether there would be a shortage, how the sugar should be purchased etc., a chain of action had been mentioned. There was an assurance given by the Government. They have violated that assurance. They have violated all the assurances. Therefore, the present public Accounts Committee wanted to examine it. But it was objected to on technical grounds. Therefore, the Committee could not do it. This is the second scandal.

Madam, don't misunderstand me when I say that the present Government, headed by Narsimha Rao Ji, is a Government of scandals, (*Interruptions*) ... a Government of only scandals. (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : Madam, is this the clarification which Mr. Bommai wants to seek? (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI : Madam, the CAG gives a report. I am not going out of the way. The CAG gives a report. In the disinvestment of public sector undertakings there is a loss of 3,300 crores. The Public Accounts Committee examines it and submit a report for action. No action is taken. I am going one by one. So far as the JPC Report is concerned—we don't think it will come at 3 O'clock—no action is taken. Take the case of purchase of railway engines. The Railway Committee gave a report. No action is being taken. Now this is sugar. There are other scandals. I don't want to go into all that. I want to know from the Government, particularly the Prime Minister—he is not here—why he is keeping mum? Why is it that no action is taken against anybody? This is the worry. The entire world is watching us. I am not concerned with XYZ. I am

concerned with the democratic functioning of the Government in this country. There are instances here in our country where, when serious allegations were made against the Ministers, they have resigned. The Prime Minister have sought their resignations. Here, particularly in this case, a one-man committee was appointed by the Prime Minister. We demanded a judicial inquiry. It was rejected. The one-man committee has given its Report and herein a particular Minister has been indicated. I must congratulate Mr. Antony. I am happy that there are still such honest Ministers and politicians in this country and more so in the Congress. Immediately, he resigned. Really, the entire country must appreciate his stand. Therefore, I would urge the other Ministers to follow him. They may not be guilty. But still, when there is a suspicion, one must resign and when he is found not guilty, he can come back. Here again I would say that the statement made on behalf of the Prime Minister is the most *mala-fide* statement. The Report says one thing and the Prime Minister says another thing. The Food Minister directly makes allegations against the officials and that too against the former Cabinet Secretary. One Minister says that he had a talk with the Prime Minister directly. The Report itself indicates that the PMO was involved. The Cabinet Secretary was involved. What does it mean? It means that the Prime Minister himself is involved. He must resign and immediately make room for better people in his party. He is not here. I would have asked many more questions if he was present here. It is a joint responsibility. The Minister has committed these lapses. According to my calculations, during these three years, the greatest achievement of this Government is the loss to the exchequer which is more than Rs. 25,000 crores. I can calculate and give figures. I have no time. I can put it on record. There has been a loss of Rs. 25,000 crores during these three years. This is the greatest achievement of the Prime Minister. He is keeping mum. That itself points an accusing finger at him. His silence is the answer. He is guilty, therefore, he is unable to take action against any Minister. This is the only conclusion we can draw and it will be better for the country if he resigns and makes way for others.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Chaturvedi, please ask questions and don't make a speech so that we can start the reply.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): Thank you very much. I will abide by your instructions. The country has been concerned with this sugar scam for the last few months and today it is dismayed at the callousness with which the principle of accountability has been completely subverted. My first

question, Madam, Chairperson is : I should like to know as to who signed this order appointing the Gian Prakash Committee. Who signed the order setting up this Committee? If it has not been signed by the Cabinet Secretary or by somebody from the Ministry of Civil Supplies or from the Ministry of Food,—I understand that it has been signed by somebody in the Prime Minister's Office—will it be correct to say that the Prime Minister's Office has become an extra-constitutional authority to sign orders appointing these committees? Secondly, Madam, I would like to know since the Inquiry Officer is as honourable as the Minister who has prepared and made this statement whether this officer now is only a private person today. Was he administered an oath of secrecy by the Prime Minister's Office before all the documents and papers were made available to him for scrutiny? Thirdly, Madam, in para 6 of the statement, the Minister says that Mr. Gian Prakash had looked at all the documents and had a chance to discuss matters with different functionaries. He says, "all the documents". Mr. Gian Prakash has said, not in one statement or in one interview but in many of them, that there might be more evidences hidden in the Prime Minister's Office or in the Prime Minister's archives. How does the Minister satisfy the House that all the relevant documents were made available to him? From my experience of having been in the JPC, I know how documents are suppressed. Therefore, how will the Minister assure this House that all the relevant and concerned documents were made available to this particular inquiry officer? Then, Madam, when Mr. Gian Prakash was put a particular question whether he held Mr. Antony responsible, he said, "I made a passing reference". When he was asked, "Do you agree with the summary of the Report that was contained in the reply given by the hon. Minister in the Lok Sabha?", he said, "I have given an Administrative Report and I am not concerned with the political angle". Then the Minister, in his reply to a question in the Lok Sabha, had mentioned the names of the Ministries. But these names have not been included in the statement. Will the Minister satisfy the House, particularly in the light of this fact, as to why he has honestly, with utmost intellectual integrity and without any ulterior motive,—dropped that particular reference in this statement? Madam, Deputy Chairperson, I would also like to refer to para 7 where he has highlighted various references to the weaknesses. But the aspect relating to lack of co-ordination has not been mentioned even though it finds a prominent place in the Report itself, as has been mentioned by many of my distinguished colleagues. May I know from the hon. Minister whether all these lapses were the responsibility of the ad-

ministrative functionaries only, the responsibility of the Government officers only, and not of the Ministers heading these particular Ministries? Then, Madam, we are all aware of the running controversy between the erstwhile Cabinet Secretary and the present Food Minister, who is, of course, not available these days. The former says that the Food Minister is a pawn in the game. What is that game and who is the person, who is playing that game? I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Food Minister was correct in saying that the erstwhile Cabinet Secretary wanted McDaniels to be given the authority to import the sugar. May I know from the hon. Minister if he has seen the various statements made by the Food Minister, including his taped interview to the *Pioneer* as well as the *Business Today*, in which he has said that Mr. Sukh Ram is a corrupt Minister and no action has been taken against him despite the PAC report and the CBI report. Why is then this House after him? Has he sought any clarification from Mr. Kalp Nath Rai as to what exactly the position is and also from Mr. Sukh Ram?

Madam, Chairperson, I will put only two more questions even though I have many more questions. I would like to know from the hon. Minister about one more thing. He reiterated that Mr. Gian Prakash was asked not to fix any responsibility, not to look into the question of accountability, not to fix the blame and not to look into the question of integrity. He reiterated it twice in the statement. If that be so, and as Mr. Gian Prakash is also saying that he has not gone into the question of honesty of the people who are running the Government? Then how can the hon. Minister draw the conclusion that there is no *mala fide* if the Enquiry Officer was asked not to look into the question of integrity? I want to know whether the hon. Minister himself has gone into this question and that is why he is saying that there is no *mala fide* in this? There was nothing. A proverb says,

"घोर की दाढ़ी में तिनका ।"

When you yourself reiterated it and when the Enquiry Officer has also concluded this way, then who would fix the responsibility and why refer to *mala fide*?

This is my last point. A request has been made that the entire matter should be entrusted for probe to a Supreme Court Judge. We know the way the reports of the Justices are treated. And the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has said occasionally that he has no Judges to spare. Here comes another question. The hon. Commerce Minister is also sitting here. I don't want to go into the role of

the STC and the MMTC. But I would like to remind him that the Director of the FCI said today that he had informed the Government of the production trends of sugar cane as early as in April, 1993 and also in October, 1993. I don't want to go into the role of the STC and the MMTC at the moment. I think all those people who are members of the CCP are equally accountable. That is why I say that this is an innocuous report which you call as the preliminary administrative report. You have also said that another Cabinet Secretary has been asked to look into it again. But why did you not do it earlier, for the last two months. May I request the hon. Prime Minister and, in his absence the Leader of the House and the Minister that they may appoint another JPC to be headed by persons with expertise in the Government like Mr. Jaffer Sharief, Capt. Satish Sharma? If you like, I can name many such people.

Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Ashok Mitra. Mr. Mitra, please abide by what I have said.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: Madam, I am very grateful to you for this opportunity and abiding by your dictate, we have skipped our lunch. I wish the Prime Minister were around ... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I also skipped my lunch.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: But I wish the Prime Minister were with us because most of the questions were addressed to him.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, I hope the Prime Minister will not skip his reply ... (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish and then the Government will reply ... (Interruptions). Let him finish first.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: My first query is: Why did our friend, Shri Antony, resign? He has not come to the House and he has not confided in us. But, he had affection for the Prime Minister. We shall be much obliged if the Prime Minister would tell us why his Civil Supplies Minister resigned on this issue of the sugar inquiry.

My second question is this. You know that about two-three days ago when we were demanding that the report must be placed on the Table of the House, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs broke into a long rigmarole saying that it was an administrative report and it would be setting a bad precedent if we publicised this report. Now, Madam, I wish the Prime Minister was here. About five

months ago when we were debating the sky-rocketing sugar prices, the Food Minister, in this House, made open allegations against two very senior officers of the Government. This was without precedent. Never in the history of the Government of India since 1947 have Ministers taken recourse to running down those serving the Ministers on the floor of the House and, yet, I would humbly ask the Prime Minister ... (Interruptions).

Please let me say ... (Interruptions). Mr. Chaturvedi, let me conclude, please (Interruptions). Please ... Please ... (Interruptions).

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Suresh Pachouri) in the Chair]

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचोरी) : कलिए, दोनों चतुर्वेदी चुप रहिए ।

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: Now, the Prime Minister had either of the two alternatives. He could have immediately suspended the two officers or he could have removed the Minister. That was what parliamentary practice, Governmental practice and administrative practice would have enjoined. But why didn't the Prime Minister do either of those things? He brought shame on us because we are part of Parliament and we are part of this democratic system.

My third question is this. Now, we had already, as early as in the month of May, read in the Indian Express and there was a verbatim reproduction of the proceedings of the meeting of the Cabinet Committee on Prices and that was being forwarded by a note by the Cabinet Secretary to the Prime Minister's Office where it was stated openly that the Cabinet Committee would also recommend that there should be immediate imports. Nothing happened for two-three months. Why did the Prime Minister's Office not take any action?

My fourth question is this. Even when a decision was taken to import, why was the decision taken to import through OGL and not on Government account? Now, what do you do? On OGL, you ask the traders to import. These are the traders who are jacking up the prices and the*—I use that expression advisedly,*—is unparliamentary—who are mulcting the people, you are offering them additional supplies so that they can further maul the people! Now I don't understand. You could have imported from the Government account. Then, finally, when you decided to import a second quantity on Government account, why did the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Commerce higgled and haggled for weeks on end about who will bear the burden of

subsidy? Now, they are members of the Cabinet Committee—the Commerce Minister and the Finance Minister—and they are the people, especially the Finance Minister who talks about regulating the prices, about how liberalisation have done wonders to the economy. Liberalisation has only liberated prices and the people are really being crushed out of existence.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Yet these Ministers just watched the situation. At least did not the Prime Minister enquire from these two very important Ministers what exactly was happening and why they had been keeping mum? These astounding things happened. At a certain juncture, for two months I was not able to distinguish whether the Minister of Food was the Chairman of the Indian Sugar Mills Association or the Chairman of the Indian Sugar Mills Association was the Minister of Food.

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

They were backing each other and there was no protest on behalf of the Prime Minister. I remember one particular statement by the Chairman of the Indian Sugar Mills Association almost threatening the Government "How dare you import? You must not import. I am the Chairman of ISMA and I am ordering you not to import." Why did you tolerate this kind of business? What was the secret for this kind of a thing?

Now, this is something which is very dear to my heart. You know, once upon a time I was connected with the Agricultural Prices Commission and in the sixties or early seventies we tried very hard to keep prices at an even keel and one of the strategies that was adopted was that we must strengthen the Public Distribution System. We knew that in the case of sugar there is technical movement of output, prices tend to go up and down and therefore, we said that we must maintain price stability through ensuring that 70% of the stocks that are released to the market every month are released to the Public Distribution System—seventy per cent at the subsidised price to the Public Distribution System.

Now you can go back and consult our records. I, the Minister of Civil Supplies who is equally helpless, there were weeks when not even one kilogram of sugar was supplied to the Public Distribution System and over all if you do the arithmetic, during the first six months of 1994, not even ten per cent of the total sales of sugar in the country was sent to the Public Distribution System. The Government existed but the Government existed in order that the private sharks could make their destiny. This is all what has happened.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mitra, will you please conclude?

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: Now, here are may two or three final questions. Now, even this wretched report reached the Government in the month of October. Why did not the Government, why did not the Prime Minister, take any action? Unless we make it an issue of it in Parliament, the Government would not do anything. My penultimate question is this: You know, we are adults. We read newspapers. We are literate. We have to read newspapers. We have read in the newspapers the language in which the Minister of Food has abused the Prime Minister and it is not the things said by him but the language that he has used with respect to this country's Prime Minister. This country is a great country, this India, despite your party, is a great country. To use such language for the country's Prime Minister. I also forget whether this gentleman is corrupt or not. I would demand of the Prime Minister that this Minister ought to be dismissed on the ground of public decency, public decency, public decency. My final question is not so much to the Government but to the Treasury Benches. What do you propose to do? The more you stall the report inside the House, the more you claim that your Ministers are as pure as Caesar's wife. The people outside are aghast. Madam, the Indian National Congress once upon a time was a great party. A great party. Now you go and talk to the people in town and country the feeling is that this is a party which has corrupt and people from top to bottom. What are you going to do about it? This is my final question. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pranab Mukherjee is intervening (*Interruptions*)

SOME MEMBERS: Who is he to reply? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: We want the Prime Minister to reply. (*Interruptions*)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The Prime Minister should come to this House. We want the Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*) Answers should be given by him and nobody else. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, you may assure us that the Prime Minister will come.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot assure you till you sit down (*Interruptions*). I cannot give the assurance. First, all should sit down. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: The PM should come.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. I will then deal with the situation. (Interruptions) Mr. Pranab Mukherjee is in his right to intervene. The Government's accountability... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: You may find out, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am finding out ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI: It was not the statement of the Prime Minister. It was the statement of a Minister of State ... (Interruptions) ...

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

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: We want the Prime Minister's reply ... (Interruptions) ...

SYED SIPTEY RAZI: This is going totally against the conventions of the House ... (Interruptions).

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मानवीर : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । ... (व्यवधान) ...

उपसभापति : बैठिए । मुझे बोलने दीजिए ना ... (व्यवधान) ... बैठ जाइए । ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI: This is my statement and I will answer... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Why do you want to defend the corrupt? ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The Prime Minister has replied in the other House. The PM spoke in the Lok Sabha. Why not here? ... (Interruptions) ...

The Prime Minister has spoken in the Lok Sabha, then why that is being denied to the Rajya Sabha?

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I believe they are not objecting... (Interruptions)... Mr. Mukherjee is only intervening.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN (Maharashtra): There is no question of intervention ... (Interruptions) ... We are asking only for clarifications.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, sit down. I believe they are not objecting to Mr. Pranab Mukherjee's intervention ... (Interruptions) ... Just a minute. Let me understand.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: There is no question of intervention.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मानवीर : लेकिन जो क्लेरिफिकेशन का प्रोवाइजर है उसमें किसी भी मिनिस्टर को इंटरवेंशन का अधिकार नहीं है ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He can answer on behalf of the Government. He is in his right to intervene.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Madam, he can answer on behalf of the Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is in his right to answer. There is no problem in it.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Madam, my point is that the subject before the House is not a discussion, it is not a debate. It is the right of the Members to seek clarifications on a statement made by the Minister.

The Commerce Minister, as a Member of the House, may have a right to seek clarifications about the statement if he is not satisfied with the original statement. But he has no right to intervene in the debate. He can only seek clarifications and nothing more than that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Pranab Mukherjee is a Minister. He has got every right to intervene. (Interruptions)

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Madam, Pranab Mukherjee is PM in name only. He is not the real PM. 'PM' stands for Prime Minister, not for Pranab Mukherjee.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: Madam, I am on a point of order. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the House be in order first. I am not dealing with any points of order until everybody takes his seat and there is order in the House. (Interruptions). Let everybody go back. I refuse to deal with anything until everybody goes back and sits down. Please sit down. (Interruptions)

आप लोग अपनी जगह पर बैठ जाइए न, वह बोल रहे हैं । ... (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी : मैडम, पिछले चार दिन से ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : आप अपनी सीट पर चले जाइए ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI: My point of order is this, Madam. In my clarification, I have charged that the Prime Minister is guilty, and I have demanded his resignation. (Interruptions). Is any one of the Ministers competent to answer on behalf of the Prime Minister? I asked for his resignation. I said that he is guilty. (Interruptions). I asked for his resignation. Only he must come and answer. The Cabinet Ministers have no right to answer on behalf of the Prime Minister when we are demanding his resignation. Only he should come and answer. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Let us not lower the dignity of the House. (Interruptions)

SYED SIBTEY RAZI: Madam, I am very sorry that Mr. Bommali is the President of an all-India Party and he has made such a remark against the Prime Minister. In the statement, nothing has been said against the Prime Minister. (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go back to your seats (Interruptions)

SYED SIBTEY RAZI: Madam, we are prevented from making our points. When we have to express our point of view, they are not allowing the Minister. There were comments made against the Commerce Ministry also. He has every right to intervene. This is not fair. (Interruptions)

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHANDARI: It is not a debate. It is only clarifications. (Interruptions)

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम : ... (व्यवधान) जो सवालता रखे गए हैं वह हम प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहेंगे । ... (व्यवधान)

अगर उनके अंदर गद्स हैं तो वे प्रधान मंत्री बदल दें ।
प्रणब मुखर्जी को प्रधान मंत्री बना दें । ...
(व्यवधान) ...

SYED SIBTEY RAZI: Nothing should go on record, Madam. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Madam, there are several Ministries concerned with this issue. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: This side, Madam. (Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: On a point of order, Madam. Two questions have been raised here. I am not disputing the right of the Members. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please switch on the mike of Mr. Vayalar Ravi, please. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: What is your point of order, Mr. Ravi? (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have allowed Mr. Vayalar Ravi to speak. (Interruptions) Please sit down. Let me listen to his point of order. (Interruptions) Mr. Ashok Mitra, please sit down. (Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: On a point of order, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have allowed Mr. Vayalar Ravi to speak.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: We cannot listen to anyone other than the Prime Minister. (Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam, I am not questioning the right of any Member sitting in the Opposition to demand the presence of the Prime Minister here. Madam, the question before this House is whether a Member of this House has the right or not. It is not a question of disputing anybody's right. I am not disputing your right to ask for the presence of the Prime Minister here. But my point is different. The question is whether a Member of this House whether he is a Minister or not—has the right to intervene in the debate. (Interruptions)

Let me finish. (Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mr. Ravi, this is not a debate. We are only seeking clarifications from the Prime Minister. We want the Prime Minister alone to answer.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam, here the question is ... (Interruptions)

श्री जनार्दन दाबव (बिहार) : आप यह बताइए कि शूगर घोडाले में जिन्होंने ... (व्यवधान) ...
उनको बुलाकर उनसे पूछा जाए कि उन्होंने कितना पैसा लिया है ? ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: The Commerce Minister has every right. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Ravi, you have made your point. (Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Let me make my point of order. I am not questioning your right. (Interruptions) Mr. Pranab Mukherjee is a Member of this House. His Ministry has also been referred to. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please allow Mr. Ravi to speak. Do you think only you have the right to speak in the House and the Members on the other side have no right to speak? This is not fair. Please. (Interruptions) You should give opportunity to the other Members also to speak. You have your viewpoint. (Interruptions) Please keep quiet. Let him say whatever he wants to say. You are creating a rumpus here. He is trying to explain his viewpoint. He has the right. One has to listen to each other's viewpoint. I have to listen to his point of order and deal with it. It is not proper that only what you want should be done and the others cannot have their say. Please. You are sitting in a big House. I do not want to give a sermon again. Please. I am to saying anything. (Interruptions) Mr. Bommai, Please sit down. Mr. Ravi, what is your point of order? (Interruptions)

श्री जनार्दन यादव : प्रधान मंत्री को यहां पर बुला लीजिए। . . (व्यवधान) . . .

उपसभापति : बंठ जाइए। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री जनार्दन यादव : प्रधान मंत्री आ जाएं, समय क्यों बरबाद कर रहे हैं ?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI : Madam, my point of order is this. There are, specifically, two issues involved here. One is that the hon. Members want the Prime Minister to be present here. I am not questioning their right. But my point, Madam, is very simple. Has a Member of this House—whether he is a Minister or not—the right to speak in the House or not? This is one thing. Secondly, whether he, as the Minister of Commerce, the right to speak or not? I say this because the Ministry of Commerce has also been referred to in the report. Further, some of the Members who spoke also referred to the Commerce Ministry. Therefore, as the Commerce Minister, has Mr. Pranab Mukherjee the right to speak and clarify the position or not? This is my point.

SHRI SOMAPPA R. BOMMAI : No. (Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Madam, on a point of order. (Interruptions)

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : सदर साहिब, अनन्तर इस मंच पर को यह कतना पड़ेगा कि क्लेरिफिकेशन डिबेट्स में होती है ? क्या बिजनेस है हाऊस के सामने ? बिजनेस सिर्फ इतना है कि वतुर्वेदी साहब के बयान के बाद क्लेरिफिकेशन के लिए आपने पूरे हाऊस को एमोज कर रखा है। क्लेरिफिकेशन का बिज-

सला चल रहा है, उसमें कोई नई बात नहीं हो सकती है। बस इतनी बात है और कुछ नहीं है।

श्री स्कन्दर बख्त : -
आर्मिल मمبر को ये बताना पड़ेगा कि क्लेरिफिकेशन
कमिशन में होती है - क्या बिजनेस है
हाऊस के सामने - बिजनेस صرف इतना
है कि चित्रोदी صاحب के बयान के
क्लेरिफिकेशन के लिए आप ने पूरे
हाऊस को एमोज कर रखा है क्लेरिफिकेशन
का सلسल चल रहा है - इसमें कौन
नई बात नहीं हो सकती है - इसमें
बात है और कुछ नहीं -

उपसभापति : बैठिए।

श्री नरेश यादव (बिहार) : इसमें सिर्फ वाणिज्य मंत्रालय ही नहीं, खाद्य मंत्रालय, वित्त मंत्रालय . . . (व्यवधान) . . . और अनेक मंत्रालय शामिल हैं, इसलिए प्रधान मंत्री जवाब देंगे। . . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Madam...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will allow you ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Madam, it is three o'clock now. According to the Supplementary List of Business the hon. Finance Minister has to lay revised paragraphs of the Action Taken Report on the Table ... (Interruptions) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He can lay it on the Table.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE--Contd.

Revised Paragraph of the Action Table
Report

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH) : Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each (in English and Hindi) of the Revised Paragraphs of the Action Taken Report on the Report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee to enquire into irregularities in securities and banking transactions. ... (Interruptions) ...