

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why did you object in the beginning? I don't understand.

Re. Need to find a quick solution for the return of opposition parties to attend Parliament session.

SHRI P. UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman today is the 9th day of the boycott of the House by the principal Opposition parties. We hear from the newspaper reports about a number of formulae discussed, rejected and partially, accepted and ultimately there is a complete deadlock. But, unfortunately, we have to learn all these things from the newspapers. Both the Houses are not being taken into confidence by the Government as to what is really happening. According to the newspaper reports, we find that both the sides have taken a very rigid stand. In the beginning itself, some of us had expressed our opinion here that what the Opposition parties were doing was not correct. They should have taken advantage of a discussion in the house on the ATR and suggested some amendments to or alterations in it. Just because we differed with them and we are sitting here it doesn't mean that we completely support the Government's stand either. We find that the Government is equally adamant in this matter. We have repeatedly said that the responsibility of the Government is also much more to see that this House runs properly in a democratic manner and a solution is found... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish. If you have a view point, you can speak after him. Let him complete. He has a right to mention his view point. Similarly, you have also a right to mention your view point.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: When I praise the Government, you keep quiet. When I say something against the Government, you object... (Interruptions)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Don't mention incorrect facts.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: That is our opinion. You may differ with that. Maybe it looks as if the Houses are running ner-

mally. We all know how normal it is. There is a complete stalemate in the functioning of the Committee. A number of Bills are pending before the various Committees. They are not meeting. Even when they hold their meetings, there is no quorum. A number of policy papers are pending before the various Committees.

Madam, seventeen more days are to go before the House would be adjourned *sine die*. Should we go on like this for seventeen more days? Therefore, all of us have to put our heads together to find a solution. Particularly, the responsibility is more on the Government for running the House. I do not think we are incapable of finding a solution, with so many statesmen sitting on both the sides. If they really mean business, if they want to settle the matter they should strive to find a solution. I do not think mere quibbling with words would solve the problem.

I find that both sides are so adamant that the Presiding Officers have found it impossible to bring the two sides to a meeting point. Madam, in my view, the only alternative left is for the Presiding Officers to discuss among themselves and give their verdict on the final status of the Report and that should be binding on both the parties. In the present circumstances, this is the only solution I can think of.

Therefore, Madam, I would request the hon. Chairman to take the initiative and discuss the matter with the Speaker, Lok Sabha. Together, they should find a solution to this problem and make it binding. Then, the responsibility for accepting it or not accepting it would lie on the Government as well as on the Opposition.

This is my concrete suggestion, Madam. I hope you would convey it to the hon. Chairman.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have six names before me. Shall I exhaust this list first? Then, you can answer. Now, Shri Chimanbhai Mehta.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, I just want to associate myself with what Mr. Upendra has said. I agree with Mr. Upendra. I would also request our hon. Chairman to take the initiative because Shri Shivraj Patil has already done his job. We have not been able to find a solution. If the House so desires, we can also appeal to leaders of both the parties that they should accept some kind of an arbitration, whether it is by the hon. Chairman or by Shivraji. We should do whatever is proper because the main is that we must find a solution to this problem.

Thank you, Madam.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : (उत्तर प्रदेश)
उपसभापति महोदया, उपेन्द्र साहब ने सदन के वर्तमान स्वरूप के बारे में या संसद के वर्तमान स्वरूप के बारे में जो दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण स्थिति में है, जो राय जाहिर की है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ और यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आज नौ दिन हो गए, हम इस सदन के सदस्य केवल अखबार के माध्यम से जानते रहेंगे और जानेंगे कि संसदीय जनतंत्र में जो गतिरोध आया है वह किस स्थिति में है। क्या इस सदन में बैठ कर किसी जिम्मेदार आदमी से मंत्री से या और किसी नेता से जानेंगे क्योंकि अधिकार बनता है कि नौ दिन दस दिनों तक एक गतिरोध है, पूरा देश उस की तरफ देख रहा है। ऐसा नहीं है कि केवल अखबार छाप देता है बल्कि एक स्थिति बनी हुई है और अच्छी स्थिति नहीं है। वह शर्मनाक स्थिति है। इसके बारे में क्या नौ दिन, दस दिन, पंद्रह दिन या दो महीने के बाद कौन सी मियाद होगी कि सत्ता पक्ष की तरफ से नहीं, सदस्यों की तरफ से नहीं, सरकार की तरफ से इस सदन को अवगत कराया जाएगा कि स्थिति कहाँ तक पहुँची है और क्या हुआ ? केवल अध्यक्ष, लोक सभा या हमारे सभापति जी कोई बैठक बुला लें और उस बैठक की पूरी की पूरी रिपोर्ट उन के चैम्बर में या घर पर या दावत में जो कुछ भी, वह अखबार के जरिए छपे और हम लोग तब जानें, तो

यह हम लोगों की दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण स्थिति है और मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँगा कि आप सरकार पर दबाव डालिए कि हम लोगों को इस स्थिति से उबारने की कोशिश करें और इस सदन में तो बताएं कि क्या बातें चल रही हैं। यानि लंदन में अगर हिटलर की लड़ाई चला करती थी तो जो रोज पलटन हारती थी, उस का भी बयान सदन में दिया जाता था या जीतती थी तो उसका भी बयान सदन में दिया जाता था। और इस सदन में सत्ता पक्ष और विपक्ष के बीच में क्या चल रहा है, इस के बारे में सदन में कोई भी नेता या मंत्री कभी कोई वक्तव्य नहीं दे रहा है और बार-बार हम लोग उठ कर यह कह रहे हैं कि यह क्या हो रहा है ? इसको खत्म करिए। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि मैं आप पर आरोप लगाऊँ या इन लोगों पर लगाऊँ क्योंकि मैंने विपक्ष के एक नेता का बयान आपके बारे में पढ़ा कि सत्ता पक्ष, सरकारी पार्टी इस समय राजहठ पर उतारूँ है। यह शब्द उनके हैं, अखबार में छापा है। राजहठ का बड़ा दम हुआ करता है। अगर आप पर है तो मैं ऐसा नहीं मानता कि विपक्ष दोषी नहीं है। थोड़ा दोषी है। आप राजहठ के अपराधी माने जायेंगे तो वे लोग बालहठ के अपराधी माने जाएंगे। बालहठ में मासूमियत है, राजहठ में दम होता है और वह दोनों तरफ से है, दोनों में है और दोनों को इस स्थिति से उबारने के लिए कौन-सा माध्यम इस्तेमाल किया जाए, यह अभी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। केवल आरोप लगा दें, हम विपक्ष की तरफ से आप और आप आरोप लगा दें हम पर कि हम राजनीतिक फायदा उठा रहे हैं इस परिस्थिति का और हम आप पर आरोप लगा दें कि आप राजहठ के मद में चल रहे हैं तो काम चलने वाला नहीं है। कायदा है, सदन है, घर है और घर का एक नियम हुआ करता है कि अगर घर का एक भाई नाराज होकर बाहर चला जाता है तो जो बड़ा भाई होता है, उसका धर्म होता है कि वह उसको मनाकर लाए, चाहे उसकी भाँग की कीमत पर उसको मनाकर लाए, तभी घर चला करता है, वरना घर टूट जाता है। यह सदन, यह मत समझिए कि यह मैम्बरस का सदन है या लोक सभा के हम मैम्बरस जो चुने जाते हैं उनका

सदन है। यह हिन्दुस्तान की 80 करोड़ जनता का प्रतिनिधि सदन है। उसमें कुछ भाई अगर नाराज हैं और कुछ लोग जो जिम्मेदार हैं, घर के मालिक हैं तो उनका धर्म बनता है कि उन्हें मनाकर लायें। और मैं आपसे आग्रह करूंगा कि आप इन लोगों पर दबाव डालें कि जो लोग रुठ गए हैं, नाराज हैं, उनको उनकी कीमत पर भी मनाकर लाना पड़े तो दो कदम झुककर लाना चाहिए और फिर सदन में बात करनी चाहिए कि तुम नाराज हो गए थे जिन मुद्दों पर, वह गलत मुद्दे थे और वे लोग समझायेंगे कि उनके मुद्दे सही थे। लेकिन उनको लाना जरूरी है। यह मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि आप उन पर दबाव डालें। एक दिन में, दो दिन में या तीन दिन में यह वक्तव्य जरूर दें कि बात कहां तक आगे बढ़ी ताकि हम लोग भी कुछ समझ सकें और अगर हम लोगों का कुछ इस्तेमाल हो सके तो हम लोग मददगार बन सकें। धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have some more names—Shri Ish Dutt Yadav, Shri S. Madhavan and so on.

श्री ईश दत्त यादव : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : एक-एक मिनट देते जाइए।

उपसभापति : ठीक है। एक-एक मिनट बोल लीजिए क्योंकि सबकी भावना तो एक ही है।

श्री ईश दत्त यादव : मैडम, श्री पी० उपेन्द्र जी, श्री चिभन भाई मेहता, श्री अनेश्वर मिश्र जी ने जिन विचारों को, भावनाओं को व्यक्त किया है उनसे संबंध करता हूं। मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा लेकिन यह हमारे देश के लिए एक चिन्ता-जनक स्थिति पैदा हो गई है कि आधे दोनों सदनों में विपक्ष के लोग नहीं हैं। यह न केवल सदन के लिए, न केवल दोनों सदनों के लिए बल्कि राष्ट्र के लिए कुछ बकेल नहीं है। मैडम, सदन में विपक्ष का अभाव अति आवश्यक है और आधे विपक्ष नहीं है; इसके बिना ज्यादा निष्पत्ति पड़े कुछ

है। मैं किसी भी पक्ष पर कोई आरोप नहीं लगाता हूं और न ही किसी पर कोई इल्जाम लगाने की मेरी मंशा है लेकिन जैसा आदरणीय मिश्र जी ने कहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी की और सरकार की ज्यादा जिम्मेदारी बनती है कि विपक्ष के लोगों से समझौता वार्ता करके एक सम्मान-जनक हल निकाल करके ऐसी स्थिति पैदा करें ताकि वे लोग फिर से सदन में आ जायें। और पी० उपेन्द्र जी ने और दूसरे माननीय सदस्यों ने जो सुझाव दिए। मैडम, इसमें लोक सभा के अध्यक्ष प्रयास कर रहे हैं लेकिन आज समाचार पत्रों में पढ़ने को मिला कि कल तीन घंटे तक वार्ता चली और तीनों घंटे की वार्ता निष्फल रही। इसलिए अब यह जरूरी लगता है कि लोक सभा के माननीय अध्यक्ष जी, अपने माननीय सभापति जी और मेरी तरफ से एक संशोधन श्री उपेन्द्र जी की राय में है कि माननीया, आप भी उसमें सम्मिलित रहें और तीनों लोग मिल करके एक विकल्प निकालें क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री जी और सरकार अपनी जगह पर हैं और ऐसा लगता है कि वे मानने को तैयार नहीं हैं चाहे देश और संसद जहां चली जाएं और विपक्ष के लोग भी कोई बात मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं चाहे संसद और देश का जो होने वाला हो। इसलिए अब एक ही विकल्प मेरी भी राय में लगता है कि आप तीनों जो सदन के, माननीय लोग हैं, पीठासीन अधिकारी हैं, आप सब लोग मिल करके एक हल निकालें और पुनः आपके माध्यम से देश के प्रधान मंत्री जी से मेरा आग्रह है, मेरी प्रार्थना है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी को सदन में आ करके बयान देना चाहिए कि अब तक की स्थिति क्या है। केवल मौन रहना इस स्थिति पर, यह देश के लिए भयंकर स्थिति पैदा होती जा रही है। सदन चल रहे हैं, विपक्ष नहीं है। सारे प्रस्ताव या बिल या कार्यवाही चल रही है। यह संसद के लिए और देश के लिए अच्छी चीज नहीं है। प्रधान मंत्री को दोनों सदनों में आना चाहिए और अपनी स्थिति को स्पष्ट करना चाहिए और उनकी-बिना तो मैं नहीं कहूंगा—अगर उनकी कोई भावना इस तरह की बन गई है कि वह विपक्ष की बात नहीं अपने के लिए तैयार हैं तो वह

इस देश के बड़े नेता हैं, देश के प्रधान मंत्री हैं, देश को चला रहे हैं, उनको थोड़ा दो कदम पीछे हटना पड़ेगा।

महोदया, एक खेल रस्साकशी का होता है। और खेलों में तो आगे बढ़ने पर जीत होती है, लेकिन रस्साकशी का खेल ऐसा है जिस में पीछे हटना पड़ता है, पीछे हटने पर ही जीत होती है। तो मुझे यह रस्साकशी का खेल लगता है जिस में प्रधान मंत्री को पीछे हटना चाहिए।

आपका बहुत बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have other names. Mr. Madhavan. Do you want to say the same thing?

SHRI S. MADHAVAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam, it is very unfortunate that we are running the House without the Opposition. We met the Prime Minister. He himself had expressed anguish over this issue. He was telling us that it was of no use running the House without the Opposition. I would request the hon. Prime Minister to intervene personally. If he talks to the Opposition leaders, I hope, there will be some solution for this.

Thank you, Madam.

SHRI ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI (Kerala): Madam, I just agree with the views expressed by the hon. Members in this House. It is unfortunate that this problem continues without any solution. As a junior Member, as a new Member of this House, I feel that this House without the Opposition is like a cup of tea without sugar. There is no meaning in conducting the House without the Opposition... (Interruptions)... We have to do something not make the tea tasty. Tea will not be tasty without sugar. That is the answer, Madam, there is a couplet:

जिन्दगी बहुत कम है मोहब्बत के लिए

फिर हठने की जरूरत क्या है ?

I request the Deputy Chairperson. I request the Chairman himself to tell

both the Government and the Opposition to come to a solution. Without a compromise, no solution will be there. So, I earnestly request both the Parties to come to a solution as early as possible. Thank you.

उपसभापति : आप ने कहा कि "जिंदगी बहुत कम है मोहब्बत के लिए", मैं कहूंगी कि—"जिंदगी बहुत कम है हठने के लिए।"

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairperson, I appreciate the feelings of my good friends but to say that it is *Raj hath* by the Government, I can't accept it. There was a meeting in the Speaker's Chamber and there were two proposals. One was given by the Government and the other was given by Mr. Indrajit Gupta, a very, very learned and a very, very senior Member of Parliament. When Mr. Vajpayee pointed out in the Lok Sabha—that is what I have read in the Press reports—"What about the proposal of Shri Indrajit Gupta?", immediately Mr. V. C. Shukla, the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, said, "I accept it." not only that. After that, the Government also said, "Yes, we are prepared to discuss it point by point with the Secretary of the Department and the Minister." The Government has accepted that. Thirdly, Madam, persons like me could have made some suggestions if it had been discussed. On the Action Taken Report I could have also pointed out where the Government could do something more than what they have done if it had been discussed. The issues should be discussed with an open mind. If the Government is ready to accept that, I am not able to understand why they are not coming to the House. Whose *Raj hath* is that? The Government has come not one step down but three or four steps down. In spite of all that, the Opposition says, "You withdraw the Report and then have a discussion". After withdrawing the Report, and then have a discussion". After

withdrawing the Report, how can there be a discussion? I am not able to understand that. We all want the Opposition Members to come to the House, to participate in the discussion and to make their contribution. After that, if they felt agitated on the issues which are not accepted by the Government—the Government should have accepted them—they could have made an issue. Then I would have said, “Yes, you have a right to do it.” But when they say “No” and demand the withdrawal of the Report, I think, no Government can do that and I, for one, will oppose the Government’s acceptance of the withdrawal of the Report because that will not serve the purpose and that will only create a very, very, bad precedent. It has never happened in this House. I fervently appeal to my good friends in the Opposition to come to the House, to discuss the ATR and to give their suggestions. The Government must consider their suggestions with an open mind. I am sure the Government will consider them with an open mind and not with a closed mind. That is the only solution. Our friends from the Opposition, who have taken a very, very good stand, should also help us. Please talk to them and request them to come to the House. The Government has come down. It has come out with many formulae. They say they want only the withdrawal of the Report. I think it is not possible. I still appeal to them and pray that they should come to the House and help us all. This is an important discussion on the National Housing Policy. I would like them to come here and make their suggestions. I request the hon. Minister for Urban Development to request them to give their views in writing and to consider them. That is what really the Government should do. The National Housing Policy is a very important subject. Therefore, I would like to request the Minister to write to the Opposition Leaders requesting them to give their views in writing because we wanted them to participate in the discussion which they have not done. So, please write to them and take their views into consideration when you finally have

the National Housing Policy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have the names of Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan, Shri Narayanusamy, Syed Sibtay Razi, Mr. Kishore Chandra Deo and Shrimati Alva. Does everybody want to say something?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam, I will really take only one minute. I just want to join the appeal made by my colleagues to the Opposition to come back and participate in the proceedings of the House. But I just want to state a few facts here to set the record straight. What the hon. Members, Shri Upendra, Shri Mishra and Shri Ish Dutt Yadav, have stated before me, with the greatest respect to them, do not reflect the correct situation. I want to mention, making it a part of the record—I am just not saying it for the sake of saying it or for the sake of a debate—that 107 observations in the Report are in the nature of recommendations and nothing more than that. Out of the 107 recommendations, the Government has accepted 87 recommendations. Fourteen recommendations are partially accepted. Only in respect of 6 recommendations no action has been initiated so far. What has the Government done? Obviously, it would be downright ridiculous for anybody, including the Opposition, to ask the Government to withdraw the action taken in respect of 87 recommendations. What does the withdrawal of the Report mean? The withdrawal of the Report means withdrawal of the action taken in 87 cases. It is that what the Opposition wants? That obviously cannot be their intention. I don’t understand what they gain out of the demand for withdrawal of the Report in respect of 87 cases. What is the Government saying in respect of the 14 recommendations, which have been partially accepted, and in respect of the 6 recommendations, which have not been accepted? The Government is saying that it is willing to open a debate. The Government is saying that it is willing to listen to it. The Government is saying, “You come up with suggestions.

We are willing to incorporate them." I don't understand what more the Government can do. Much noble sentiments have been expressed that the Government should come down. The Government has come down. How much further can the Government come down? Do you want to withdraw the action taken against the guilty? In 87 instances action has been taken. It would be defeating the purpose. Is it that the Opposition wants to protect those who are guilty? Is it that what they are trying to do? I don't understand the demand for withdrawal of the Report. They say, "Please come forward to discuss the 14 recommendations." The Government is willing to discuss them. Let us discuss why the Government is not willing to take action in the 14 instances where the recommendations have been partially accepted and in the 6 instances where the recommendations have not been accepted. I agree. It would be wrong. But, let us have a discussion. Nothing is to be gained. We are defeating the institution of Parliament by saying, "Withdraw it because it is meaningless." The demand is meaningless. I think the hon. Members of the Opposition also know it. They are now prisoners of the statement which they made earlier. I would appeal to them to rethink their position and come forward and initiate the debate about the recommendations which have not yet been accepted. Then this deadlock would be resolved amicably. All of us should come together and make the Parliament work as an institution.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Madam,...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, what do you want to say?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Only when I say that, you will know. I would like to make one point. Some hon. Members know about it and some hon. Members do not know about it. I am not going to touch upon the

points which have already been made by the hon. Members.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narayanasamy, if you know something more than what Shrimati Jayanthi Narayanan and Shri Jagesh Desai and Shrimati Margaret Alva know, you can explain it. At least, I do not know anything.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Madam, some of the hon. Members of this House do not know this fact. I would like to highlight it.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, he is going to educate us.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I am not going to educate you. I am not here to educate. I am trying to say something. Madam, as far as this House is concerned, you know about the entire incident. You must be knowing about the things in the other House also. As far as this Action Taken Report is concerned, as far as the securities scam is concerned, initially, the Opposition agreed to a Short-Duration discussion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This was told in the House on the day when you were absent. This matter has been raised three times. All this was discussed on the floor of the House. If you know anything new, I am prepared to listen to it because I am a patient listener.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I agree with you. Madam, when the Chairman agreed that it could be discussed as a motion, the Opposition should have agreed to discuss it in the House, through there is no convention in the House to discuss the motion which is given by the Opposition. When a meeting of the various political leaders was called, the Chairman agreed to it. But, the Opposition did not agree to it. They slowly increased their demand. The Opposition went to the extent of saying that the Action Taken

Report has to be withdrawn by the Government. The Government has taken action on various recommendations of the JPC. There was a difference of opinion only on smaller issues. If the Opposition wants that the democratic institution should be respected and if the Opposition has faith in Parliamentary democracy, they should come to the House and discuss the issue threadbare. They can confront the Government on various points which they want to make. The hon. Prime Minister and the Parliamentary Affairs Minister made the position very clear that they have got an open mind to consider this proposal. Unfortunately, in my opinion, they are trying to make political mileage out of it. That is my feeling. I do not know about the other Members. Differences will be there in the Parliament. There will be differences even between two Members on some issues, until and unless the issue is discussed. The Parliament is the forum to discuss issues. Finally, the Chair decides the issues. Madam, I make an earnest appeal to the Members of the Opposition and to the leaders of the Opposition to kindly come to the House and discuss the issue. I would also appeal to them to give respect to Parliamentary democracy and allow Parliamentary democracy to function. The Government have already said that they have got an open mind to consider the proposals given by them. This deadlock can be resolved in this way.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Madam, much has been said and done and the ATR has become a new word in the dictionary. While I do not agree hundred per cent with both the sides, I would like to make this point. The Congress party...

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra): Mrs. Chowdhury, I would like to know whether ATR is the new word in the dictionary or NTR is the new word in the dictionary.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: NTR. Probably, all of you are Pro-R. Temporarily I am anti-R.

"ATR" has become a new word in

the dictionary and people are discussing this. So, I will not recommend the treasury benches to pat themselves on their back or to adopt a holier-than-thou attitude and condemn the Opposition for what they are doing, because it is a fact that this scam did take place. A scam of this magnitude cannot be swept under the carpet and moreover, we cannot devalue the JPC which is an institution. It is not something which is peculiar to India alone but it has been done in other countries as well. There is a sanctity given to the institutions when we constitute them. And we cannot achieve anything by arm-twisting tactics. Nor can I, on the other hand, condone what the Opposition is doing because boycotting or putting any pre-condition and then asking for a discussion is tantamount to blackmailing. We cannot ask for two or three individuals to be removed from the House and say that only then we would proceed. Why did the Opposition not mention the names of the entire lot of people who are involved in this? If we are to be the conscience-keepers of the nation, why aren't the bureaucrats' names mentioned who are involved in this? Everybody knows that it was a chain process. So, why if that we are picking more on certain people than on the rest? Madam, there is also a grave necessity for us, as Members of this House, to ponder over our responsibilities. We are in Parliament not as individuals or Ministers. We are in Parliament with a collective responsibility towards a common goal for the betterment of our nation. All of us are public representatives in our limited capacities and I think the nation has far bigger and burning issues. The securities scam is an elitist problem. Yes, you are talking about the middle-class who had money to invest. But what about my farmers who have no money? What about the people who are living below the poverty line, who have no food to eat? What about the States which are suffering from drought? We have the national issue of rising terrorism. We find that explosives are being smuggled into our country for goondaism. And we are not

concerned with these things. Madam, the Opposition abdicates its collective responsibility towards the nation for three Ministers. Three Ministers are being placed above the nation, when we are responsible to the 800 million people. This amazes me. Yes, I think to an extent they had to take a stand. May be, up to a weak is understandable if they want to drive home their point. But we cannot totally abdicate our responsibility, and then go back and ask for votes, because the Opposition also plays a dynamic role in the act of governance, the act of governance not with absolute autonomy, not in isolation by itself. It is to have the reaction of the Opposition. If these benches remain vacant, then, the ruling party will go ahead and do what it wishes to do. And they both will be held collectively responsible in the eyes of the nation. By virtue of that, it is going to reflect on a few people like us who are not taking sides. I think we have got to apply our mind and take up various issues. This is costing money. This Parliament does not run on love and treasure both of which are absent. We need to take a serious view about this, apply our minds collectively and come to a quick solution of this problem. Madam, I quite agree with Mr. Upendra's suggestion when he said, if the speaker, in his wisdom, and our Chairman in his wisdom, choose to come together and give a verdict to the House—when we seem to be unable to come together—then, perhaps, something can come out of it. It is a suggestion on which, I think, may be, we should apply our minds. While I do appreciate the ruling party's attempt at dinner diplomacy, I feel, it should be cut down. A lot of people feel comfortable with the fact that they are being fed in the nights but nothing comes out of it in the morning... (Interruptions) I have not been invited. Madam, the fact remains that I do not wish to associate myself with either side of the House in this unhappy situation in the country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are other names also.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: I am concluding just now. But the problem is that the JPC does not infiltrate into the real India. The JPC talks of monies which could afford to be lost or had been lost and the people are still alive. I am talking about India where we have people who don't have the money, who are struggling to earn their own and trying to make both ends meet where women are being harassed, children are being kidnapped, explosions are ripping the country and where we have many other problems to which we have to apply our mind. So, on my behalf... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Renuka, I have other names.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Madam, I am concluding. On my behalf and so behalf of... (Interruptions)...

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: To which party do you belong?

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Telugu Desam (2).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On that note, thank you.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Madam, I am concluding.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have some other names also. Do they also want to speak? Otherwise, I will call the Ministry to reply.

मंत्री जी आप बोलिए ।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA): Madam, I do share the concern which has been expressed in the House. The Government is as concerned and as keen to see the House function as the Members are and as our friends, who have spoken now in the House, have said, I don't want to go into all that has been done because I think it is daily knowledge. But I would like to say that on the first day, we sat with the Leaders of the Opposition in both

the Houses. The initiative was taken by the Chairman—you were also present, Madam—and by the Speaker in Lok Sabha. I do also want to say—Madam I think you remember this—that when the Business Advisory Committee met, the first demand was for a Calling Attention and it was immediately accepted. All the Leaders of all the Opposition parties demanded it. Later, they said that they did not want it and instead they wanted a discussion. As you are aware, even though the Congress party is in a minority in this House, we ultimately agreed to it under rule 163. Under this rule, they had the power to vote on the motion which could have meant passing a resolution saying that they did not accept the report or wanted an amended report or whatever the resolution was. Even when we had made an offer agreeing to this the reply was—I would not say who said this and Madam, you were a witness to this—that it was now not a address to this—that it was now not a question of form or norm but a question of politics.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Madam, who said this?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: It was said in the Business Advisory Committee meeting. Therefore, all I am saying is, please don't think that we don't want a solution.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Who said that, Madam?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whatever that happened in the BAC and whatever that Mrs. Alvaji said, is enough. Mrs. Alva cannot go beyond this.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I am also saying that there was some objection to certain words used in the Report. There was a very strong opinion against this even from our own Members in the IPC and others. The Finance Minister had apologised. He said in the other House: "I apologise to the nation, I apologise to the Members of the Committee and I am prepared to come again and apologise the House if the Opposition Members are prepared to listen to me." After that, we announced the withdrawal of the words to

which objection was taken and we went even to the extent of saying that a there were any more objections, we were prepared to treat it as an interim report and come out with another report as we went along. For instance, everything that the Government has to do cannot be done in the first report. You are aware, Madam, that a number of cases are under investigation by the CBI. We have got 54 cases where we have finished investigation and filed FIRs. As we go along, as we achieve fresh breakthroughs, more and more FIRs will be filed and we will come before the House with more information on what more the Government has been doing. Orders were passed as far as banking system failures are concerned. Many recommendations were about correcting the loopholes or the system failures on which we had taken follow-up action. There were other issues for which many bureaucrats were responsible. Action has been initiated. Action has been taken against some of them. Here I want to say that there is a legal system also. Even if action has to be taken against them, it has to be taken as per the law of the land and as per certain norms. You cannot just dismiss them in one day or in one process without giving them an opportunity to reply. There are processes. We have said that we are prepared to accept any criticism of the Opposition, whatever they have to say. But they should come to the House, tell us what the wrong is, tell us what they want to be changed or amended and let the floor of Parliament be the central point of discussion. Let us not take the issue to the streets. These issues can not be solved in closed-door chambers. Parliament is the centre point of debate and discussion. You can bring a No-confidence Motion; you can bring any other Motion; Discuss it, then decide what is wrong and what has to be done.

Madam, I want to say in all honesty and with a very open mind that we have at no stage said that something is closed. But, you will agree with me, Madam, that it is the prerogative of the Prime Minister to appoint or to change the Ministers in his Cabinet. I do not think that this right can be taken away by

anybody under the Parliamentary system. There are reasons, there are times, and there are situations in which the Prime Minister will take the decisions that he has to take. But, to say that the Opposition can decide who should be the Ministers in the Government or who should be the people in whom the Prime Minister should place his confidence or otherwise, I think, is something which is not envisaged ever within the Parliamentary system.

I am just saying that we are open to discussion; we are open to criticism either here or outside. But there are friends here who are able to talk to us and to them, maybe as much as we are trying. We share your concern and we would request anyone who is prepared to convince them and to request them to return to the House to do their bit. We have met jointly. We have met in groups. The Prime Minister has, individually and otherwise also, in groups, called Members of the Opposition, talked to them, appealed to them and tried. He has said that he was prepared to accept certain suggestions. Let us talk about it; let us work-out something in both the Houses and sort it out;

Madam, the offer which Mr. Upendra made, rather the suggestion which Mr. Upendra made, I can tell you, has also been made by us, that we are prepared to accept the decision of the Chairman and the Speaker. Let them look at it and say what should be done. We are prepared to go by their decisions

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Do you still abide by that?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: We have made this offer in the discussions there and in the discussions here. But I do not want to go into that because most discussions, we have been old, should be behind closed doors and should not go into the Press or to the public because it has been an exercise of confidence-building. I can tell you today that we are prepared for any acceptable solution which can bring them back. But as somebody has said, let it not become a matter of a prestige that they have taken a stand and that unless we withdraw the Report they

will not come into the House. Let us find a way by which the Report can be discussed, can be improved, amended and augmented—we have offered any word that they would like to use. Therefore, I do not think it is fair to say that the Government is standing on prestige or that we have a closed mind. We want the Opposition here. We want them to participate. We want that this issue should be resolved within the House, in the two Houses of Parliament, because ultimately this is the centre point for all debates and discussions and final resolution of differences. Madam, Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I heard both the sides and their views. One thing comes out of it, that everybody is concerned that the House should run in proper order. This is my personal feeling also and, I am sure, of the Chairman too—that the House should run in proper order. There should be the Opposition, there should be the ruling party, and all of you should discuss the various issues.

I again thank Mr. Upendra for having taken the lead on the floor of the House to bring it to the notice of the Members, though we are all concerned. We are all reading in the newspapers. In our own way, we are personally one-to-one discussing the points. Mr. Speaker has taken the initiative and had meetings with everybody. I am sure everyone who is concerned about upholding the democratic values in this country is taking his own personal initiative. But, one thing has come out of it and it is that you raised it on the floor of the House; and then everybody came out and we have put on record both the opinions and I hope that we can solve this problem very soon. Whoever is the person who can solve it, can do so, there is no prestige about it, there is no dignity about it, as Mrs. Alva also has said. If there is any suggestions which the Government is willing to accept, it can come; you may do so. All of us are involved in solving it. Let us hope that by the end of this week, at least this week, we should have something and let us we have the other viewpoints on important issues that we are

discussing in the House. There is the National, Housing Policy and we will be discussing other issues also. If the other viewpoint does not come, then the Government would not be enriched by the views of those hon. Members who are not in the House. It pains me that they are not there. Sometimes it pains when there is noise. Sometimes it pains me more when there is quietness in the House. It is very painful.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Madam, the Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs has explained the Government's stand clearly that they are prepared to abide by the decision of the Presiding Officers. Let it remain like that. Let the Opposition react to that. If they are in a position to accept that then there will be some decision.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is the Opposition and it is also the Presiding Officers who should accept. The one who has to decide should also accept. I mean, there should be three people involved in it, the Presiding Officers, the Opposition and the Government. The three of them should decide what should be the *modus operandi*; and then some solution can come. But, it is really painful as a parliamentarian to see that there is no Opposition here.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Madam, there were 20 Members in the JPC. There may be 20 leaders of the Opposition.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar): Thirty Members.

SMT. MARGARET ALVA: Thirty leaders. My point is that there are 800 Members in the two Houses of Parliament. I am sure, they would also like to participate and have their views heard. They must also be given the opportunity to express their opinion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In fact, when we discussed this issue, it was not the JPC Members who participated. It is the other Members who participated in it.

Re: Non-availability of books in regional languages at the Book Shop at the Airport of Delhi.

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया (बिहार):
मैडम.....

उपसभापति : इस पर आप क्या टिप्पणी करेंगे ? कुछ और बात है ?

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया : मैडम, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार का ध्यान देश और राजधानी के महत्वपूर्ण दिल्ली हवाई अड्डे की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। महोदया, जिनदगी में हम जब कहीं भी ट्रेवल करते हैं या सफर करते हैं तो हमें कुछ पुस्तकों की जरूरत पड़ती है क्योंकि आदमी कुछ पढ़ना-लिखना चाहता है। मगर दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि दिल्ली हवाई अड्डे पर जो पुस्तक की दुकान है वहाँ पर सिर्फ अंग्रेजी की किताबें ही मिलती हैं। मैंने वहाँ आज तक, जितनी बार मैं वहाँ से गुजरा हूँ, हर बार मैंने कोशिश की है कि वहाँ से कोई पुस्तक खरीद लूँ, मगर वहाँ हिन्दी की कोई पुस्तक उपलब्ध नहीं है। महोदया, पिछली बार 22 जुलाई को जब मैं ट्रेवल करने जा रहा था, मैंने स्पेसिफिकली जाकर... (व्यवधान)

SHRIMATI JAYANTH NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam, it is a private shop.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: It may be a private shop. It is within the complex of the Government. I am not speaking about Hindi only. I am speaking about Tamil also. Don't worry. There are people who want to read Tamil...

SHRIMATI JAYANTH NATARAJAN: There are Hindi books there, but there are no Tamil books there.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Not a single Hindi book is available in that shop.

उपसभापति : अहलुवालिया जी, समस्या-वारी की बात कर रहे हैं।

श्रीमती जयन्ती नटराजन : कभी-कभी करते हैं।

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया : मैडम, आप इनकी बात पर न जायें। मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारी संस्कृति और सभ्यता को खराब.... (व्यवधान) ...
Mr. Narayanasamy, can you keep quiet?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: A lot of Hindi magazines are available there.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Yes, yes. I know what type of Hindi magazines you read. You don't know what is क ख ग

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why should there be opposition on such a trivial issue?

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया : महोदय, मैं यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी संस्कृति और सभ्यता का किताबों के माध्यम से बर्बाद किया जा रहा है। आप उस दुकान में अभी चली जायें और वहाँ एक इंडियन रायटर की इमिल श बुक दिखा दें।

SHRIMATI JAYANTNI NATARAJAN: There are hundreds over there. I got a book written by Kiran Narayanan. This is totally wrong.

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया : मैडम, वहाँ किसी भी रीजनल लैंग्वेज की कोई किताब नहीं है। पुरी दुकान में सिर्फ एक फोर्टनाइटली "सहेली" मुझे मिली। अब सहेली मैगजीन तो मैं पढ़ नहीं सकता। बस एक मैगजीन था।... (व्यवधान) ...

1.00 P.M.

महोदय, मेरी यह गुजारिश है कि दिल्ली के हवाई अड्डे पर एक पुस्तक की दुकान, जो की सरकार के द्वारा अलाट की गई है, वहाँ हर भाषा की मैगजीन और पुस्तकें उपलब्ध होनी चाहिये और अभी अगर देखा जाए, उस दुकान की अभी अगर इन्वॉयरी करा ली जाय तो वह सिर्फ किताब की दुकान नहीं है, वहाँ स्मगलड वडियाँ बिकने लगी हैं। किताबों नहीं मिलती हैं, वडियाँ बिकने लगी हैं और भी गिकट के

इपोटिड आइटम बिकने लग हैं जैसे कि वह ड्यूटी फ्री थाप हो। महोदय, मेरी आप के माध्यम से गुजारिश है।... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRIMATI JAYANTNI NATARAJAN: That is a private shop.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Madam, it is a private shop. They will run into losses if... (Interruptions) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him express his viewpoint. It is not a compulsion if he wanted to... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: It is my fault that I have allowed him to speak on Korapur. It is my fault that I have allowed her to speak on Veerappan. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia is expressing his views. Mr. Narayanasamy, ... (Interruptions) ... Mr. Ahluwalia is expressing his views in a very democratic manner. (Interruptions)

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया : महोदय, बोल लेने दीजिये, यह बाद में दोतीन मिनट बाद रोयेंगे, घर पर आकर माफी मांगें।

महोदय, मेरी बात सीधी सी है कि वहाँ पर हिन्दी और इस देश की सारी भाषाओं की पुस्तकें उपलब्ध होनी चाहिये और एयरपोर्ट अथॉरिटी को सरकार की तरफ से आदेश जाना चाहिये कि वहाँ कम से कम 50 परसेंट शैल्फ जो है, बुक शैल्फ, वह हिन्दी और दूसरी भारतीय भाषाओं की किताबों से भरा होना चाहिये।

SHRIMATI JAYANIH NATARAJAN: Madam, this is a private shop. I think with great respect to Ahluwaliaji, this Hindi fanaticism has gone too far. Madam, this is a private shop. Tenders are called for by the Airports Authority of India. You cannot force a private shop to sell only Hindi books or only books of a particular language. He will sell only those books which sell well. Madam, President Venkataramans book, which in my opinion, is the most boring book in the world, has been a best-seller because people want to know what the controversy is all about. Therefore, you cannot force a book-seller to sell only Hindi books. This is a dangerous trend of Janaticism. I disagree totally with what he said. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, no more discussion on this. I do not want to open an unnecessary controversy for nothing. That is over. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Unfortunately, every time the Tamilian Member get up... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: The need for the Opposition to be here is obvious. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I take strong exception to what Mr. Ahluwalia has said (*Interruptions*). We are Indians first and Indians last... (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Madam, we are all Indians. It is very wrong to say that. Are we not part of this country? Tamilians are also part of India... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, one minute. Everybody should sit down... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. MUTHU MANI (Tamil Nadu): Madam, I want your protection. I want to point out my grievance, with your permission, Mamam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your grievance?

SHRI S. MUTHU MANI: Madam, we want to get our matters typed in Tamil here after speaking before you.

We want to translate our matter and to send the matter to Tamil Nadu. But here, in the Rajya Sabha Secretariat, in the Typing Section, there is no typewriter in Tamil. So, kindly provide a typewriter in Tamil. (*Interruptions*) This is our main demand on behalf of the regional language people. Thank you.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Madam, all the 14 languages.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Muthu Mani, please sit down (*Interruptions*) Please sit down.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: It should be in all the 14 languages. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Ahluwaliaji, now it is enough. Ahluwaliaji raised an issue. If you do not agree with it, don't agree. But there is no point in converting some subject into Hindi-English-Tamil kind of a controversy. Please do not do it. And, as far as the typewriter is concerned, we will find out as to what can be done. We will find out.

Now, Message from the Lok Sabha.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA The Comptroller and Auditor-General's (Duties, Powers and Conditions of Service) Amendment Bill, 1994.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Madam, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:—

In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Comptroller Auditor-General's (Duties, Powers and Conditions of Service) Amendment Bill, 1994, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 8th August, 1994.

3. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the