

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (KERA LA): It is a very reasonable suggestion made by Shri Jaipal Reddy. Kindly ask the Government to give a statement just before the adjournment of the House ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: ... *(Interruptions)*... Without going into the merits or demerits of the issue involved regarding repeal or no repeal of TADA, at the moment, the question which the House is seized of is how these Members have been mishandled for no fault of theirs, for no provocation absolutely. So, it will be very appropriate that the Government should be directed to clarify the position and make a statement in this House before we adjourn today.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: I want to make a request that the Government should come with a statement immediately because the Parliament Members are being beaten up by the police and the police misbehaves purposely and knowingly. Therefore, it is only proper that you should direct the Government to come and make a statement immediately.

SHRI M.A. BABY (Kerala): This is not an isolated incident. I do not want to refer to what has happened earlier. But since the incident has taken place just under the nose of this Parliament and the Central administration there should not be any difficulty for the Central Government to come forward with a statement today itself. Therefore, I request you to kindly direct the Government to come forward with a statement by the Home Minister before the House adjourns to day. ... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): The Railway Minister wanted to react. Do you still want to react?

SHRI C.K. JAFFER SHARIEF: Madam, all that I wanted to say was that I do not think there is anything more to add to what Mr. Baby has said and what Shri Jaipal Reddy has said. About the incident the hon. Members have narrated, the Government also will have to collect the details to come and make any report before the

House. let the Home Minister do it.

All that I wanted to say was that even we on this side have taken certain positions. Even as a member of the Government, I have myself voiced about the misuse of TADA in certain parts of the country, in certain States. If TADA is being misused against any innocent man, that has to be condemned. That we have been doing. So, let us not make it a party issue. If it is being misused, let us tackle it together and it should be used only where it is required to be used, where the areas are disturbed. Let it be applied to people who deserve to have it applied to them. For those who are innocent, there is no need for it. This is what I wanted to tell. There is no need for any commotion or emotion on this. Something might have happened about which the Government can explain. I only wanted that they should cooperate and this business should be passed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): We now start with the discussion on sugar.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): Now, we start the discussion on sugar.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: What happened to the Railways?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): It was decided that at 4 o'clock we would take up the discussion on sugar.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Are you so strict on rules? It can be taken up after 6 o'clock. ... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): It was decided earlier.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: No, no, Madam. You take it up. It can be finished. ... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA): The Railway Appropriation Bill would be taken up tomorrow. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Madam, he can reply to it tomorrow.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

The situation arising from Hike in Sugar Price and delay in its import

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, before I proceed discuss this question relating to sugar, I don't know to

whom I should address myself. Who is the person competent to reply to a debate on this question? We believe that the Prime Minister alone is competent to answer this question, because so many Ministries, such as the Food Ministry, Commerce Ministry, Civil Supplies Ministry, Finance Ministry, the Cabinet Secretariat, the P.M.O. were involved in this question. Therefore, I don't know whether this discussion will serve any purpose if the discussion is to be replied to by the Minister for Food, who according to us is among the accused. Quite apart from the fact that.

[The Vice-Chairman (SYED SIBTEY RAZI) in the Chair]

We consider him an accused, we consider him totally inadequate for the job. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, I request you to direct the Government to see that the Prime Minister comes to the House and listens the discussion and responds to it. I believe, no point, no purpose, will be served if the discussion takes place in the absence of the Prime Minister. That is my first submission and I want the Government to react to this. What is the view of the other Opposition parties?

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN (Maharashtra): Sir, I would like to add one more point. I am a signatory to this discussion. When a Member gives notice of a Short Duration Discussion, he never addresses it to any particular Ministry, unlike the Calling Attention Motion which is addressed to a particular Minister and a particular Minister is responsible to answer that. The Short Duration Discussion is always addressed to the Secretary General and the Secretary General has to find out the appropriate person to answer the issue raised in the Short Duration discussion. So, in a way my point of order is that when the Short Duration Discussion notice was given on this subject we never expected that the Food Minister, whether he is competent or not, whether he did the right thing or not, whether he is accused or not these are all different subjects would reply. But, as far as this issue of Short Duration Discussion is concerned, when this Short Duration Discussion is addressed to the Secretary General, I think, there is a mistake somewhere on the part of the Secretariat in sending it to the Food Ministry because it doesn't relate to the Food Ministry only. If you read it, you will see that it doesn't say about value, it says about import and many import decisions have nothing to do with the Food Ministry. The Commerce Ministry comes into it and so, when there are multiple Ministries

involved in it and the discussion concerns the multiple Ministries, naturally the person who is responsible, who can be held responsible for all these multiple decisions, should be here to answer all our questions.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I entirely agree with the statement made by Shri Jaipal Reddy and the hon. Member from the BJP because the number of issues which are related to this concern the office of the Prime Minister. The question has arisen whether any instructions went from the Prime Minister's office or not. What has been the role of the Cabinet Secretary? For instance, what role he played in actually floating the global tenders? All these issues have come up, issues on which Mr. Kalp Nath Rai is not competent to answer. Similarly, Commerce Ministry. What has been responsible for the STC, what have been the decisions when were these decisions taken? How can Mr. Kalp Nath Rai answer these questions?

Another point, when we discussed this issue last time, Mr. Kalp Nath Rai took one hour to speak. Let me confess to you that we decided to walk out at the end of the speech. The answer he gave was nothing to do with the speech and we, out of disgust, left the House much earlier. Later on...

THE VICECHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Come to the point.

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA: When the Minister is not competent to answer the question, let somebody give who is responsible enough linking all the various Departments concerned. I would suggest as my other friends did.

श्री ईश दत्त यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश): माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, श्री जयपाल रेड्डी जी ने और दूसरे माननीय सदस्यों ने जो विचार प्रकट किया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। यह चीनी का घोटाला इस देश का एक बहुत बड़ा घोटाला है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Do not speak on that. This is a point of order.

श्री ईश दत्त यादव: मैं उस पर नहीं बोल रहा हूँ। बहुत बड़ा घोटाला हुआ है और जो अखबारों में समाचार आए हैं, उनसे लगता है कि एक मंत्री दूसरे के ऊपर और दूसरा मंत्री उसके ऊपर और कोई प्रधानमंत्री के ऊपर, कोई सचिव के ऊपर जिम्मेदारी फेंक रहे हैं। इसलिए जो माननीय सदस्यों का सुझाव है कि प्रधानमंत्री जी को, वाणिज्य मंत्री को, खाद्य मंत्री तो है ही, इन सब लोगों को रहना होगा क्योंकि ऐसा लगता है कि खाद्य मंत्री अकेले हो गये, सारी

जिम्मेदारी लगता है इन्हीं की हो गई, यह जवाब देंगे। लेकिन इसमें जिम्मेदारी सभी की बनेगी। यह सब जवाब देंगे तब पता लगेगा कि कौन आदमी जिम्मेदार है। इसलिए इन बातों का समर्थन करते हुए मैं अनुरोध करता हूँ इस इसमें प्रधानमंत्री जी। वाणिज्य मंत्री और सभी लोग उपस्थित रहें, तब इस गम्भीर विषय पर चर्चा होनी चाहिये।

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Sir, it is a short duration discussion on a subject rise in sugar prices and the delay in its import. The honourable Members are first supposed to participate in this discussion, make their points, give their views and raise queries. It is for the Government to respond. It is only when the discussion is completed that the question of the Government making a response to any discussion or any points raised by the honourable Members would arise. If the hon. members are not satisfied with any reply given on behalf of the Government, I say, on behalf of the Government, they can further put questions if they are so advised or if they so want, but to say that this discussion is totally irrelevant without participating in the discussion, without initiating the discussion, without completing the discussion is wrong. Unless the Prime Minister is present here, it seems to indicate, that the object of this discussion is nothing and this I respectfully submit. This was the attempt which was made in the June Session also and this is being repeated again. This should not be allowed ... (Interruptions)...

THE VICECHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): All right, all right, please. What is the point of order?

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL (Rajasthan): Sir, the only one point. You may kindly have a look at the delay in imports. Who is the Minister concerned?

THE VICECHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I have seen. You can put all these questions when the discussion takes place. I have listened to you already. You made your point.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Sir, import relates to the Commerce Ministry. The delay is on account of non availability of some excise concession and certain duty concessions. But Commerce Ministry is very much concerned. The Commerce Minister was to be here because it is a matter with regard to delay in imports

and that is why the price rise has been there. Because, last time, you may kindly remember, Shri Kalp Nath Rai replied on the floor of the House, that they did not import STC and MMTc imported. But, the Commerce Ministry says that they did not import. They did not import because the matter of excise duty was not finalised. So after all, somebody was to be here to give reply to this short duration discussion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I have gone through the contents of the Short Duration Question and I think I am fully convinced that it is in the full competence of the Food Minister to attend this discussion.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: It relates to the Prime Minister's Office, the Cabinet Secretariat....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): He is representing the whole Government ... (Interruptions)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: He does not represent the Government. He openly says that his Food Secretary is corrupt. How can he justify his own ... (Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Let me complete my ruling ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: So far as Shri Kalp Nath Rai is concerned, he made his position very clear on the last occasion when this issue was discussed in this House that he was not responsible for this import.

श्री ईश दत्त बादवः उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (सैयद सिबते रज़ी): आप बैठ जाएं। मैंने आपकी बात सुन ली है। बार-बार एक बात कहने से मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई सदन के समय का उपयोग नहीं हो पाएगा। मैंने इस चीज पर गौर किया और गौर करने के बाद इस नतीजे पर पहुँचा कि इससे पहले भी जो डिस्कशन हुए हैं उसमें फूड मिनिस्टर ने जवाब दिया है और इस बक्त भी फूड मिनिस्टर अपने पूरे अख्तियार से यहां मौजूद हैं और जो भी वे जवाब देंगे, मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से होगा और यह कहना कि सेक्रेटैरिएट ने गलती से इनको बुला लिया है, यह गलत बात है। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है।

The Secretariat, whatever they have done, they have done correctly. It is his Department

under which sugar ... (Interruptions)... We should start it now.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Mr. Vice Chairman ... (Interruptions)... can he give any reply? He is not in the Commerce Ministry. Sir, I said....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I am sorry the Chair is not going to oblige you like this. Kindly verify this from the Minister. I am not going to verify anything. It is not the job of the Chair to verify what you are saying. I have listened and looked into the language and terminology of the Short Duration Discussion and also I am convinced that the Food Minister who is here is totally competent to reply and whatever he says, he says in his authority as Minister, there is no need to call anyone.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Is he competent to reply?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Gupta, please do not make attributions like this. I am not permitting you. Please take your seat. Mr. Reddy, you please come to your point. The discussion should not be discontinued like this. It is already half past four. Mr. Reddy, please come to your point.

श्री ईश दत्त तादव: उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, एक मिनट का समय लूंगा... (व्यवधान) आपकी जो व्यवस्था है उसको मैं मानता हूँ। आपने जो व्यवस्था दी है उसको मैं शिरोधार्य कर रहा हूँ, इन्कार नहीं कर रहा हूँ। लेकिन पूरे हाउस और कम से कम पूरे बिपक्ष की जो मांग है इसका भी आपको आदर करने के लिए मैं अनुरोध कर रहा हूँ।

दूसरी चीज यह है कि श्री कल्पनाथ राय जी मेरे बड़े घनिष्ट मित्रों में से हैं। मेरे यहां के रहने वाले हैं। मैं नहीं चाहता कि सारी जिम्मेदारी इनके ऊपर डाली जाए... (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (सैयद सिद्दी रजी): आप यहां मित्रता मत निभाएं। मिस्टर यादव, आप यहां मित्रता मत निभाएं... (व्यवधान) यहां जो रूल्स एण्ड प्रोसीजर हैं उनके हिसाब से काम होगा। मैं आपको मित्रता निभाने के लिए कोई मौका नहीं दूंगा। कृपया अपनी सीट ले लीजिए।

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, since you are permitting me, I am left with no option. But I would like to stage a protest against the P.M.'s Office. It has become a habit with the Prime Minister to absent himself from the House when questions that concern his own Office are raised. Sir, last time we heard the reply of the Food Minister. Some of us could not put up with it. Therefore, we had to leave the House in protest. His reply was not only villainous but clownish.

And yet, the Government deems it fit to ask the same Minister to face the House time and again.

Sir, when we discussed the matter last time in the House, we did not demand any kind of enquiry at that time because we were under the impression at that time that the Public Accounts Committee was seized of the matter. After the House adjourned *sine die* at the end of the Budget Session, the ruling party thwarted the enquiry by the Public Accounts Committee. The enquiry by the Public Accounts Committee was aborted. If the enquiry by the Public Accounts Committee was allowed to be proceeded with, there would have been no need for this discussion on the floor of the House today on this question at all. Why did the ruling party abort the enquiry by the Public Accounts Committee? Apparently, the Government and the ruling party are afraid of facts being ferreted out in such a fashion as to sully its image. What did they do?

After aborting the enquiry by the Public Accounts Committee, the Government asked one Mr. Gian Prakash to conduct a preliminary administrative enquiry. We have serious Constitutional and moral objections to this.

First of all, Mr. Gian Prakash, as the former C.A.G., should not be asked to enquire into anything, for he cannot hold any office, even if he is not receiving any salary or getting any perquisites. Secondly, Mr. Gian Prakash is the Chairman of a private company, namely, Parsurampur. It throws a lot of light on the conduct of Mr. Gian Prakash. Here is a man who has been forbidden specifically by Constitutional provisions not to hold any office under the Central Government or the State Governments. Yet, he has condescended, may

stooped, to be the Chairman of a private company.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, what is the record of this company? When he was asked by Pressman as to whether his company, Parsurampur, had imported sugar, he said: "Not this year", thereby implying that the company had imported sugar earlier on, when he was the Chairman.

Sir, here, I must take the House into confidence in regard to another important fact. This company, Parsurampur, has received a new sugar licence this year. The Chairman of this company has been asked to look into the sugar scandal!

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Very serious.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Can anybody challenge this fact? I have the list with me of the 74 companies which have been given sugar licences during 1993-94. Number 69 in this list is: Shri Fatanlal Parsurampur. He got the licence. The Chairman of this company is asked to look into the sugar scandal! Can there be anything more ridiculous, more outrageous, than this?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Shame.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: It is a typical example of the depth of cynicism to which this Government has sunk. Can we expect Mr. Gian Prakash to shed any light on this problem? I am not merely trying to play on the word. We know what "Gian Prakash" means. Light of wisdom. Can he shed any light of wisdom on this question? Perhaps, he is very competent, for he is very much involved in it! When all the Opposition parties took objection to his doing the job, would any person with a sense of honour conduct any enquiry into this?

May I tell you, Mr. Vice Chairman, this company, Parsurampur, was not recommended for licence by the Food Ministry? Then who gave the licence? The Industry Ministry. Who is the Minister for Industry? The Prime Minister. When I ask the Prime Minister to reply to the debate, I do it not because I have any charges to level against him—I may have charges to level against him—but because he has been responsible for so many things in this area. And why does he run away, take to his heels, whenever he is

confronted with truth?

Now it is a perfect example of success ful mutual* The Food Minister* the Cabinet Secretary, The Commerce Secretary has a problem with the Cabinet Secretary, the Food Secretary has a problem with the Food Minister. Sometimes, we are told that the PMO passed the order, sometimes we are told that the PM himself gave an order. And all of them maintain guilty, conspiratorial silence. I therefore call it a perfect example of mutual*

In my last speech I referred to the 1989 sugar scandal. I do not want to traverse the ground that I had covered earlier.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI S.B. CHAVAN): Sir, may I intervene in the matter? When the hon. Member is making such serious charges against the hon. Prime Minister, courtesy demands that he should inform him that these are the charges he proposes to make against him, and he has also to inform the Chairman that these are the charges that he is going to make against the Prime Minister himself so that, at least with regard to the information which he requires in answer to the debate and the points that he makes, he should be thoroughly prepared. These are the rules that we have in this House, and unless these rules are completely honoured by him, I don't think he can make any wild allegations against the Prime Minister.

SHRI M.A. BABY (Kerala): That is why we are demanding the presence of the Prime Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: You can't make any charges...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M.A. BABY: We fully agree with Chavanji that these are all serious matters, and only consideration of that we have been repeatedly demanding that the Prime Minister should be present here.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: My point is totally different.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Yes, that was not the point.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: My point is, in this House, before you make any charge, not only against the Prime Minister but even against a

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Minister, what the rules demand is that the Minister concerned and also the Chairman will have to be kept informed and you have to take full responsibility for the charges that you are making against him.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am in full agreement with the Leader of the House that if charges are to be levelled against any particular individual, against a Minister or even a Member, notice has to be given that these are the charges he wants to level against him. Mr. Jaipal Reddy, as I understand, has not yet levelled any charge against the Prime Minister.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: He has said so.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: No, he has not yet. There is a difference here. Charges with regard to dereliction of duty, with regard to collusion, nonsupervision, something like that, these are not charges. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Sometimes it is said that the PMO has given the order, sometimes it is said that the PM himself has given an order. This is what he has said.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: This is not a charge. This is a matter of fact. I am sorry, this is not a charge. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mr. Vice Chairman, will you kindly take my explanation? I referred to some facts. If the facts amount to allegations, that is a different proposition. I have not levelled any allegation. I have drawn the attention of the House to certain relevant, serious facts.

Now, let me proceed, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I think the point which was raised by the Leader of the House is relevant, and you should be a little cautious in making your speech. I will look into the record. If anything is tantamount to allegations and requires evidence or anything else, it will be looked into.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Okay. But, the point is this. Let him say what allegations I have made. I challenge the Leader of the House to explain what allegations I have made. ... *(Interruptions)*...

He has not understood what I have said.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Reddy, you are a very senior Member of this House, and, whenever you speak, you speak with some authority. That is correct. But, as the Leader of the House has said, you have to be very careful in making allegations like these. I will go into the record. If anything is wrong or if anything is against the practice and procedure of the House, it will be struck down.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: When I spoke last time, I referred to the 1989 sugar scandal. I also tried to draw the attention of the House to the inquiry made by the CBI into the sugar scandal. I wanted the Government to come out with the facts the CBI inquiry had brought out. The Government did not do so. I put a question to the government on the 12th August, 1994. It was, unfortunately, an Unstarred Question. I asked the Government to tell me whether the CBI had completed the inquiry and, if so, what its findings were. The answer was evasive.

May I tell you, Sir, when the CBI enquired into the 1989 sugar scandal, it established that the then Minister of Food had misutilised his position? It established that he had prevailed upon the committee to entertain offers from unregistered firms, as a consequence of which the country lost valuable foreign exchange and the consumers in the country had to pay more for sugar. This was conclusively established by the CBI inquiry. If you want, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am prepared to authenticate this report and lay it on the Table of the House. I have a copy of the CBI report which contains the facts and conclusions in regard to the 1989 scandal.

What is the position today? In spite of the adverse conclusions of the CBI, the indicted Minister is elevated, in the sense that he is saddled with a more important portfolio. I wonder and the people also wonder—it is not a question of my wondering only—whether we have a Council of Ministers or something else. I do not like to use words like scoundrels and fraudsters. But the people wonder about it.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY

OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA): Sir, may I just mention one thing? Since the hon. Member has raised this issue of 1989 and said something about it, I do want to clarify that in 1989 the CBI inquired into it when Mr. V.P. Singh was the Prime Minister. The report of the CBI to the Prime Minister, which I have shared with him also, is that they found no proof to link the Minister in any way with anything which may be called corruption. And you know it very well, Mr. Jaipal Reddy. It is not fair to say that he was indicted or that he was tainted. I am just putting the record straight.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Sir, Mr. Jaipal Reddy has said that this was conclusively the fact, but, Mrs. Margaret Alva has contradicted him. We should know the facts.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mr. Vice Chairman, I am quoting from the CBI report. The facts are in para 10, page 16.

"The facts stated in the aforesaid paragraph would also indicate..."

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: How can he quote the Report?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I am prepared to authenticate. Since you have actually objected, give me an opportunity to authenticate and lay the Report on the Table of the House... (Interruptions) You contradicted. You challenged me. So, I will authenticate it and lay on the Table of the House.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: You read it out and let us know what is there.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: "The facts stated in the aforesaid paragraphs would also indicate how the Minister went out of the way to show favour to M/s. S.T. Diamonds and M/s. Arosan Enterprises by repeatedly insisting that forfeiture of guarantee and encashment of big bonds need not be insisted upon. He reversed the order passed to this effect on his return to Headquarters. As a result of this, the Bank Guarantee and Bid Bonds could not be forfeited. M/s. Manik Overseas on behalf of M/s. S&T Diamond went to the High Court and obtained order against forfeiture of Big Bonds. This resulted in pecuniary loss to the Government with corresponding gain to the private parties. In fact it had been suggested to

the Minister on 9.10.1989 to call for fresh tenders for delivery of sugar upto 30.10.89. The Minister rejected this suggestion and was instrumental in giving contract first of all to M/s. S&T Diamonds and thereafter to M/s. Arosan Enterprises from whom unsolicited offer had been received."

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: What more do you want, Madam?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: The entire document, which runs into 17 pages indicts Mr. Sukh Ram. I would say Sugar Ram. And now he is asked to deal with telecom contracts.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I think Mr. Reddy you should not use such words which are derogatory to anyone. It is not up to the mark of the Parliamentary practices in the House. Such attributes which are derogatory should not be used.

I would also inform you that your party has been allotted 18 minutes. Already you have taken 17 minutes. I would request you to conclude within two or three minutes. We have to conclude the discussion within a specified time.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Sir, I want to raise a point of order.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: If this is also debited to my account, naturally I will lose my time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I would deduct this time from your time.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Sir, I respectfully submit that this is a short duration discussion on a specific subject—rise in sugar prices and delay in its import in 1994. All that the hon. Member is saying relates to 1989 and 1990 and it contains allegations against an individual who has no opportunity to defend himself on the floor of this House.

THE VICECHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please take your seat. I have got your point. Yes, Mr. Reddy, you speak.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Therefore, Sir, we have been saying that this is a Government of scams and scandals, a Government of gargantuan frauds. We have securities scam, we have a PSU disinvestment scam; we have

a scam relating to purchase of preferential shares by the multinationals at highly discounted prices. Then we have sugar scam, power sector scam, oil sector scam. I am really wondering whether this Government is surviving on scams and whether it also wants to thrive further on scams! In the import of sugar and in the decisions that were taken and not taken to import sugar, there was both/ Himalayan bungling and huge swindling. Now let me refer to certain aspects. It was in August/ September, 1993, that there was a meeting of the Secretaries (Civil Supplies) of the States at the national level. At that time, it was realised that there would be a shortfall. But our Minister allowed himself to be guided by Mr. Jain, Secretary General, Indian Sugar Mills Association (ISMA) who successfully persuaded the Minister to believe that there would be no shortage. Later on, he himself imported 90,000 tonnes of sugar. They made a killing by creating a scarcity of sugar. They also went on to make a killing by importing sugar.

The Minister for Civil Supplies, Mr. Antony said in an interview that in November he wanted import of 1 million tonnes of sugar. But Mr. Kalp Nath Rai took his own sweet time. But in January, 1994, he wrote that efforts must be made to import sugar. What happened between January and March? Why did the meeting of Cabinet Committee on Prices, which was scheduled to meet on the 29th January, not meet at all? Why was this meeting of the Cabinet Committee on Prices postponed six times? How is it that the decision to import sugar through OGL was taken only sometime in the second week of March? How is it that within hours of the decision to allow import of sugar through OGL, two ship loads of sugar arrived at Kandla port? That means those who contracted sugar abroad were also responsible for getting this decision notified in March. It would take not fewer than 20 days for the ship to arrive in Indian waters. What did the Cabinet Secretary say? He retired sometime last month. In an interview to the "Pioneer" on the 8th August, the former Cabinet Secretary said, "Look, it was the Commerce Ministry which had to decide the entire issue and the Prime Minister...(Interruptions)..." Mr. Home Minister, will you kindly stay back?

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: Do you want to level allegations against me also?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: You are fortunately saddled with a noneconomic portfolio.

I am quoting from the interview given by the former Cabinet Secretary appeared on the 8th of this month: "Look, it was the Commerce Ministry which had to decide the entire issue. On the Prime Minister's bidding, the FCI was told to import sugar. Yes, a hue and cry was made alleging that the FCI was banned by the Public Accounts Committee to import sugar. It is patently a false allegation." He goes on to say many other things. The former Cabinet Secretary says that the FCI was asked to import on the Prime Minister's bidding. I am not saying that the Prime Minister should not give the bidding. In fact, my complaint is that he does not too often give his bidding. How does he justify this decision? Why does he not come clean? Why is the Prime Minister often confused with the PMO? That is the point, I am trying to make. What did the Commerce Secretary say? The Commerce Secretary told in an interview that the Cabinet Secretary had sent two unregistered parties to him. I do not have to quote the epithets, colourful epithets, and the expletives used by our Food Minister against our Food Secretary. We have a wonderful Government! The Food Minister and the Food Secretary do not talk to each other. They have not been on talking terms for the past four months. They are in the same Ministry. The Commerce Secretary and the Cabinet Secretary were not on talking terms for a few months. They remained in their respective positions.

Mr. Vice Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister as to why sugar was allowed to be exported in the beginning of 1993. Ours is a wonderful country which loses while exporting, which loses while importing. In our country, we do not have sugar refining facilities. Our sugar is not of export grade. I may, in this connection, tell you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, there is an international standard, called "Imcumsu" to judge the purity of sugar and it is judged in terms of the white colour on crystallisation. The Indian Imcumsu is 150. The international Imcumsu is 46. Therefore, in exporting sugar,

we lose money because it is not purchased at a proper price. It is not in demand in the world market. And when did we export? When we knew that the acreage came down. A wonderful decision! When the acreage of sugarcane came down, we decided to export. Later when the acreage came down, we also gave 74 new licences! May I draw the attention of the House to the fact that apart from Parasurampur, one S.N. Chaturvedi of Bangalore-fame also got the licence. Does it ring a bell in the mind of Mrs. Margaret Alva and others? I think S.N. Chaturvedi's name should set the Ganga on fire. He was the person who got Rs. one crore from Harshad Mehta by way of advance equity participation in an agrobased industry to be located in Western U.P. (Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Sir, I respectfully submit this. What has this got to do with this debate? What has it got to do with sugar? He is indulging in nothing but abusing. He must be stopped. He has no business to indulge in... (Interruptions)... vilification, denigration, of A, B, C and D. What is the provocation? (Interruptions). He must be stopped. And all that must be expunged. I respectfully submit that all that he has said must be expunged from the record of the House. It must be expunged. (Interruptions). He is indulging in irrelevant denigration of individuals.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Sir, why is he upset about "one crore"? this is a different "one crore".

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Everybody is concerned about 'one crore'. (Interruptions).

SHRI MADAN BHATIA:.... This exercise must be stopped.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Sir, I am on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): What is your point of order?

SHRI M.A. BABY: I would like to have a ruling whether the term "one crore" is parliamentary or unparliamentary. If it is unparliamentary, from when onwards has it become unparliamentary?

श्री सुरेश पचौरी (मध्य प्रदेश): सवाल यह पार्लियामेंट्री और अनपार्लियामेंट्री का नहीं है। सवाल, वह है जिस पर चर्चा की जा रही है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Baby, the context is very important. It is true that "one crore" is not unparliamentary. But if it is used like this, ... (Interruptions). Unnecessarily you are going beyond the subject. I would request you to limit the debate... (Interruptions).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I am referring to the new sugar mill licences. I would like to know... (Interruptions).

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Vilification is the hallmark of his political standing and nothing else.... (Interruptions)....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Let me request him.

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: इतना समय ले लिया है, हमको भी अपनी बात कहनी है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष: (सैयद सिबते रजी): रेड्डी साहब, मेरा आपसे अनुरोध है कि आपने काफी समय लिया है।

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: ... (व्यवधान) उसके बाद वी.पी. सिंह प्रधान मंत्री बने, तब उन्होंने क्या किया?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (सैयद सिबते रजी): रेड्डी जी, आपने काफी समय ले लिया है जबकि आपको पार्टी को 18 मिनट मिले हैं। आपने ऑलरेडी आधे घंटे का समय ले लिया है। आपसे दो बातों का अनुरोध है, एक तो कि आप अपनी स्पीच जो है, वह समाप्त करने का प्रयास करें, जल्दी समाप्त करें। दूसरा, कृपया विषय को परिधि में ही रहें।

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I am not being allowed to say what I want to say. (Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: He must be stopped from saying all this. He has nothing to say on the subject.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Sir, whenever the word one crore comes.... (Interruptions)....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Swell, I am not permitting you. Please sit down.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I referred to Mr. S.N. Chaturvedi, who was responsible for introducing Krishnamurthy to Harshad Mehta and who also had the opportunity of introducing quite a few Ministers to Harshad Mehta and I would like to know as to the basis on which he got this sugar mill licence. Look

at his record as an industrialist. He has an industry called Sreshma Chemicals which has now become a nonperforming asset. He owes Rs. 18 crore to Canara Bank and he gets a sugar mill licence as an individual and not even as a firm. I am referring to the rampant corruption in various Ministries, including the Food Ministry, the Industry Ministry etc. Now, we all know that the consumer had to pay more for sugar through his nose; we all know that the nation had to pay in foreign exchange more through its nose. What was 280 dollars at one time per tonne, rose to, in some cases, 438 dollars, as imported by the STC and the MMTC. The STC and the MMTC imported sugar at this price from one Mr. A.D. Monn. It is a perfect Scam. Why do we call it a perfect Scam? Your politicians are involved in it, your bureaucrats are involved in it, your traders are involved in it and your industrialists are involved in it. Now, in view of this, can anybody say that Mr. Gian Prakash, a person who retired 12 years back, would be able to make an impartial enquiry? I do not know from where he has been exhumed from and brought back to the stage. How does an enquiry by Mr. Gian Prakash meet the ends of justice? Will anybody set any store by the enquiry? We reject this enquiry. Mr. Gian Prakash has been asked to enquire because the powers that be—Mr. Kalpana Rai and other Ministers and the PMO, all of them have great confidence in the lack of independence of Mr. Gian Prakash. They are going to present the country with a fixed report. Everything will be whitewashed. I, therefore, demand an enquiry by a sitting Supreme Court Judge. Nothing less than that will do justice to this affair. Thank You.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, this very matter, namely, the rise in the sugar prices and the alleged delay in its import, was discussed threadbare in this hon. House in the last Session, in the middle of June. Now we are almost towards the fag end of August. What are the developments relating to the issues which have taken place between June and the fag end of August? Has there been any further rise in sugar price? This is one part of the discussion. Secondly, has there been any further delay in the import of sugar? This is the second part of the discussion. On the contrary,

between the middle of June and today, the retail price of sugar has gone down by at least Rs. 2 per k.g. in all the important cities and the country as a whole. The price of sugar—this is important—has gone down to the extent of Rs. 2 per k.g. during this period.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: What is the price now? *(Interruptions).*

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I did not interrupt you. When your turn comes you can correct me. *(Interruptions).*

THE VICECHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please don't interrupt.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the price now? *(Interruptions).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): You will get a chance. When your turn comes you can put the questions to the Minister. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Sir, during this period, more than five lakh tonnes of sugar has already been imported into this country. Sir, sugar of the value of Rs. 10 lakhs was contracted for by the Governmental agencies in June and sugar to the extent of more than nine lakh tonnes was contracted for by the private importers. During this period, there has been no delay and, on the contrary, almost 10 lakh tonnes of sugar has been imported into this country. If that be so, I would like to ask: what is the provocation for the repetition of this discussion in this House?

Sir, the provocation for the repetition of this discussion, in spite of the fact that there has been a marked decline in the price of sugar and there has been a tremendous import of sugar into the country, is to indulge in abuses, untruths, falsehood and vilification not only against the Government but also against the hon. Prime Minister. This is the provocation for this debate. Let us be very clear about it. All these allegations which have been made, have been made on nothing but falsehood and untruths. The hon. Prime Minister has been picked up for this denigration campaign for one and only one reason and that is the performance and because of the image which he has built up in the hearts of the people of this country in the last three years. It is a political phenomenon that when it becomes impossible to fight with

the a leader of the Government on an ideological plan and when that leader acquires an image of historic proportions in the hearts of the Opposition but to resort to a campaign of vilification, denigration and character assassination. This is what India has seen right from 1969. Mrs. Gandhi was a victim of this campaign for 20 years. Mr. Rajiv Gandhi became a victim of this campaign during his whole lifetime and, ultimately, he became a victim of assassination on account of the campaign of personal hatred which was unleashed against him by the Opposition.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I request the Members not to interrupt Mr. Bhatia.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Because of the tremendous performance of the hon. Prime Minister, he has been picked up in the same inanner for personal vilification.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, he has made an allegation that the assassination of Rajivji was the result of the Opposition's campaign. This is a wild allegation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Don't take it otherwise. It is his point of view. I think there is nothing to think otherwise. It has nothing to do with you. It is a general comment ... *(Interruptions)*... Mr. Baby, I am not permitting.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Sir, I am on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): It is a general comment. It has nothing to do with you. Don't take it otherwise. Please take your seat.

SHRI M.A. BABY: The allegation made by the hon. member... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Nothing is against you. Please take your seat.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Bhatia, you please sit down. He has raised a point of order. What is your point of order?

SHRI M.A. BABY: Sir, I have full confidence in you. You please examine the

record. The allegation made by the hon. Member is that the assassination of Rajivji was the result of the campaign carried on by the Opposition in the country. I very strongly object to this formulation. We are equally concerned about the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi. If such a formulation as made by the hon. member is in the record, that should be removed from the record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Baby, the comment was made in the context of his speech. He wanted to emphasise certain points and during the course of emphasising those points, he has made that general comment. It is not an attack either on the Opposition or on you. I don't think that something objectionable has been said by the hon. Member... *(Interruptions)*... No, please ... *(Interruptions)*... Members say so many things during the course of their speeches. What he said was not against the Opposition. So many things were said by the hon. Members of this House. Don't be very touchy on this issue.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: In 1993, when they found, from the economic point of view, from the industrial policy point of view and also from the political point of view, that the ground had been cut from under their feet, they picked up the scam to attack the hon. Prime Minister purely based on falsehoods and that campaign failed. Then, they picked up on the Agni issue in order to attack the hon. Prime Minister and they miserably failed. Then, they picked up on Prithvi to attack the hon. Prime Minister and again they failed miserably. Then, they picked up on GATT to make an allegation that this Government, led by the hon. Prime Minister, was parting away with the sovereignty of the country and they failed too miserably to cut any ice with their own countrymen. When he was going to the United States, they picked up on him to say that he was going to the United States and there he would surrender the interests of the country in order to attack him personally, to denigrate him, to vilify him. And what happened? Today their mouths are silent and the campaign against the hon. Prime Minister *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Sir, is it a Short Duration discussion on the Prime Minister?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Let him speak.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Since June, they were left with no issue and they picked up on sugar. During the last session also—I remember and I hope you also remember—they stood up and spoke in one voice, in a huge chorus, that the Prime Minister must be present in the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): That issue is solved. Don't touch on it now... (*Interruptions*)....I had already given my ruling.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Mr. Jaipal Reddy said in the course of that debate that since an enquiry was pending before the PAC they did not raise various issues, they did not fully discuss it and they thought that PAC would look into this matter. I would like to remind this hon. House that it was Mr. Jaipal Reddy, who not only made tremendous attacks upon the Government with regard to its sugar policy, but also demanded the resignation of the Supply Minister by saying that these were not allegations but these were truths. He did not wait for the inquiry to be completed. If he waited for the inquiry to be completed by the PAC, what made him demand the resignation of the Civil Supplies Minister? This shows... (*Interruptions*)....

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I did not demand the resignation of the Civil Supplies Minister, Mr. A.K. Antony. On the contrary, I went out of the way to say that this is one Minister who is not guilty... (*Interruptions*)....

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: On the contrary, he was the least interested in the inquiry or in the matter which was being considered by the PAC. He had already taken every fact as a gospel truth and demanded the resignation of the Civil Supplies Minister. He had made some allegations against the Prime Minister during the course of his speech last June. Today, he is repeating the same. It is totally untrue that because the matter was pending before the PAC, he did not discuss this matter threadbare or he did not demand any inquiry. This is total falsehood.

Secondly, Sir, he says that Mr. Gian Prakash is a retired CAG and the when the inquiry has

been entrusted to him, he assumed an office under the Government of India which he is not competent to do. It is a remarkable proposition. The Government of India ordered a preliminary inquiry to look into the facts relating to the shortage of sugar and the matters connected therewith and has entrusted this inquiry to Mr. Gian Prakash. Secondly, this inquiry has been entrusted to him for submitting a report, not to the Parliament, not to the country, not to the public, but to the Prime Minister for his information in order to enable him to come to a particular conclusion, one way or the other. It is simply the assistance of the former CAG, Mr. Gian Prakash, which has been enlisted by the hon. Prime Minister for the purpose of informing his own mind. This is an inquiry which has no statutory basis. It is neither binding on the Parliament nor does it concern the Parliament. It is neither binding on the country nor does it concern the country. It is a matter entirely concerning the Prime Minister. The terms of the inquiry are very clear. It is not even an inquiry. The Government has decided to conduct a preliminary administrative inquiry to ascertain the facts. This was the order. If in dealing with the situation arising out of the shortage in the availability of sugar in the current sugar season, the Government is pleased to entrust this inquiry to Shri Gian Prakash, CAG (Retd.) and it says that Mr. Gian Prakash will give his report to the Prime Minister, what is wrong in that? The Prime Minister is entitled under the rules of business to call for the records of any particular Ministry to satisfy himself as to whether anything wrong has taken place or not and he has sought the assistance of a person in whom he has confidence, in whose ability he has confidence, to go through the records and report to him as to what the correct position is. It is not even binding on the Prime Minister. He has only sought the assistance of Mr. Gian Prakash to report to him after looking into the records as to what the position, according to him, is.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: So, what is the nature of the inquiry?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: It is just a preliminary administrative report which he will give to the hon. Prime Minister. It is not binding even on the hon. Prime Minister. And

he says here is an enquiry which has been entrusted to Mr. Gian Prakash which has elevated him to a position where he comes to hold an office under the Government of India. Does he understand what the office under the Government of India means? I submit, Sir, yes, I will tell you what is an office. The Supreme Court has explained what an office is. "Office" means the true test in order to determine whether an person is an officer of the Government and whether he is in the service and pay of the Government and whether he is in the service and pay of the Government. That is the person who holds an office under the Government of India and not a person, I submit Sir, this has been further elaborated in another judgement. This is no way that you have your say everytime ... (*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Bhatia, you address the Chair. I will take care of the. Don't worry.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Sir, there are four tests which have been laid down to find out whether a person holds an office under the Government of India or not. One is that the office should be independent of the person holding it meaning thereby that the office must exist even if the person is not there. This is just a preliminary enquiry. It is not an office which has been created. A preliminary enquiry has been ordered and this preliminary enquiry has been entrusted to Mr. Gian Prakash. And the second is that there should be a relation of master and servant between the Government on the one hand and the person holding the office on the other. Does the entrustment of this enquiry, I ask the hon. Members, does the entrustment of this enquiry or preliminary enquiry for the benefit of the Prime Minister himself make him a servant under the Government of India? Does it make him a servant under the Government of India. Any person, because of his ability or capability can be entrusted with a particular function by the Government of India in the interest of the country and the public. I give just one example. Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee was asked to lead the Delegation to the Human Rights Commission in order to represent the case of India at that particular Commission. Did that make Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee the servant of

the Government of India?... (*Interruptions*)...

Sir, if a retired CAG is sent as a member of a delegation to the United Nations does it mean that he is a servant of the Government of India? He has been entrusted with a particular function to represent the case of India at the United Nations. Then the definition of the office given in the Black's dictionary that I would like to quote—only one line. What is an office? "an employment on behalf of the Government in any station or public trust, not merely transient occasional or incidental." This is merely a transient function which has been entrusted to Mr. Gian Prakash for the information and the benefit of the hon. Prime Minister—a limited function to go through the records and let him know what the correct position is. It has nothing to do with the Government of India as a whole, it has nothing to do with the public at large. The hon. Prime Minister after receiving the reports may accept what is contained in the report. The allegation which has been very seriously made about Mr. Gian Prakash's being entrusted is based on nothing but a total travesty of the correct position. He picks up this one particular fact. Mr. Gian Prakash happens to be the Chairman of a company which has been given licence for sugar. Therefore, it is said that he cannot be an independent person to hold the enquiry.

Sir, the subject of the enquiry is: delay in the import of sugar, shortage of sugar and the rise in the price of sugar. The enquiry is not into the question whether there should be more sugar factories in the country or not. (*Interruptions*) The licence which has been given—if at all it is true—is a licence for setting up a factory in the country for production of sugar. This has absolutely nothing to do either with the delay in the import of sugar or with the shortage of sugar or even with the increase in the price of sugar in April and May, 1994. What is the connection between the two?

Was Mr. Gian Prakash concerned with the import of sugar? Was any company headed by him concerned with the import of sugar? Was any company headed Mr. Gian Prakash concerned with the production of sugar during this period? The answer to these questions is, obviously, "No". If the answer to these questions is "No", the *mala fide* nature of this allegation

against the appointment of Mr. Gian Prakash is blatant and obvious. (*Interruptions*) The purpose, obviously, is an oblique purpose, i.e. a political purpose—of denigration and vilification and nothing else. I could understand if Mr. Gian Prakash had been concerned with the import of sugar. I could understand this allegation if any company of his, if any company of which he is the Chairman, had been concerned with the import of sugar. I could understand this allegation if any company of his had been involved in the production of sugar during this period. If any company of his had been involved in the production of sugar during this period, I could understand the validity or the relevance of this allegation. But such a reckless and an irrelevant allegation being made by a responsible Member of the House speaks volumes about the *mala fide* character of the entire discussion which has been initiated by him.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Politically *mala fide*!

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: This is the reason, Sir, why I had to dilate upon this subject.

Sir, coming to the subject... (*Interruptions*)... Just a minute. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): This is the way the Member has to argue!

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: After how much time has he come to the subject? How much time has he taken to come to the subject?

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, I would like to know as to what he had spoken so far.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): He is consuming the time of his party. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I have not completed my sentence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I have not permitted him to go beyond the time. I am not permitting anyone to go beyond the time.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Coming to the subject of delay...

श्री अनन्तराय देवशंकर दवे (गुजरात): अब यह सबजेक्ट पर आए हैं, इसके पहले जो बोला है वह एक्सपोज किया जाए।

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: He is putting words into my mouth. I have not said: "Coming to the subject of the discussion". I have not said that. I did not complete my sentence. Please listen to me.

Sir, coming to the subject of alleged delay in the import of sugar during this period, let me place a few facts before the hon. House. In 1993-94, the Ministry of Agriculture had estimated that the cane production in the country would be 231 million tonnes as against 230.8 million tonnes during 1992-93. The Ministry of Agriculture had estimated that in 1993-94, the production of sugarcane was going to be higher than what it was in 1992-93. This is one important factor.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Who said that?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: The Ministry of Agriculture. Secondly, Sir, sugar production during 1993-94, up to 31st December 1993, was 29.71 lakh tonnes as against 28.25 lakh tonnes up to the corresponding day of the previous year.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: What is the source?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: This means that during this period the production of sugar was higher than in the corresponding period of the previous year. Thirdly, the release of sugar for sale from October 1993 to January 1994 was higher than in those months in 1992-93. I will give the figures for 1992-93. In November 1992, the release of sugar was 6.50 lakh tonnes. In 1993-94 it was 7.20 lakh tonnes. In December it was 6.20 lakh tonnes. In 1993-94 it was 6.10 lakh tonnes. In January, it was 5.35 lakh tonnes in 1993. In 1993-94 it was 5.75 lakh tonnes. This means that the release of sugar by the factories during the corresponding period in 1993-94 was higher than the release in 1992-93. And then, Sir, the retail price of sugar during October, November, December January, February, even in March, was almost the same as in the corresponding period of 1992-93. These were the facts which were

of Civil Supplies. When these facts were there before the Ministry of Civil Supplies can it be said that the Ministry of Civil Supplies should have taken a decision to import sugar immediately, in the face of these facts? All these facts showed that there would be no shortage of sugar, that there would be no question of import of sugar. But there was one variable factor, and that was the note which was struck, not by the Government but by the representatives of apex institutions of the industry, who maintained that the production of sugar would be 111 to 112 lakh tonnes in 1993-94 as against 134 lakh tonnes in 1992-93. It is because of this information that the Ministry of Civil Supplies immediately took steps to send its officers to various sugar-producing States to find out what the correct position was with regard to the production of sugar. On 17th of January 1994 the Secretaries of all the States met together and made an estimate that the total production of sugar in 1993-94 would be around 104 lakh tonnes. Even that quantity of sugar, together with the stock which was already available in the country—because there was a record production in 1992-93—would have been enough to meet the requirements of the country in 1993-94. But at this juncture something happened. And that was the decision of the Government of Uttar Pradesh.

The Government of Uttar Pradesh made an order, as a result of which sugarcane was diverted to the production of khandsari and gur. That was the reason which led to the shortage of sugar, and that was towards the end of January when this order was made. Immediately a fresh estimate was made.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: How much sugar was produced and how much cane was diverted?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please don't disturb him.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: An immediate estimate was made by the Ministry of Supply, and it was estimated that because of this diversion of sugarcane to khandsari and gur, the production of sugar in the country would fall to 94 lakh tonnes.

From 104 lakh tonnes, immediately the estimate fell to 94 lakh tonnes, short by 10

lakh tonnes. This was the situation which was created towards the end of January. Then the Ministry of Civil Supplies immediately swung into action and made a recommendation that a situation had arisen at that time when we had to import sugar. Then the Cabinet Committee met.

The hon. Member was asking what happened in January. This is exactly what happened in January. Then the decision was taken, and sugar was put on OGL, open general licence. It was not a favour to A, B or C. I could import sugar. Any citizen of this country could import as much sugar as he would like without any import duty and without any restrictions. This is for the first time that sugar was put on the OGL, giving right to each and every citizen of this country to import sugar as much as he wanted.

Sir, I would submit that even in the month of March when it was put on OGL, there was hardly any increase in the price of sugar. But the difficulty arose in the month of April and May, at the end of April and May when the prices suddenly spurted.

It was only in the months of April and May that the price of sugar shot up. It was basically in May, but it was so towards the end of April also. In spite of sugar having been put on OGL, private investors did not come forward to import sugar immediately. The understanding of the Government of India was that once it was put on OGL because of its shortage, private investors would, on their own, import sugar to meet its requirement because the price had gone up slightly. There was shortage of sugar. Import of sugar would be a profitable proposition. Therefore, they thought that private investors would import sugar, but they did not do so because the prices were still almost stationary. They were sitting on the fence and they were not entering into any contract for import of sugar. If there was any delay in the import of sugar, it was not because of the Government of India. It was because private investors, on whom the Government had depended, continued to sit on the fence and did not import sugar into the country.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Why did the Government depend on private importers?

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I will give an appropriate answer at an appropriate time. You, please wait.

When it was found that private investors were not importing sugar, that they were sitting on the fence and that the prices had spurted very much in the month of May, at that time, commercial agencies of the Government swung into action and decided to import sugar on their own. They did not enter into the international market earlier. It is a known fact that when the Government agencies of the country enter into the international market to purchase any commodity, the international price of that commodity shoots up. It is for this reason that the Governmental agencies were exercising restraint and were leaving it to private importers to import sugar. This is an important fact, Why did they not immediately swing into action? When the Government found that private investors were not importing sugar, it was left with no choice but to enter into the international market and import sugar on its own. When the prices spurted, then, private investors also entered into contracts for import of 10 lakh tonnes of sugar. Governmental agencies also entered into the market and entered into the contract for the import of ten lakh tonnes of sugar. From June onwards after these contracts were entered into, the prices started going down. Today what is the position? I give only two figures. The figures are that the private importers, who have entered into the contract for import of 9.48 lakh tonnes of sugar, have already imported 5.80 lakh tonnes of sugar. Out of that 2.20 lakh tonnes of sugar has been released into the market. So far as the Government is concerned, the STC and the MMTC, as I stated earlier, have contracted for ten lakh tonnes of sugar, out of which 1.95 lakh tonnes of sugar has already arrived in the country. So, the total quantity of sugar which has already arrived in the country is 4.15 lakh tonnes—2.20 lakh tonnes imported by the private importers and 1.95 lakh tonnes imported by the STC and the MMTC. This sugar has been thrown into the Indian market and the prices of sugar have come down by Rs. 2 per k. g. Now, what does this show? The quantum of was a shortfall in this country could not be more than ten lakh tonnes. If the throwing into

the market of 4.15 lakh tonnes of sugar resulted in the reduction of price of sugar to the tune of Rs.2/- per kg, this means that if eight or nine lakh tonnes of sugar had gone into the market, the prices of sugar would have remained at the same level at which they prevailed in January-February-March 1994. Ten lakh tonnes of sugar has been contracted for by the private investors. If they had contracted for import of ten lakh tonnes of sugar two months earlier as the Government had adumbrated it would have been totally unnecessary for the Governmental agencies to import any sugar into this country. In order to keep the prices stable all that was required was that there should be import of sugar from March onwards to the tune of ten lakh tonnes of sugar. The private importers have made a contract for the import of ten lakh tonnes of sugar, but only late by about two months. The mischief with the prices took place only within those two months and for that all these political harangues, these falsehoods, these untruths, these campaigns of vilification and these campaigns of denigration are made. From the hon. Prime Minister right up to the whole Government everybody is being indicted. I feel ashamed that the floor of this hon. House is being used with falsehoods and untruths to indulge in this sort of false political campaign. This is the correct position. On what basis are they asking that the hon. Prime Minister should be present in the House when these are the facts? These are the facts which are in the possession of the Ministry of Food. It is the Ministry of Food alone which can give these facts. Have they bothered to go into these facts? Has the initiator of this discussion bothered to go into these figures? The answer is "no". The answer is only abuses. That is the hallmark of this hon. Member indulging in untruths, falsehoods, abuses and nothing else. That is the politics which has buried the Janata Dal deep under the ground and it is not going to rise again from the ashes which it has been reduced to. Thank you.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, चीनी का यह घोटाला कोई आकस्मिक घोटाला नहीं है। अगर गत 25 वर्षों में हम देखें तो हर चार-पांच वर्ष के बाद जब गन्ने की पैदावार बहुत बढ़ जाती है, गन्ने का दाम किसान को नहीं मिलता है तो वह अपनी अगली फसल के लिए

गन्ना छोड़कर किसी और अधिक मूल्य देने वाली फसल की ओर मुड़ जाता है और जिस वर्ष गन्ना छोड़कर किसान सूर्यमुखी फूल की ओर मुड़ जाए तो मृगफली की ओर मुड़ जाए या और किसी दूसरी फसल की ओर मुड़ जाए तो उस वर्ष चीनी का उत्पादन कम होता है। यह जो चक्र है, यह पांच-छह वर्ष के बाद सदैव आता है और इसलिए यह 1989 में आया, आज आया और अगर आज भी हम ठीक से व्यवहार न करें तो यह शताब्दी जब समाप्त होगी तब भी आएगा। इसलिए चीनी घोटाले को एक आकस्मिक घोटाला मानना एक गलती होगी।

महोदय, यह आकस्मिक घटना नहीं है और इसमें 1989 को और इस वर्ष को इसलिए जोड़ दिया जा रहा है क्योंकि अगर यह अंतर्राष्ट्रीय चक्र है तो दुर्भाग्य से गलत निर्णयों का और भ्रष्टाचार का भी चक्र उसी प्रकार घूमता रहता है। हर पांच-छह वर्ष के बाद जब चीनी का उत्पादन कम होता है तो हिन्दुस्तान में चीनी आयात की चर्चा शुरू कर दी जाती है। जब चीनी आयात की चर्चा होती है तो जिस गति से हमारी सरकारें काम करती हैं, वह गति देखते-देखते चर्चा और निर्णय में तीन-चार महीने का समय तो कभी देरी मानी ही नहीं जाती और इसलिए जब तक तीन-चार महीने का समय होता है तब तक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार में चीनी के दाम बढ़ जाते हैं। हमारी यह गलतफहमी है कि चीनी का अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार कोई मुक्त बाजार है। चीनी का अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार मुक्त बाजार नहीं है। यह बहुत इने-गिने लोगों के हाथ में है। रिफाइन सुगर एसोसिएशन, जिसके सदस्य शायद हाथ की अंगुलियों पर गिन सकें, इतनी संख्या है। यह सारी दुनिया के चीनी व्यापार को नियंत्रित करते हैं। इसलिए जब भी हम चर्चा शुरू करके आयात की बात करते हैं तो चर्चा और आयात के बीच में जो समय जाता है, उसमें जैसे इस वर्ष 200 डालर, 220 डालर से लेकर 400 डालर, 450 डालर तक प्रत्यक्ष रूप में चीनी खरीदते समय अंतर आया, वह आ जाता है। यह अंतर हमारे निर्णयों के कारण आता है और इसलिए इस अत्यंत केंद्रित और बंद व्यापार के साथ हिन्दुस्तान किस प्रकार का व्यवहार करे, यह न हमने 1989 में सीखा और जिस प्रकार सत्ता दल की ओर से अब तर्क दिया जाता है इससे यह लगता है कि किसी से पैसा निकले, मिले न मिले, यह एक अलग बात है, लेकिन लगता यह है कि इस चीनी के घोटाले से इस वर्ष भी हमारी अकल खाते में एक नए पैसे की भी वृद्धि नहीं हुई है और हम अभी भी यह मानकर चल रहे हैं कि हमने जो किया है वह ठीक किया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे तो आज, सत्तारूढ़ दल के वह सदस्य अभी हैं नहीं, यह सुनकर सबसे ज्यादा आश्चर्य हुआ कि कृषि मंत्रालय ने यह बताया कि इस वर्ष चीनी का उत्पादन निरंतर गत वर्ष से अधिक होने वाला है। अभी तक कम से कम जिन मंत्रालयों की चर्चा हम कर रहे थे उसमें कृषि मंत्रालय का नाम कहीं नहीं आया था, अब कृषि मंत्रालय अगर बीस लाख टन अधिक की घोषणा करे और अगर चीनी का कम उत्पादन हो तो यह कृषि मंत्रालय की भी पद्धति पर प्रश्न-चिह्न लगेंगे। लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि कहीं न कहीं इसमें गलती हो रही है। अगर इस व्यवहार को देखा जाए तो अक्टूबर में ही जो नागरिक आपूर्ति मंत्रालय है, जिसकी मुख्यतः जिम्मेदारी चीनी रियायती दरों पर सामान्य व्यक्तियों को देना है, उन्होंने अक्टूबर में ही कहा था कि चीनी का उत्पादन कम होने वाला है, सार्वजनिक वितरण प्रणाली में चीनी कम आने वाली है और इसलिए चीनी बाहर से मंगानी नितांत आवश्यक हो जाएगी। अब इस समय खाद्य मंत्री यहां बैठे हैं और वे बार-बार केवल एफ़्सीआई का कॉन्ट्रैक्ट और संसदीय समितियों की चर्चा करते हैं, लेकिन इसमें सबसे बड़ा पहला प्रश्न उत्पन्न यह होता है कि अगर नागरिक आपूर्ति मंत्रालय को यह लगता था कि दस लाख टन चीनी का आयात करना पड़ेगा, चीनी का उत्पादन कम होगा तो खाद्य मंत्रालय ने अक्टूबर से क्या किया? इसलिए आप सारी घटनाओं का क्रम अगर देख लें तो खाद्य मंत्रालय को इस बात का पता था-खाद्य मंत्री को भी था और खाद्य सचिव को भी था, मैं खाद्य मंत्रालय जब कहता हूँ तो गलत हो जाता है क्योंकि मंत्रालय में मंत्री भी होता है और सचिव भी होता है लेकिन क्योंकि मंत्री और सचिव एक दूसरे का चेहरा देखना पसंद नहीं करते और वे एक दूसरे पर आरोप लगा रहे हैं इसलिए मैं जान-बूझकर कह रहा हूँ कि खाद्य मंत्री को भी पता था और सचिव को भी पता था। अब अगर खाद्य मंत्री और खाद्य सचिव दोनों जानते थे तो इस आयात की व्यवस्था नवम्बर से करने के लिए क्या बाधा थी? अगर मेरी जानकारी गलत है तो आप उत्तर में कह सकते हैं। जैसे अक्सर मंत्रालय में होता है, खाद्य सचिव ने नवम्बर में ही चीनी का आयात हो, इस प्रकार का एक नोट तैयार किया। क्या यह सच है कि खाद्य सचिव ने इस प्रकार का एक नोट तैयार किया जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि चीनी के आयात की आवश्यकता है?

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: How do you know the secret?

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: इसमें कोई सीक्रेट नहीं है, यह सारे समाचार पत्रों में हैं और मंत्री जी इसका उत्तर देंगे। तो यह नोट जब केबिनेट में गया तो क्या यह रिकार्ड किया गया?

इन्हीं दिनों में बार-बार खाद्य मंत्री यह कहते रहे कि चीनी के उत्पादन में कमी नहीं होगी, चिंता करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, इसलिए अगर खाद्य सचिव और खाद्य मंत्री के नोट में अंतर आता है तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी तय करनी पड़ेगी कि आखिर किस स्तर पर यह निर्णय हुआ कि आयात की आवश्यकता इतनी गंभीर नहीं लगती? अब दिसम्बर में खाद्य मंत्रालय ने चीनी आयात की सिफारिश की है, लेकिन यह सिफारिश करने के बाद भी जो केबिनेट कमेटी आन प्राइसिस है, इसमें जब भी चर्चा हुई एक ओर तो यह कहा गया कि चीनी का उत्पादन कम होगा इसलिए आयात की आवश्यकता है, लेकिन उसी समिति की बैठक में बार-बार खाद्य मंत्री की ओर से यह भी कहा गया कि चीनी का उत्पादन बढ़ भी सकता है और इसलिए जो नरोवा-कुंजरोवा स्थिति रही और जिसके कारण सरकार यह निर्णय कर ही नहीं पाई कि आयात कब करना है, आखिर इसकी जिम्मेदारी किस पर जाती है? खाद्य मंत्रालय की ओर से, खाद्य मंत्री की ओर से जहां तक कहा गया कि अगर आयात करोगे और चीनी ज्यादा आएगी, अगर मूल्य कम होंगे तो किसानों का और हिन्दुस्तानी चीनी मिलों का नुकसान होगा, इसलिए आयात जरा सोचकर करिए। अब सत्य क्या है? अगर इस प्रकार खाद्य मंत्रालय की ओर से, बार-बार चीनी की कमी होने के बावजूद भी, यदि आयात की व्यवस्था नहीं की गई है तो क्या खाद्य मंत्री इसके लिए जिम्मेदार नहीं है? यह दुनिया की अजीब सरकार है कि खाद्य मंत्री कहते हैं कि खाद्य सचिव ने जो किया, इससे मेरा कोई संबंध नहीं। अब खाद्य सचिव को तो मैं यहां बुला नहीं सकता, हमारी दृष्टि में संसद के लिए जिम्मेदार तो खाद्य मंत्री है, खाद्य मंत्री या उनकी पूरी सरकार है और मैं आश्चर्य से देख रहा हूँ कि चार महीने से प्रधान मंत्री उस पर कुछ निर्णय नहीं ले रहे हैं, जबकि खुलेआम खाद्य मंत्री यह कहते जा रहे हैं कि मेरा सचिव अच्छा नहीं है-सचिव भी वही है, मंत्री भी वही है, स्थिति भी वही है। अगर यह स्थिति हुई तो क्या इस प्रकार से खाद्य मंत्रालय अपनी जिम्मेदारी से मुक्त हो जाता है? अब यह केबिनेट कमेटी आन प्राइसिस जो है, इसने भी कोई जल्दी निर्णय नहीं लिया।

भाटिया जी ने कहा कि गुड़ के निर्णय के कारण यह हुआ है। मैं बड़ी नम्रतापूर्वक खाद्य मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि गुड़ बनाने पर प्रतिबंध डालने के निर्णय का चीनी के आयात और कमी के प्रश्न से कोई संबंध नहीं है। यह निर्णय जनवरी का है और जब चीनी के आयात की जरूरत अक्टूबर से महर्षस हो रही थी तो गुड़ के निर्णय पर इसकी जिम्मेदारी डालना मुझे ठीक नहीं लगता। अब खाद्य मंत्रालय ने फरवरी में वित्त मंत्रालय को लिखा।

इसलिए इसमें वित्त मंत्रालय की भी जिम्मेदारी आती है कि आप एस०टी०सी० और एम०एम०टी०सी० को आयात के बारे में अनुमति दें। अब इसमें हुआ क्या, खाद्य मंत्रालय के यह लिखने के बाद भी एम०एम०टी०सी० और एस०टी०सी० बाजार में नहीं गई। प्रधानमंत्री को बुलाने का जो प्रश्न आता है भाटिया जी, वह यहां आता है। मैं यहां प्रधानमंत्री से संबंधित व्यक्तिगत बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ। बुलाने का प्रश्न इसलिए आता है कि एस०टी०सी० और एम०एम०टी०सी०, ये संस्थाएं मुक्त व्यवस्था से पहले जो थीं, मुक्त व्यवस्था के बाद वैसी नहीं रही हैं। अब जैसा एस०टी०सी० और एम०एम०टी०सी० के अधिकारियों ने कहा कि इनसे कहने के बाद भी बाजार में जाकर इन्होंने चीनी नहीं खरीदी क्योंकि इनको पता था कि चीनी ऊंचे दामों में खरीदकर कम दामों में बेची जाए तो उसके पीछे जो 500-700-1000 करोड़ रुपए का घाटा होगा, यह घाटा कौन देगा। इसमें यह आया है कि यह कहा गया कि एस०टी०सी० और एम०एम०टी०सी० कोई धर्मार्थ संस्थाएं नहीं हैं। अन्य दुकानदारों की तरह वे भी बाजार में जा रही हैं। अगर मुनाफा होगा तो काम करेंगे, घाटा होगा तो नहीं करेंगे। इसलिए इनके पुराने उदाहरण उचित नहीं हैं।

अब ये जो एस०टी०सी० और एम०एम०टी०सी० बाजार में खरीदने नहीं गई तो क्या केन्द्र सरकार के पूर्व निर्णय से यह संबंधित नहीं है क्योंकि जब तक एस०टी०सी० और एम०एम०टी०सी० को यह कहा नहीं गया कि आपको जितना भी घाटा होगा, वह हम देंगे, केन्द्र सरकार देगी, तब तक वह बाजार में नहीं गई। इसका वित्त मंत्रालय के पास क्या उत्तर है? अभी भाटिया जी ने बिल्कुल ठीक कहा कि वित्त मंत्री के पास शायद खाद्य मंत्री चले गए होंगे कि चीनी कम हो रही है। तो उन्होंने कहा कि चिंता मत करो, मैं चीनी के आयात को ओ०जी०एल० पर रख देता हूँ। अब ये माना गया कि चीनी का आयात अगर ओ०जी०एल० पर चला जाए तो लोग टूट पड़ेंगे और बाहर से चीनी लाएंगे। मुझे लगता है कि इस उदाहरण से यह स्पष्ट हुआ कि मुक्त बाजार की भी अपनी मर्यादाएं हैं। चीनी को ओ०जी०एस. पर रखने के बाद भी जो निजी क्षेत्र है, उस क्षेत्र को इसमें जितना आगे आना चाहिए था, जितनी संभावना सरकार को लगती थी, वह नहीं आए। सरकार ने चीनी को ओ०जी०एस० पर रखने के पहले क्या इस बात का विचार किया था, क्या इसका अंदाजा लगाया था कि चीनी का घाटा कितना होगा और ओ०जी०एल० पर जाने के बाद निजी क्षेत्र द्वारा कितनी चीनी लाई जाएगी, उससे बाजार में कितनी जाएगी, कितनी कीमत तय होगी, इसका अनुमान किया था।

अब वित्त मंत्रालय की इस नीति का निर्णय कौन करे? एस.टी.सी और एम.एम.टी.सी. की गलती का निर्णय कौन करे? अब अप्रैल में थोड़ी चीनी आई लेकिन उसका उपयोग नहीं हुआ। अब मार्च में निर्णय हुआ। निर्णय 9 मार्च को होता है और दुनिया की खबर 22 फरवरी को हो जाती है। आखिर अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार में आपकी कैबिनेट के निर्णय अगर 15 दिन पहले पता चल जाए और उससे दाम बढ़ जाए तो कौन इस पर प्रकाश डालेगा? कौन इसको टूटेंगा? उसके बाद अगर आप देखें तो वहां से चर्चा जिस कारण शुरू हुई, वह यह था कि वह निर्णय लीक हो गया। चीनी के दाम फिर बढ़ गए। प्रधानमंत्री जब विदेश जा रहे थे तो उन्होंने कैबिनेट सेक्रेटरी को बुलाकर कहा कि कुछ देखो। उन्होंने एफ.सी.आई. को कहा। मुझे इस संबंध में केवल एक बात कहनी है। जहां तक नियमों का प्रश्न है, अगर सरकार का निर्णय था कि एफ.सी.आई. के द्वारा इस प्रकार का आयात नहीं करना चाहिए और एस.टी.सी. और एम.एम.टी.सी. के द्वारा करना चाहिए।

6.00 P.M.

यह अगर सरकार का निर्णय था कि एफ.सी.आई. के द्वारा इस प्रकार का आयात नहीं करना चाहिए और एस.टी.सी. और एम.एम.टी.सी. के द्वारा करना चाहिए, तो खाद्य मंत्री संसद को यह उत्तर देकर यह नहीं कह सकते कि मैंने क्या गलत किया। नियमों की दृष्टि से उन्होंने ठीक किया। लेकिन सवाल केवल नियमों का नहीं है। आखिर वह निवृत्त भले हुए हों, मुझे व्यक्तिगत किसी से कुछ देना-लेना नहीं है। लेकिन अगर खाद्य मंत्री अपने साक्षात्कार में यह कहे... (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Mahajan, will you yield for a moment? Hon. Members, according to the List of Business, at 6 o'clock we have to take up the Half-an-Hour Discussion. But, still there are three speakers more on this subject which we are discussing. I would like to have the sense of the House. I would like to know whether we should complete this subject and then switch over to other subject.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sir, let us complete this subject.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: मैं यह कह रहा था कि जहां तक नियमों का प्रश्न है, खाद्य मंत्री का यह कहना ठीक है कि जहां तक चीनी आयात का संबंध है, एस.टी.सी. और एम.एम.टी.सी. के द्वारा होना चाहिए था। एफ.सी.आई.

को इस प्रकार के टैंडर देना जो नियम बने, उसके अनुसार गलत था। यह ठीक है। लेकिन हमें संबंध कि खाद्य मंत्री क्या कहते हैं और यह सैक्रेटरी क्या कहता है और वह सैक्रेटरी कहता है कि "This is none of our business." अगर आप सरकार की पूरी सरकार के रूप में देखते हैं तो उनके आपस के झगड़े से हमको लेना-देना कुछ नहीं है और फिर कैबिनेट सचिव ने भी नियम तोड़ा होगा तो उसकी इस देश में क्या सजा होती है? अभी-अभी एक साक्षात्कार में खाद्य मंत्री ने कहा है कि:

"The decision to import sugar worth Rs. 500 crores was taken by the Food Secretary and an extremely corrupt Cabinet Secretary without my knowledge."

यह 7 से 21 अगस्त के "बिजनेस टूडे" में कल्पनाथ राय जी के साक्षात्कार को मैं उद्धृत कर रहा हूँ।... (व्यवधान) उसमें यह स्पष्ट रूप से कहा है और आगे दो बार कहा है "He had to go because he was corrupt."

मतलब, कैबिनेट सचिव को बदलने का प्रधान मंत्री का जो निर्णय था कम से कम वह खाद्य मंत्री के अनुसार - चूंकि कैबिनेट सैक्रेटरी करप्ट थे, पहले तो उन्होंने एक्सट्रीमली करप्ट कैबिनेट सैक्रेटरी कहा और अब कहा गया कि वह करप्ट थे इसलिए उनको जाना पड़ा। कैबिनेट सैक्रेटरी को क्यों जाना पड़ा, न जाना पड़ा यह प्रधान मंत्री जानें। लेकिन शुरू में हमने प्रधान मंत्री की मांग इसीलिए की थी कि खाद्य मंत्री खुलेआम यह कहें कि कल तक हमारा जो कैबिनेट सैक्रेटरी था "He was an extremely corrupt person. He had to go because he was corrupt."

और इसलिए उन्होंने इसमें यह कहा और जो चीनो एफ.सी.आई. से मंगाना था, उसको अगर जोड़ा है तो क्या कैबिनेट सैक्रेटरी का एफ.सी.आई. से चीनी मंगाने का निर्णय करप्टन से जोड़ा था और इसलिए अगर कैबिनेट... (व्यवधान) यहां मारग्रेट आल्वा जी बैठी हैं। कैबिनेट जो कम से कम नौकरशाहों में सर्वोच्च माता जाता है, उस पर इसी सरकार का एक वर्तमान मंत्री "एक्सट्रीमली करप्ट कैबिनेट सैक्रेटरी" इस प्रकार का अगर आरोप करे, मैं निश्चित कल्पनाथ जी को जानता हूँ कि वह जो भी कहते हैं उसके पीछे एक तर्कशास्त्र और उनके पास प्रमाण जरूर होंगे। यह ऐसा नहीं है कि उन्होंने ऐसे ही कुछ कहा होगा। लेकिन स्वाभाविक रूप से इसका अर्थ है चीनी के घोटाले में कल्पनाथ जी की गलतियां क्या हैं, यह तो अपने आप में और सवाल है। लेकिन अगर इसमें कैबिनेट सैक्रेटरी ने जो नियम तोड़ा और एफ.सी.आई.

की ओर से मंगाया, क्या उसमें करप्शन था और इससे एक समस्या और निर्माण हुई कि खाद्य मंत्री ने इस टैंडर को, ताकि यह गलत मंगाना यह पद्धति से छोड़कर है, यह मुझे पूछा नहीं था, मैं संसद को जिम्मेदार हूँ इसलिए मैं यह टैंडर नोटिस कैंसिल करता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जहाँ तक नियमों का सवाल है, मैं खाद्य मंत्री को इसमें नियमों के अर्थ में कोई गलती नहीं दे सकता। लेकिन नियम अलग हैं और नियमों के परिणाम अलग हैं। क्या खाद्य मंत्री ने केवल और हम जो काम कर रहे हैं, यह केवल नियमों पर ऊंगली रखकर अगर काम करें जिससे देश का नुकसान हो, तो मुझे लगता है कि नियम से देश की आवश्यकताएं महत्वपूर्ण हैं। देश का हित महत्वपूर्ण है और उस दृष्टि से जिसमें आपने एफ.सी. आई. के टैंडर कैंसिल कर दिए, आप नियमों में तो कहते हैं मैंने गलत नहीं किया है लेकिन उससे चीनी के दाम फिर बढ़ें, इसके संबंध में आपको और क्या कहना है?

अब आगे जहाँ तक जांच का सवाल है, अपने पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी को तो जांच करने नहीं दी। यह तो बीच में तीन दिन का सेशन आया, कुछ बात चली लेकिन जैसा जयपाल जी ने कहा कि सबको लगा कि पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी में यह मामला जाएगा, वहाँ जांच होगी। किसी ने ज्यादा कुछ पूछा नहीं और जब संसद का अधिवेशन एक सप्ताह पहले होना था तो प्रधान मंत्री की ओर से कहा गया कि मैंने ज्ञान प्रकाश जी को कहा है कि वह देख लें। अब जयपाल रेड्डी जी यह कह रहे हैं कि ज्ञान प्रकाश जी को चीनी मिल की अनुमति मिली थी इसलिए वह इस जांच के लिए उपयुक्त व्यक्ति नहीं हैं। मुझे लगता है कि हो सकता है कि चूँकि उनको चीनी मिल की अनुमति मिली थी, इसलिए बहाना हो गया कि वे इस विषय में विशेषज्ञ हैं तो शायद वे इस चीनी आने-जाने में इसको ज्यादा समझते होंगे। अवश्य अनुमति मिली। सवाल ज्ञान प्रकाश जी का नहीं है, जयपाल जी ने इसमें उचित प्रश्न उठाया है, आप टेक्नीकैलिटी में मत जाइए। अब ज्ञान प्रकाश जी को चीनी मिल का लाइसेंस मिला था, इम्पोर्ट का थोड़ा ही मिला था। सवाल चीनी के लाइसेंस, मैं उस प्रदेश से आता हूँ जो हिंदुस्तान का 40 प्रतिशत चीनी निर्माण करता है और चीनी के लाइसेंस के बारे में खाद्य और इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्टर ने किस प्रकार के दलाल बैठे हैं, ये मेरे से ज्यादा कल्पनाथ जी जानते होंगे। यहाँ तो एक फाइल आगे जाने के लिए लाखों रुपयों की बात होती है। अब इस प्रकार के भ्रष्टाचार में जिस व्यक्ति को एक लाइसेंस मिला, सवाल लाइसेंस का नहीं है। उस व्यक्ति को अगर आप दूसरी चीज़ में यह कहते हो कि

आप इसकी जांच करो तो क्या वह जांच ठीक होगी? लेकिन भाटिया जी ने बिलकुल ठीक कहा है कि यह जांच अगर होती तो प्रधान मंत्री पर थोड़े ही बंधन है कि वे उसे मान लें? इसलिए जांच जो भी आए, भाटिया जी के भाषण में दो बातें मुझे सारांश रूप में लगीं, पहले उन्होंने कहा कि पहले तो इसमें गड़बड़ कुछ नहीं हुई तो मुझे लगा कि हमको समझाने के बजाय प्रधान मंत्री को समझाते तो कम से कम ज्ञान प्रकाश जी की तकलीफ तो कम हो जाती कि ऐसी समिति की आवश्यकता ही नहीं थी। मैं तो प्रधान मंत्री को निर्णय, उनके भाषण को सुनकर प्रश्नचिन्ह लगाना चाहता हूँ कि घोटाला हुआ ही नहीं। ऐसे कैसे प्रधान मंत्री हैं जो बिना घोटाले के समिति की नियुक्ति कर बैठें? और इसलिए मुझे लगता है कि इसमें नियम में मत जाइए। यह सीधा स्पष्ट रूप से घोटाला हुआ है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अब इस घोटाले पर मैं इतना ही कहना चाहूँगा कि यह हिंदुस्तान की इस सरकार का तीसरा घोटाला है और ये जो तीन महा घोटाले हैं, पहली वर्षगांठ पर जो महा घोटाला हुआ था वह सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के शेयर का घोटाला था। कम से कम उसमें तो ठीक पता चला कि साढ़े चार हजार करोड़ का देश का घाटा हुआ। सी.ए.जी. ने जो कहा, मैं उतना ही कह रहा हूँ, उससे ज्यादा हो सकता है। इस सरकार की दूसरी वर्षगांठ पर दूसरा घोटाला हुआ बैंक का। अब इस घोटाले में कितना रुपया गया है, इसका अभी तक किसी को पता नहीं है।

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता (मध्य प्रदेश): और कहा गया है, यह भी पता नहीं है।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: अब लोग कहते हैं कि आठ हजार होगा, बारह हजार होगा, पंद्रह हजार होगा। और तीसरी वर्षगांठ देखें तो यह चीनी घोटाला हुआ। अब इसमें भी इस चीनी के महा घोटाले में भी कितना है, इसका अंदाज़ तो नहीं लगा है लेकिन ये भी चार, पांच छह हजार करोड़ से कम तो नहीं होगा। अब अगर आप इस सरकार के घोटालों को गिन लें तो बड़े घोटाले ही इस सरकार ने तीन वर्ष में हुए हैं, उसमें कुल घोटाला 25 हजार करोड़ से अधिक हो जाता है।

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): अब आगे-आगे देखिए होता है क्या।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: और इस 25 हजार करोड़ को तीन वर्ष की उपलब्धि पर जब बांटा जा रहा था तो मुझे लगा कि इस सरकार का नाम गिनीज़ बुक ऑफ वर्ल्ड रिकार्ड्स में लिखना चाहिए कि ये सरकार प्रतिदिन 25 करोड़ का

घोटाला करने की क्षमता रखती है। इसमें सैटर्डे, संडे होलिडे नहीं होता। मतलब मैंने जो हिसाब किया है, उसमें इस प्रकार की छुट्टी नहीं है अब इस प्रकार का घोटाला है। सब में केवल एक समानता है कि जो पहला घोटाला हुआ, पहली वर्षगांठ का, किसी को सज़ा नहीं हुई। बैंक का घोटाला हुआ, किसी को सज़ा नहीं हुई। चीनी का घोटाला हुआ, सज़ा किसी को नहीं हुई। भाटिया जी ठीक कह रहे हैं कि पांच लाख टन चीनी आ गई है। (व्यवधान)

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री (उत्तर प्रदेश): वो रियायत हो गया था तब गया है।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: वो रियायत हो गए हैं। जो गए नहीं।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: मैं आप से यह कह रहा था कि इन सारे घोटालों में एक ही समानता है कि किसी को जांच ठीक ढंग से नहीं हुई, किसी को सज़ा हुई नहीं। मुझे किसी पर आरोप नहीं लगाना है, न प्रधान मंत्री पर, न खाद्य मंत्री पर, मुझे आरोप में रुचि नहीं है, लेकिन क्या इस देश की संसद 25-30 हजार करोड़ रुपये के घोटाले को इसी तरह....

श्री जगेश देसाई (महाराष्ट्र): मुझे यह समझ में नहीं आया कि आप ने कहा कि 6 हजार करोड़ का घोटाला हुआ। कहां से लाए वह फिगर, जरा हमें समझाइए। इतनी तो शुगर की कीमत नहीं होगी... (व्यवधान)

श्री सतीश अग्रवाल: इतनी नहीं होगी तो कितनी है वह आप बता दो... (व्यवधान)

श्री जगेश देसाई: 6 हजार करोड़ की कीमत नहीं हो सकती... (व्यवधान)

श्री सतीश अग्रवाल: जगेश देसाई जी, इन्होंने गलत कहा है, प्रमोद भाई ने गलत कहा है, हम भी फाइनेंस के आदमी हैं, आप भी फाइनेंस के आदमी हैं, उन्होंने गलत कहा, लेकिन आप स्पष्ट कर दें, आप बता दें कि कितनी रकम है?... (व्यवधान)

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जे.पी.सी. भी बैंक घोटाले का प्रमाण नहीं लगा सकी जिसमें जगेश देसाई जी भी सदस्य थे। अगर ज्ञान प्रकाश के कागज़ मुझे दे देते तो सात दिन के अंदर मैं घोटाले का पता लगा लेता... (व्यवधान)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: This is totally false... (Interruptions)... That is what I am saying... (Interruptions)...

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: मुझे अंत में इतना ही कहना है कि

इस सरकार की प्रतिमा बढ़ी है, जैसे भाटिया जी ने कहा, प्रधान मंत्री का राजनीतिक वज़न बढ़ा है, कद बढ़ा है, वह महामानव के रूप में लोगों के सामने परिवर्तित हुए हैं। हर एक को अपना नेता ऐसा ही लगना चाहिए, मुझे उसमें दिक्कत नहीं है, लेकिन मुझे इतना ही कहना है कि सरकार की इतनी अच्छी प्रतिमा के साथ भी हम यह न भूलें कि इस सरकार पर एक के बाद दूसरे और दूसरे के बाद तीसरे घोटाले और भ्रष्टाचार का भी आरोप लगा है। यह हमारे विपक्ष का आरोप है, इतना कह कर आप खामोश नहीं रह सकते। जिस अग्नि-परीक्षा के लिए लालकिले से प्रधान मंत्री कहते रहे कि मैं अग्नि परीक्षा के लिए तैयार हूँ, इन तीनों मामलों में किसी अग्नि परीक्षा के लिए वह तैयार नहीं हुए। अगर इसी प्रकार घोटाले के पीछे घोटाले होते रहे, स्वाभाविक रूप से जनता की अदालत जो भी फैसला करेगी, मुझे इस में नहीं जाना है, लेकिन मैं सोच रहा था कि इतने सारे घोटाले हुए हैं, स्पष्ट रूप से हुए हैं तो इस में हम मांग क्या करें? यह हम अगर मांग करें कि इस की सीबीआई की इक्वायरी कराओ तो सीबीआई की इक्वायरी हो चुकी है और सीबीआई इक्वायरी के संबंध में आपने तो सीबीआई की रिपोर्ट पढ़ी मैं कल्पनाथ जी की रिपोर्ट पढ़ता हूँ। उन्होंने भी चार पेज की रिपोर्ट बनाई है शुगर के स्कैम पर। उन्होंने कहा है:-

"Interestingly, the CBI report of the Sugar scam, which indicts the then Food Minister. Shri Sukh Ram has been"

खाद्य मंत्रालय के राज्य मंत्री (श्री कल्पनाथ राय): श्रीमन, मैं इसका कंट्रेडिक्शन दे चुका हूँ, यह गलत छपा है। मैं आलरेडी दे चुका हूँ। (व्यवधान)

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: मुझे पढ़ने की भी आवश्यकता नहीं है। अगर उन्होंने इस को डिनाई किया है तो यह बिजिनेस टुडे अपने स्टैंडर्ड से सोचेगा, नेचुरली टेप-रिकार्ड्ड चीजें होती हैं, वह बाद में अपनी लड़ाई लड़ेंगे, लेकिन इतना स्पष्ट है कि 1989 में जो सीबीआई की रिपोर्ट आई, जो अभी-अभी कम से कम जयपाल रेड्डी जी ने पढ़कर सुनाई। वैसे तो संसद के नियमों के अनुसार पढ़ने के बाद आर्थेटिकेट करके टेबल पर रखना ही चाहिए था.....

श्री एस जयपाल रेड्डी: वह डिमांड नहीं किए हैं.... (व्यवधान)

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: He may not demand it. But as a Member when you quote something or some report, I think the rules

demand that you should lay it on the Table of the House.

यह तो नियमों के अनुसार काम करना है। लेकिन ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Now that Mr. Pramod Mahajan is suggesting that I authenticate the report, I will do it tomorrow morning. Let this be put on record.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Because you cannot quote from a report without authenticating and putting on the Table. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, under the rules, a member is obliged to authenticate it and lay it on the Table if he is quoting from a document. If the quoting is objected to by the Members and the Member is obliged to authenticate it and lay it and since Mr. Pramod Mahajan has made a demand, I will try to respond and I will do it tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): This matter will be decided between you and the Chairman, what is necessary and what could be laid. It has to be decided inside the chamber by the Chairman. By saying this, I think, it has no connection with this, at present.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mrs. Margaret Alva, our hon. Minister can spare us the trouble if she can circulate the copy.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Copy of what?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Yes, Mr. Pramod Mahajan, you please conclude. You are already delayed.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Mr. Jaipal Reddy seems to have more documents than the Government have. ... (Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I think, don't raise a discussion like this... (Interruptions)... Please, Mr. Salim. Yes, Mr. Pramod Mahajan.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: कल्पनाथ राय जी ने जैसे कंटराडिक्ट किया वैसे ही मारग्रेट आलवा जी भी कंटराडिक्ट करें जयपाल जी की रिपोर्ट को तो अच्छा होगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (सैयद सिबते रज़ी): आप कृपया बहस में न पड़िये।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: ठीक है वह कंटराडिक्ट नहीं कर रही है तो इसका मतलब मैं यह समझता हूँ कि जयपाल जी ने जो कहा है वह सत्य है। इस प्रमाण को लेकर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर सीबीआई की इन्क्वायरी हुई तो उस पर तो आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिए क्योंकि सीबीआई की इन्क्वायरी में इंडिक्टमेंट इज ए वे फार परमोशन। मुझे लगता है खुद मंत्रियों को डिमांड करनी चाहिए कि सीबीआई की इन्क्वायरी करो, इंडिक्ट करो। उससे प्रमोशन होती जाती है। सीबीआई इन्क्वायरी से कुछ निकलेगा नहीं। दूसरे मैं सोच रहा था उसके लिए जेपीसी डिमांड करूँ। लेकिन फिर जेपीसी, फिर एटीआर, फिर एटीआर का झगड़ा और फिर बहिष्कार। इसलिए मुझे लगता है जेपीसी की कोई आवश्यकता इसमें नहीं है। इसलिए जैसा जयपाल जी ने कहा मुझे लगता है उच्चतम न्यायालय के एक न्यायाधीश के समक्ष...

श्री एस. जयपाल रेड्डी: सीटिंग मेम्बर।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: पुराने नहीं, वह भी अच्छे होते हैं लेकिन फिर भी सीटिंग हो तो ज्यादा अच्छा है, उनके समक्ष ये सारे कागज दिये जायें और इस घोटाले के लिए जो जिम्मेदार हों उनको इसमें सजा होने का प्रावधान करें। मैं केवल इतना ही कहूँ कि अगर इस प्रकार का प्रावधान हम न करें और किसी को सजा न दिलवायें तो इसका अर्थ यह होगा कि इस घोटाले को सत्तारूढ़ दल की ओर से या तो पर्दा डाला जा रहा है या समर्थन हो रहा है। इसलिए अपनी सरकार की प्रामाणिकता और जिस पर सत्तारूढ़ के सदस्यों को पूर्ण विश्वास है ऐसा मुझे लगता है, यह प्रामाणिकता सिद्ध करने के लिए, यह समय की मांग है कि वह विपक्ष की मांग मान ले। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Dr. Biplab Dasgupta. You have eight minutes.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, have some mercy on me. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, my friends in the Opposition have raised some very interesting points and I would not try to repeat them. The question is very simple.

Between May, 1993 and May, 1994, there has been a 50% increase in the wholesale price of sugar. It went up from something like Rs. 11.25 to Rs. 16.50 in May, 1994. The question is when the average level of increase in prices was around 10-11 per cent, this increase has been five times more than the average price increase

in the country. So, the question was why this price increase? Their explanation was partly right. There has been a decline in the acreage as far as sugarcane production is concerned and it is true that the production of sugar itself has declined. It has declined very substantially both the acreage and sugar production. For instance, in 1992, the total production was 134 lakh tonnes in 1992-93, it came down to 106 lakh tonnes and in 1993-94 to 96 lakh tonnes—a very sharp decline. The question is, when sugar is such an important item of consumption, what did the Government do to ensure that this gap between demand and supply was bridged by imports? That is the question. Sir, that was the question. Did the Government anticipate that there would be a shortfall in the supply and if so what measures the Government undertook to ensure that there would be no increase in price? What did they do? We find that despite this shortfall in domestic supply, not enough was done to initiate the process for making imports at the right time. In November—please deny if this is not true—the Food Secretary informed the Minister that there would be a serious demand-supply gap; so, 15 lakh tonnes should be secured through imports. In fact, the Civil Supplies Minister also insisted that in order to maintain supply to the Public Distribution System, this import should be undertaken. On March 9—please tell us if this is wrong—the Cabinet Committee on Prices asked the State Trading Corporation to carry out the necessary import. On April 18, the Prime Minister directed that the supplies to the Public Distribution System should be maintained, but on April 25—please tell me if it is true or not—the Food Minister wrote to the Prime Minister saying that the PDS supply should be cut. He wanted a cut in the supplies to the Public Distribution System! Please deny if this is not the case. On April 25, did you not recommend the cut in the Public Distribution System? Then, on May 3, the Prime Minister reiterated his directive that the import should be undertaken and the Public Distribution System should be maintained. On May 13, the Cabinet Secretary organised a meeting of the Committee of Secretaries and in that meeting the performance of the State Trading Corporation was heavily criticized by the Secretaries. Please deny if this is not the case. It should be verified from the records that the

Commerce Secretary himself suggested that imports should be undertaken through the FCI because the State Trading Corporation was not performing. And then, this global tender issue came up. The Minister, according to the Departments Secretary, and according to whatever reports appeared in the papers, and the Cabinet Secretary who is very much involved in the decision, and gave the explanation, simply disappeared without leaving any contact address. If this is the case, I do not know how he is functioning in the Ministry.

But, then, the directive came from the Prime Minister's Office. Mr. Saifullah himself was involved. The direction was that something immediate should be done to ensure that the prices do not continue to increase any further. On that basis they floated the global tender on May 16, and, on May 17, the written direction of the Cabinet Secretary went to the Food Secretary. On May 19, when the Minister returned from his tour, wherever he was which was not known to his officials, he was given some results of the global tender. He was not given any decision. Decision was not taken by his Secretary. He was asked to make the decision. This is the position; please decide. At that point of time, the Minister cancelled the global tenders on the ground that import was not necessary. It was only after May 19, arrangements were made by the STC, MMTC and others for import. Some imports were undertaken by MMTC, but as the Commerce Minister has said, when we discussed in the last session, that it was only 70000 tonnes and not 15 lakh tonnes. Since import was not undertaken at the right time, the prices started increasing so alarmingly. Later on, of course, when imports started coming after May 19, orders, some actions were taken. By when, imports actually started coming from July what happened? Immediately, prices started falling. In fact, the prices started falling so rapidly that some importers felt alarmed. My question is if the imports were undertaken at the right time in line with economic logic, then there would not have been any increase in the prices at all. The Ministry failed to anticipate, even if the Secretary and others anticipated, the Minister himself had failed to anticipate. Whether that is a scam or not that is another thing, but as far as the economic aspect is concerned, the Minister

did not perform his duties as a consequence of which the country had to suffer, the people of India had to suffer from the high price. And once the import started, once the unloading started, immediately the prices started falling.

The second question is relating to the relationship between the Minister and his officials in the Department. Now the question to be answered by the Minister is this: what is the relationship between the Minister and the Secretary? The Secretary cannot come to the Parliament and make his statement. Generally officials are given protection by the Minister concerned because the Secretary cannot come himself. But here is a case where just the opposite happened. The Secretary was not only not protected but he was viciously, mercilessly, attacked in the Parliament, outside the Parliament both the Food Secretary and the Cabinet Secretary. It was very much out of tune, out of line with our own traditions. Now the question is why the Minister took such a step and how he can justify it. For instance, the issue which the Minister raised is this that the import by the FCI was not favoured by the Public Accounts Committee. That is the point that he has made. The idea is that after the 1989-90 scam, there was this decision by the Public Accounts Committee that the import should not be undertaken by the Food Corporation of India. It is all right. It is an exceptional case, these two agencies, which are responsible for importing, the State Trading Corporation and the MMTC, failed to perform their duties despite warnings, repeated reminders, and this was the opinion of the senior official and also of the Prime Minister, which obviously left officials with no other option but to go for purchases by the FCI. My question is this: if the Minister is feeling that Secretary has violated his orders, how can that Secretary continue as Secretary for the last three-four months? Does it mean that the prime Minister himself does not have confidence in the Minister. Despite the public row between the Minister and his Secretary, if the Prime Minister permits that Secretary to continue in his office, does it not indicate that there is something wrong somewhere? Maybe, the Prime Minister is not having total confidence in his own as a consequence of which a situation has come where the Food Ministry is speaking with

two voices; one is the voice of the Minister and the other is the voice of the Secretary. Not only this, if I was asked if there was any dispute between the Food Secretary and the Minister, other things remaining the same I would certainly support the Minister because he controls the Department. It is not the job of the Secretary to control the Department, other things remaining the same. This expression we use in Economics, "Other things remaining the same." Certainly it is the Minister whose job is to run the Department and the Secretary should be assisting him administratively. It is not his job to take such a major decision. But, other things are not remaining the same, various points are mentioned, the sequence of events has been narrated, and what does it indicate?

Thirdly, what has been the role of the Minister himself? If it is true that on April 25 the Minister wrote to the Prime Minister asking for a cut in the public distribution system allocation, he has done something very injurious and the people of India should know whether it is true or not because the public distribution system which is so vital for the poorer sections of the population was going to be pruned because the Minister did not want such supplies to be directed through the public distribution channel. He wanted more to be given to the traders so that it could be sold at higher prices. I also understand that the Minister—if it is not true let the Minister deny it—in November the Minister declared that he was against sugar imports. And is it true or not that the Minister threatened to resign if despite his views the sugar import was passed through? Did he threaten to resign or not? In December... (*Time-bell rings*)—in another two-three minutes, I will finish. In a meeting of the Indian Sugar Mills' Association, he gave an undertaking—let him deny that it is not true—to the sugar manufacturers that as long as he was there as the Food Minister, he would not allow sugar imports to take place. He made this statement in the meeting of the Indian Sugar Mills' Association that as long as he was there as the Minister in charge of sugar, in charge of Food, he would not allow sugar imports to take place. Please tell us whether this is true or not.

In the same meeting, he said that the price which was charged by the sugar manufacturers in India had been low. In fact, he said that a

good price for India would be Rs. 20. Not only that he was not interested in reducing the price of sugar, but he, in fact, also wanted it to be enhanced to Rs. 20 because he thought that that would encourage production.

Let me now come to the report which was published in the 'Jansatta'. This report came out in the 'Jansatta' on 12th June. This report contains very serious allegations. I am not saying that these allegations are true. All that I am saying is this. These allegations have been made publicly in a very widely circulated newspaper. I am sure the hon. Minister himself must have got a cutting of this report. Why then was this report not denied? The minimum the Minister should do now is that, at least, he should say in the House today that this report is not true; he should deny the report which has been published in this daily.

SHRI M.A. BABY: What is the allegation?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: The allegation is that one Mr. Jain, one Mr. S.L. Jain, who is the Chairman of the Indian Sugar Mills' Association, financed his wife's visit to England.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Whose wife?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: The Minister's wife. The allegation is that Mr. Jain financed the Minister's wife's visit to England so that the Minister's wife could stay in England for six months, so that she could have a baby in England...*(Interruptions)* a baby could be born in England with all the rights of being born in England. She stayed in England for six months and the entire finance for this came from Mr. Jain. Let the hon. Minister deny this.

SHRI GURUDAS GUPTA: People can always have children. What is the problem?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: People can always have children. There is no problem. But the problem, the question, is one of funding. There are also some specific allegations of corruption made in this newspaper. The allegations are not only against one Minister, but also against some other Ministers and some of the officials. Perhaps, the name of a Member of Parliament has also been mentioned. My Hindi may not be very good. My question is: Should not the Minister think it his duty to say

that this report is wrong? Should he not say that this report is not true? Why had not the Minister come out with a statement so far to make us feel assured that we do not have a corrupt Minister? *(Time-bell rings)*

Now, what should we do with this? Whatever has been discussed so far clearly shows that something wrong had taken place. It clearly shows that the things which had happened earlier were disturbing. There is a suspicion that another scam is lurking somewhere. The question is whether we should not do something more to establish the correct position. At least, should not the Minister be given an opportunity to say that he is innocent?

Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, there is enough circumstantial evidence to show that something wrong had taken place, in terms of the price, in terms of the manipulations of import, in terms of the way in which the various orders and instructions were given and flouted, and also in terms of the relationship which is established with the sugar manufacturers who are actually the beneficiaries of the higher price, who are actually the beneficiaries of these manipulations. The point is this. After all that had happened concerning the share scam, should not the hon. Minister, should not the Government, ensure that we do not have another big scam on our hands?

Sir, very valid suggestions have been given by some of the Members from this side. It would not satisfy us if somebody, some person personally known to the Prime Minister, is given the authority to go into the matter and give his opinion. What does that opinion mean? It doesn't mean much. It only means it is a personal opinion given by somebody to the Prime Minister; the Prime Minister may agree with it or may not agree with it. We know what has happened to the JPC. The JPC report came, and what happened to the Action Taken Report? It is a No-Action Taken Report. So, what remains now? Therefore, we have to accept that there is no alternative but to go in for a very detailed and systematic inquiry by somebody who is completely detached from the scene, may be a retired Judge of the Supreme Court or a sitting Judge of the Supreme Court. Sir, I feel it is a very serious matter and this matter should be

handled with all the seriousness it deserves. Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Shri Virumbi.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, a Half-an-Hour Discussion has been listed to be taken up at six o'clock, but now this discussion is being continued. I think this will take a little more time because the Minister has to reply also. So there is no point in discussing such an important subject after 7.00 or 7.30.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I have already taken the consensus of the House and the House has agreed to finish this discussion first.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: I suggest that it may be postponed to tomorrow. *...(Interruptions)...*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Shri Virumbi. Five minutes, please.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: I mean, not sugar but the Half-an-Hour Discussion.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, I just want to point out that probably hon. Members are aware that at seven o'clock there is the Annual General Meeting of the Indian Parliamentary Union. The Speaker has probably issued notices to all of us. I am only saying, if, therefore, we can complete this by seven o'clock, it will be all right. But I do not know what the opinion of the House would be, as otherwise some of us may have to stay back. *...(Interruptions)...*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): The Half-an-Hour Discussion could be taken up tomorrow. As you know, the Minister would be busy in the other House tomorrow. So, the discussion on sugar should be completed today itself, at the earliest possible time. We have two more speakers and I would request them not to take more than five minutes each so that within 15 minutes we can exhaust the speakers' list and then the Minister can reply.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: The Minister has only to announce the setting up of. *...(Interruptions)...*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Whatever he has to say, let him do it in his own way. Yes, Mr. Virumbi. Five minutes, please.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I have a humble suggestion to make. Let the Members complete their discussion by seven o'clock and the House adjourn; let the Minister give the reply as the first item at 12 o'clock tomorrow. *...(Interruptions)...*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Reddy, actually the problem is this that the hon. Minister would be busy in the other House. There may be something unexpected in the House and the Zero Hour may continue for a long time. I think it should be finished today, in any case. *...(Interruptions)...* But the second discussion can be taken up tomorrow. I think the House agrees to the other discussion to be taken up tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Okay. Mr. Virumbi, please.

(The Vice-Chairman (Shri Md. Salim in the Chair))

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, what I feel is that this sugar issue is part and parcel of the liberalization policy. When the shares of the State Bank were actually being disinvested, the value of one share was Rs. 100. But what is the actual market price of it now? It is between Rs. 325 and 450. At that time the Government fixed the price of a Rs. 10-share at Rs. 100, Rs. 90 being the premium in the market. Whereas people were ready to buy a share at Rs. 325, the Government fixed only Rs. 90 as the premium, and thus we have lost Rs. 325 per share.

While I was discussing the issue of the State Bank shares in the House, I received a reply from the Treasury Benches that the State Bank was not going to be privatized at all, only 49 per cent equity was being given to private people and the remaining 51 per cent would be with the Government. I may say that the day is not far off when this 49 per cent will be converted into 51 per cent, just as the minority in this House has become the majority.

How has the minority Government become a majority Government? The same way, I mentioned the other day, it will be done.

Yesterday or the day before yesterday I mentioned this. A drug policy will be announced by the Government. The Government will come forward with a policy that 51 per cent share is going to be privatised. That is the policy. The Government is going to announce it soon.

The sugar policy is a corollary of the total liberalisation policy. Therefore, what I feel is that eleven months ago the scarcity of sugar was felt in this country. It was actually felt in October. In October, November and December the Government was not at all prepared to import sugar. What have they done? Even the people who were prepared to import sugar were stopped from doing so. The STC was hesitant to import sugar because the subsidy was not sorted out. The Government did not do what it ought to have done immediately. Therefore, in between, private people came to know that there was going to be scarcity of sugar in India. They arranged purchase of sugar in the international market. When the international traders came to know that there was going to be heavy scarcity of sugar in India between March and June, automatically the sugar cartels in the international market enhanced the price of sugar. During February, the international market price of sugar was only Rs. 8.95 P. In 1990-91, when your liberalisation policy was started, the ex-factory price was Rs. 6.10 P. Now, within three years, the ex-factory price has gone up to Rs. 9.05 P.

When we asked about it, what was the reply given by the Treasury Benches? They said, "We have increased the sugarcane price. Therefore, whether we are willing or not, we were reluctantly forced to raise the sugar price also." It is not so. That is what I want to say. When you decontrolled the molasses, the price of molasses in some areas increased five-fold and in some other areas it increased fifteen-fold. Mr. Madan Bhatia, the hon. Member of this august House has told us that the scarcity had arisen because of the policy of the U.P. Government. We must know the truth. The sugarcane growers in U.P. preferred to give their sugarcane to *gur* and *khandsari*

manufacturers instead of giving it to sugar mills. Why? It is because they are able to get the payment immediately. Why are the *khandsari* and *gur* manufacturers prepared to buy sugarcane immediately, and why are they prepared to pay for it immediately? He has more or less concealed the reason for this from the House. That should be revealed and disclosed. What is the matter?

Sir, after the decontrol of molasses, just overnight the scenario changed. *Gur* can be converted into molasses with some chemical treatment. He has totally concealed this from this House. *Gur* can be converted into molasses with chemical treatment. Once it is converted into molasses, they can get 15 times the price. That is why the growers were prepared to sell their sugarcane to *gur* manufacturers who purchase it and manufacture *gur*. They sell it immediately. It is converted into molasses. Then it is sold at 15 times the price.

What is the origin of this? The origin of this trouble is your policy of decontrol of molasses. Therefore, Mr. Madan Bhatia has to see the facts. He should not accuse the Opposition. It is absurd. What I say is that the sole cause of this bad scenario that has come about now, is the liberalisation policy pursued by this Government.

I quote from the "*National Herald*" to prove my argument. It says:

"This hike in demand for *gur*, according to the sources, resulted in the directive for the decontrol of molasses. After the decontrol, a fifteen-fold increase in prices of molasses was noticed. *Gur* can be easily converted into molasses after a simple chemical treatment. Therefore, the distilleries that use substantial amount of molasses, prefer to purchase the *gur* and convert it into molasses instead of purchasing molasses directly."

I think the truth has now come out.

I would now like to refer to one more thing. When the scarcity took place, a special feature worth witnessing was that the percentage of the levy sugar had gone down and the percentage of the free-sale sugar had increased. In view of the scarcity in sugar, the sugar barons in India were above to prevail upon the Government, which is responsible for the

welfare of 95 crore people. They said that they would not part with their manufactured sugar, but at the same time agreed that they would hand-over the imported sugar to the Government. If instead of Mr. Narasimha Rao, Mrs. Indira Gandhi had still been the Prime Minister of the country, I don't think these very sugar barons would have had the guts to say like that. In such a situation Shrimati Indira Gandhi Government would have taken to task all the sugar barons. Here what I want to say is that even during the Indira Gandhi's regime had a long standing view been taken for the benefit of the people it would have been better. Here a few Members are speaking about such an action. The question is: are these sugar barons not responsible for the welfare of the country and its people? The Government is succumbing to their pressure. Within three to four days of the talks the Government of India announced that it was going to import sugar. It clearly shows that the Government succumbed to the pressure exerted by the sugar barons. It clearly shows that underhand dealings have taken place. Therefore, I demand that a proper inquiry commission should be instituted to find out the truth. Otherwise another JPC should be instituted to find out the truth of the whole affair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Please conclude. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: After the 'no action report' has come, they say that they do not want a JPC. All right.

Let us set up an inquiry commission to find out who has done all these mischiefs and the persons responsible should be punished according to the law of the land. With these words, I conclude.

श्री गया सिंह (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, कई घोटालों की चर्चा हो रही है और अभी चीनी घोटाले पर जो चर्चा हुई, उस पर मैं दो-तीन पॉइंट्स कहना चाहता हूँ।

महोदय, ये सरकार को जो तीन साल की उपलब्धि है और जिसकी चर्चा यहाँ हो रही है, जो नयी आर्थिक नीति सरकार ने हिंदुस्तान में चलायी, यह भ्रष्टाचार उसी की ही उपज है क्योंकि अपने देश को जो कल-कारखाने और उद्योग हैं, उनको तो बंद करना है और विदेशी कंपनियों और मल्टी-नेशनल्स को लाना है। तो उसकी शुरूआत ही भ्रष्टाचार से हुई है।

महोदय, आज हम जिस घोटाले की चर्चा कर रहे हैं, इसके लिए आखिर इस देश के कौन लोग हैं जिनको नुकसान हुआ है? मंत्रीजी को नुकसान नहीं हुआ, सचिव जी को नुकसान नहीं हुआ, प्रधान मंत्रीजी को नुकसान नहीं हुआ। नुकसान हुआ इस देश के करोड़ों गरीब, मिडिल क्लास के और जो नीचे के लोग हैं उनको क्योंकि चार महीने तक चीनी के दाम इतने ज्यादा बढ़े। महोदय, आज इस पार्लियामेंट के अंदर ही लिफ्ट में सबेरे से चर्चा है कि, देखिए साहब चीनी तो खत्म कर दी, अब आप लोग क्या करेंगे? तो चीनी घोटाले की चर्चा चारों तरफ है क्योंकि इसके वही लोग भुक्तभोगी हैं। यह उनकी चर्चा में है जो कि गरीब लोग हैं, मध्यम-वर्गीय लोग हैं, ऐसे करोड़ों लोग इसकी चपेट में आए हैं। हालांकि मंत्रीजी तो इसका जवाब दे ही देंगे, लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ, जिसकी चर्चा अक्टूबर, 1993 में हुई और जब हमें यह जानकारी हो गयी और वह जानकारी होनी ही थी क्योंकि हमारे पूर्व बिहार के चीनी उद्योग के अंदर बहुत सारे ऐसे किसान हैं जिनको कि तीन साल से शुगर की जो उनकी बकाया है, उसकी वसूली नहीं मिल रही है।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय: यह आप लालू यादव जी से पूछिए।

श्री गया सिंह: लालू यादव तो आपके दोस्त हैं। बगल में अभी थे, चले गये इसलिए आप दोनों मिलकर तो कर रहे हैं। हम तो उनका सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं और आप उनकी क्या मदद करते, अभी तीन मिनिट का टाइम है, इसलिए क्या बताऊँ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री मोहम्मद सलीम): आप चीनी पर रहिए, आप लालू यादव पर मत जाइए।

श्री गया सिंह: जी, मैं तो सामने देखकर बात कह रहा हूँ, यह तो मंत्री जी हमको छेड़ रहे हैं और ले जा रहे हैं लालू जी की तरफ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि न केवल बिहार के अंदर बल्कि जो उत्तर प्रदेश की भी इन्होंने चर्चा की, और भी कई राज्यों में स्थिति यह है कि किसानों को उनकी उपज का मूल्य नहीं मिल रहा। उनको तो बात अलग है जो उन्होंने दिया, लेकिन चीनी उद्योग के लोगों ने नहीं दिया। मंत्री जी ने जो लखनऊ में उतनी बड़ी सभा की थी, जो तीन महीने आयोजन किया था तो उसका भी अखबारों में निकला था कि सारे चीनी उद्योग के मालिक लोगों ने सब पैसा तो ऊपर लगा दिया, किसान को कहां से देते। इसलिए लालू जी से कम हमारे मंत्री जी

भी नहीं हैं। उन्होंने बड़ी-बड़ी मीटिंग की तो आपने भी बड़ी-बड़ी मीटिंग की हैं।

महोदय, हम जो कहना चाहते हैं, वह यह कि आज इसके लिए जिम्मेवार कौन हैं? जो करोड़ों लोगों को इतना नुकसान हुआ है, उसकी जिम्मेवारी किसकी होगी? प्रधानमंत्री जी का, भाटिया जी कहते हैं कि मत बोलिए, उनका नाम मत लीजिए। मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि वह तो भूतपूर्व कैबिनेट सेक्रेटरी थे, जो गड़बड़ करके चले गए। यह जिम्मेवारी किसकी होगी? हम सिर्फ यही कहना चाहते हैं कि जिस चीनी घोटाले की यहां चर्चा हुई उससे हम सहमत हैं। हमारे विरोधी दल के माननीय सदस्यों ने बहुत सी बातों का जिक्र किया है, क्वोटेशन भी दिए हैं, रेड्डी साहब ने तो कई क्वोटेशन सामने रखे, फिगर भी रखीं। हम तो सिर्फ यह कहना चाहते हैं कि मंत्री जी अगर हिम्मत है तो हिम्मत दिखाएं। मंत्री जी की समझ है कि जो ज्यादा घोटाला जिसने किया है उसकी सरकार ने बहुत पुख्ता से मदद की है। बैंक घोटाला हुआ, वित्त मंत्री ने सारी दुनिया के लोगों को मदद की। इसलिए बिजली मंत्रालय से हटाकर फूड मंत्रालय में ले आए कि ऐसा घोटाला करो कि इस सरकार को हिम्मत नहीं होगी इस मंत्री को हटाने के लिए। हम आपको हटाने की मांग नहीं करते। हम सिर्फ यह कहना चाहते हैं, मांग करते हैं कि आप में हिम्मत है तो इसकी जांच सुप्रीम कोर्ट के सिटिंग जज से करा लीजिए। इनसे अगले सेशन तक आपको रिजल्ट मिल जाएगा कि यह आपने क्या किया। इससे ज्यादा हम और कुछ नहीं कहना चाहते।

उपसभ्यक्ष महोदय, आपने जो समय दिया, इसके लिए धन्यवाद।

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the scarcity of sugar and the hike in its price have been agitating this country not only this year but even the last year. The Federation of Sugar Industries, time and again, has been raising the issue with the Ministry of Civil Supplies that there was a shortfall in the sugar production. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Honourable Members, if you want to discuss, you go to the Lobby and discuss. But please allow Mr. Ambedkar to speak.

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR: The stock which was there in 1991-92 and the current gap in production was about 1.68 million tonnes. During this interval

the Government has taken a decision to export sugar. Nearly 4,11,000 tonnes of sugar was exported. In the next year the gap between the current production and the stock with the Government has diluted nearly 1.7 million tonnes of sugar.

The Federation of Sugar Industries has approached the hon. Minister in the month of July and told him that the sugar production has gone down in the State of Maharashtra. There was a drought. About 10 per cent of the agriculturists have shifted their cultivation from sugarcane to soya bean. They have projected that the production of sugar throughout the country will not be more than 98 lakh tonnes. The actual consumption of sugar in this country was 1.34 million tonnes. There was a shortfall of nearly 22 lakh tonnes.

On the note prepared by the Sugar Federation, the Minister himself and the Food Department prepared a note. That note had gone to the Cabinet in the month of October. In the month of October, the note was approved by the Cabinet Secretary only with a lacuna as to who should fix the price of the sugar that had to be imported. That was not mentioned. When that was circulated, the hon. Minister himself moved another file stating that the production of sugar in this country would be not less than 112 lakh tonnes. That note was circulated again. The Ministry of Food and Civil Supplies turned it down saying that it was a wrong figure. A joint meeting was held somewhere in December with the Sugar Federation and the Ministry of Food and Civil Supplies in which it was said that if the situation did not improve, we would have to pay very heavily. Even today, for 1994-95, the production of sugar has gone down. We cannot expect it to go up because it is a three year cycle that we have to undergo. In that three year cycle, even next year, we will have to import sugar. On import of sugar, it was decided that if we imported by end-December, we would be in a favourable condition and if we passed orders in December, then the situation would be adverse because in the international arena the position would be like that. Mr. Vice-Chairman, during December, the ruling international price was ranging between 220 and 280 US dollars per tonne.

When it was decided to put sugar in the OGL, during that period, the price of sugar had started rising. By that time, the whole decision was taken. the price of sugar had gone up to 400 US dollars. (*Time-bell rings*).

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the landing price of sugar was calculated and submitted to the Minister. Taking the price of sugar to be 400 US dollars, taking into account the insurance cost, freight and the cost of distribution, the cost of sugar over here is Rs. 12.90 per kg. It is sold in Delhi at Rs. 17.00 per kg. The figure of profit estimated has already gone into the pockets of the persons who imported sugar. They have pocketed nearly Rs. 70 crores. This is a scam in which there is a deliberate attempt, not by just one Ministry but by all the Ministries taken together. Sir, I would like to quote one comment:

"The sugar muddle is not a case of malfunctioning of the Government and its administrative machinery. Whatever has transpired in the regulation of supplies and prices of sugar has been directly influenced by concerned interest groups. Ministers have taken positions without a semblance of a coherent and collective view of the issues at stake. If the Food Minister, Kalpnath Rai, has been eager to promote the interests of the sugar industry and the agriculture Minister, Balram Jakhar, those of cane growers, Manmohan Singh has been concerned with the burden of subsidy on the sale of imported sugar under the Public Distribution System, Commerce Minister, Pranab Mukherjee, was reluctant to undertake imports without clear directives as to the sale of imported sugar...."

In the domestic market." The sum total of this exercise has led to a lot of delay on the part of the various Ministries. Mr. Kalpnath Rai, kindly listen to what I say. Sir, it is a very important point which relates to him and I know he will not answer that point. Mr. Kalpnath Rai, the fact about which I am going to speak now is already on record. When you were a Minister of Power, there was one project which was to be set up for generation of power. During the National Front Government, the price of this project was X. During Chandra Shekhar's time also, the price of the project was X-I. But during your time,

the price was raised by 15 per cent. Later on it became double, if I may say so. You had also given the reasons for rise in the price and it is on record. Even with regard to the sugar industry, you have gone on record to say that you had settled scores with those persons who were older than you. Nobody has been able to understand as to who those older persons are. There will be many people in the Ministry who are older than you. May I request you to state as to what that cassette contains? What has he said in the dinner party? We will be glad if you could share that information. Thank you.

श्री भूपिन्दर सिंह मान (पंजाब): महोदय, यह चीनी का घोटाला इन दिनों का बहुत बड़ा घोटाला है जिसके बारे में निचले स्तर पर भी इसकी चर्चा हुई है। घर-घर में इसकी चर्चा हुई, चूल्हे-चूल्हे में इसकी चर्चा हुई। यह घोटाला इसलिए हुआ कि चीनी कम पैदा हुई। सभी की जुबान पर इस घोटाले की बात थी। तो यह इसलिए हुआ कि चीनी कम पैदा हुई। अब चीनी क्या कारखाने में पैदा होती है? यह तो खेत में पैदा होती है और खेत में चीनी को पैदा न होने दें, इस स्थिति को आप बढ़ा रहे हैं। इसको तोड़ने के लिए आप क्या करेंगे? आप यू.पी. में किसानों के गुड़ तक बनाने के लिए रुकावट डालने जा रहे हैं। एक तरफ तो टेक्नोलोजी बढ़ रही है। जब पहले यह था कि लक्कड़ का बेलना था, फिर लोहे का आया। फिर मिट्टी का पैन था, फिर लोहे का पैन आया। बढ़ता गया और अब टेक्नोलोजी यह आ गई कि अब क्लोउड पैन सिस्टम है तो आप गन्ना पैदा करने वाले को क्लोउड पैन सिस्टम नहीं लगाने देंगे जब कि वह लगाना चाहता है तो इसका सीधा मतलब है कि आप चीनी मिल वालों के साथ मिले हुए हो और उनके साथ मिलकर आप देश को ऐसी स्थिति में फंसाते हो। जैसे महाजन जी ने कहा कि हर चौथे-पांचवें साल के बाद यह साइकल चलता है। गन्ने की फसल 3 साल की फसल होती है। एक साल खाद्य मंत्रालय किसानों से धोखाधड़ी में निकाल देता है। तो खाद्य मंत्रालय को तो आपने किसानों को धोखा देने के लिए रखा हुआ है। वह कहता है कि आप गन्ना बोओ, आपको लाभ होगा। दो-तीन सालों के बाद किसान को पता चलता है कि इसमें तो नुकसान है। उन्हें पता चलता है कि हमें धोखा हो गया। तो वे किसी और फसल पर जाते हैं। तो उस वक्त चीनी मिलों का और आपका तालमेल बनता है। अब अगर यह कहा जाए किसी समय कि किसी को लाइसेंस दिया हुआ है और उसके ऊपर आपकी अपार कृपा नहीं है तो यह मानने में आम लोगों को दुविधा

है। जिसको चीनी मिल का लाइसेंस मिल गया, उसको तो सोने की खान का लाइसेंस मिल गया।

तो जब किसी एक को आप सोने की खान देते हो और उसको आप कहते हो कि अफा मेरा ही इन्कवायरी करो, तो उस इन्कवायरी में क्या होने वाला है, यह देश को समझ आ रही है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, किसान तो छः रुपए में आज भी चीनी पैदा कर रहा है और देश को बीस रुपए तक चीनी लेनी पड़ी है। तो छः रुपए तक तो किसान खेत में चीनी पैदा करता है और सिर्फ चीनी को निकालकर उसको फाईन हालत में जो सामने खड़ा है वह कहां तक जाता है? तो यह अपने आपमें घोटले का एक हिस्सा है, यह जो चीनी मिलों का एक गिरोह है। कई बार मिलजुलकर तो इनके सरकार को भी धोका देने की बात सामने आई है। चीनी मिलों की एसोशिएशन ने सरकार को बहकाकर यह कहा या शायद सरकार के साथ मिलकर यह कहा या सरकार से आहिस्ता में कहा कि चीनी काफी ज्यादा पैदा होने वाली है, सरकार ने अच्छी तरह से मान लिया। उसके बाद सरकार को चिंता हुई हो कि यह तो गलत हो गया, चीनी तो कम हो गई, तो अब बाहर से मंगवानी पड़ेगी। तो यह सारी झमेलाजी देश को धोका देने के लिए खास तौर पर देश को धोका देने के लिए जो हो रही है, उसके लिए बिल्कुल ठीक बात है। रेड्डी जी ने जो शुरू में बात की कि इस घोटले की जांच सुप्रीम कोर्ट के सिटिंग जज से होनी चाहिए। क्या इस वक्त यह जो लाइसेंस दिए जाते हैं, अगर आप घोटले से निकलना चाहते हैं और आगे घोटले नहीं होने देना चाहते हैं तो क्या चीनी मिलों को लाइसेंस फ्री करोगे?

श्री सतीश अग्रवाल: यह नहीं करेंगे।

श्री भूपेन्द्र सिंह मान: नहीं करेंगे। थोड़े दिन हुए प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां थे। उन्होंने राज्य सभा में कहा कि हम इस बारे में नहीं सोच रहे हैं, नहीं करेंगे। तो जब आप लाइसेंस से छोड़ने वाले नहीं हैं तो आप मिले होने पर उन लोगों के साथ जो देश को लूटने वालों का एक गिरोह बना हुआ है और उनके साथ मिलकर देश में धोकाधड़ी का चक्कर चल रहा है, जिसमें देश फंसा हुआ है, उससे निकालने में आप क्या करने जा रहे हैं? मैं समझता हूँ कि आपको इसके बारे में सोचना चाहिए तथा आज तक की जो गलतियाँ हैं उसको मानना चाहिए कि शगर मिलों को लाइसेंस की प्रोटेक्शन देकर हमने देश का नुकसान किया है। जो टेक्नोलोजी देश में है, जो दुनियाँ में है, उस टेक्नोलोजी को इस्तेमाल करने से आप किसान को क्यों रोकते हो। अब आप कहो कि किसान को जो नई टेक्नोलोजी है, जहां तक वह अपने गन्ने से कुछ बनाना चाहे, उसको

आप रोकेंगे नहीं। इस प्रकार से ही आगे आने वाले स्कैम रूक सकते हैं। तथा यही कहता हुआ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Sir, it is already 7.10 p.m. Sir, we have to attend the meeting of the Indian Parliamentary Group at 7 o'clock. We are already late by 10 minutes. It will take another 10 minutes to reach there. By the time we reach there the meeting will be over. So, there is no point in attending the meeting. Sir, my humble suggestion is that the reply should be given tomorrow.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Sir, tomorrow I will be busy in the Lok Sabha. (Interruptions).

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: We can have it tomorrow evening.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, any time convenient to the hon. Minister. (Interruptions).

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Sir, I will finish the reply within five minutes. (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): The Minister is saying he would finish the reply in five minutes. (Interruptions).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir take the sense of the House. We have to attend the meeting of the Indian Parliamentary Group also. (Interruptions).

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Sir, the time of the House can extended only by taking the sense of the House. (Interruptions). Sir, take the sens of the House.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir take the sense of the House.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Sir, there are five Members on the Treasury Benches and 15 Members are sitting on our side. The sense is clear. (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Tomorrow we have other business also. (Interruptions).

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Sir, tomorrow I will be busy in the Lok Sabha.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, the Minister can come at 6 o'clock.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: We will sit upto 8 o'clock. (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): The Minister is saying he would finish his reply in five minutes. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Sir, the Minister can finish in five minutes if he announces the setting up of a judicial commissioner. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, take the sense of the House. *(Interruptions)*.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Mr. Minister, when would you like to reply?

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to reply just now.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Sir, the sense of the House has been taken twice. It has been decided that this business should be finished today itself... *(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Please take the sense of the House.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, we want a detailed reply from the Minister. We have a very competent Minister who is armed with all the facts ...*(Interruptions)*...

SYED SIBTEY RAZI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have a humble submission. All the speakers have completed their speeches ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, you take the sense of the House.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Sir, the Minister is taking us very casually. He is taking us very lightheartedly. After all this discussion, he wants to dismiss all this within just five minutes. It is an insult ...*(Interruptions)*... After all this discussion, he wants to finish his reply within five minutes. What does it mean? No, we cannot allow this.

SYED SIBTEY RAZI: Sir, this is not fair. We have been waiting for the reply of the Minister and the list of speakers has already been exhausted. Now it is the turn of the Minister. We should be patient enough to listen to the Minister. At this juncture, when the Minister is on his legs and is prepared to reply, the demand of the Opposition is not fair ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, the Minister is planning to give a very indifferent, short reply. He wants to do injustice. Therefore, you kindly adjourn the House ...*(Interruptions)*... You take the sense of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Please sit down, all of you. Please listen to the Minister ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: We demand that the sense of the House should be taken ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, if you are not going to adjourn the House, you ensure that there is quorum in the House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Please sit down.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: The time of the House was up to 6.00 p.m. only. If we want it to be extended, it can be done only after taking the sense of the House ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: You please take the sense of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): The Minister is saying that he can reply immediately after the Question Hour. Are you ready for that?

SHRI M.A. BABY: Sir, tomorrow there is a Calling Attention motion. It has precedence over any other business...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, we leave it to the Secretariat. Let them organise it. We have no objection to any time tomorrow. Let the Secretariat organise it.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: If you want the reply to be given tomorrow, we have to finish it before he goes to the other House. Otherwise, it is not possible for us. We have the Appropriation Bills in Rajya Sabha.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): But there is a Calling Attention Motion tomorrow at 12.00 noon here. They are ready to have the reply any time tomorrow.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: After the Question Hour, we have to take up the Calling

Attention Motion. There is no Zero Hour. We can take it up immediately after the Question Hour.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Mr. Minister, will you be able to come tomorrow in the evening? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will reply just now. I am not accepting it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, you take the sense of the House...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Please sit down, all of you...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: See, there are no Congress Members here to hear his reply...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Mr. Vice-Chairman, why is he showing his eyes?...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Please sit down. The House is not prepared to listen to the Minister. Hon. Members want that the Minister should reply tomorrow. The day after tomorrow is the last day of the session...*(Interruptions)*...

The Minister's position is that tomorrow he will be busy in Lok Sabha. I request him that he should find some time tomorrow in the late hours, even in the evening, or the day after tomorrow. But please...*(Interruptions)*... please sit down.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Sir, I request Shri Jaipal Reddyji that since tomorrow I am totally busy in Lok Sabha, he must accomodate me. When he gives me time, I will reply...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: According to your convenience, fine...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I am suggesting the day after tomorrow, after the Question Hour...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Okay.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Okay.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Ambush of an Assam Rifles column in Manipur by underground elements on the 18th August, 1994

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Now, Shri P.M. Sayeed will lay the statement on the Table of the House. It is already circulated.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P.M. SAYEED): I lay on the Table of the House a statement regarding ambush of an Assam Rifles column in Manipur by underground elements on 18.8.1994.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Okay. The House is adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at seventeen minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 25th August, 1994.