

**REFERENCE TO MOTION ADOPTED BY  
THE HOUSE FOR APPOINTMENT OF A  
COMMITTEE FOR ALTERNATIVELY  
TWO SEPARATE COMMISSIONS OF  
INQUIRY TO INQUIRE INTO  
ALLEGATIONS OF CORRUPTION MADE  
AGAINST MEMBERS OF FAMILIES OF  
THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE  
FORMER HOME MINISTER—Contd.**

श्री कल्प नाथ राय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : हम ने सभापति महोदय, 10 अगस्त को राज्य सभा में प्रस्ताव पास किया था चौधरी चरण सिंह के परिवार के भ्रष्टाचार की जांच करने के लिये और प्रधान मंत्री श्री मोरारजी देसाई के परिवार के भ्रष्टाचार की जांच कराने के लिये और उा के अनुसार एक कमेटी बनायी जानी थी, लेकिन मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि 10 अगस्त को प्रस्ताव पास होने के बाद आज तक आप ने उस कमेटी का एनाउन्समेंट नहीं किया। सारे देश के अंदर जनता सरकार, उसके मंत्रियों और मंत्रिमंडल के भ्रष्टाचार के संबंध में जनता में बात हो रही है और एक तरफ बिहार में भयंकर बाढ़ आयी हुई है और बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री जी यहां दिल्ली में घूम रहे हैं। आज लाखों करोड़ों बाढ़ पीड़ित गोरखपुर, देवरिया और मुगलसराय में ठोकर खा रहे हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में आग लगी हुई है। रोम जल रहा था और नोरो बंसी बजा रहा था... (Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not to discuss it now.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : सभापति महोदय, मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनता सरकार को इसी सब गड़बड़ी और भ्रष्टाचार की जांच के लिये वह कमेटी का एक प्रस्ताव पास किया गया था। मैं आप के जरिये सरकार को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यदि आप ने उस कमेटी का एनाउन्समेंट कल तक नहीं किया तो हम इस हाउस में धरना देंगे। मैं आप से सामने इस बात का एलान करना

चाहता हूँ कि यदि आप ने उस भ्रष्टाचार की जांच करने के लिये कमेटी को नहीं बनाया तो हमारे जैसे आदमी मजबूर होंगे। इस हाउस में धरना देने के लिये। सभी पार्टियों के नेता, पंडित कमलापति त्रिपाठी, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेता श्री भूपेण गुप्त, कांग्रेस के नेता श्री के० सी० पंत और गोस्वामी जी और सदन के दूसरे सभी साथियों से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस हाउस की क्या मर्यादा है कि इस राज्य सभा ने 10 तारीख को एक प्रस्ताव पास किया जनता सरकार के भ्रष्टाचार की जांच करने के लिये...

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): He should not be allowed to speak with, out a poster.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : और आप ने कमेटी नहीं बनायी। आप को इस सरकार से कहना चाहिए, आप को सरकार की निर्देश देना चाहिए। आप हमें बतायें कि हम क्या करें? यदि यह सरकार आप के आदेशों का पालन नहीं करती है तो आप को तुरन्त कमेटी का एलान करना चाहिए...

श्री पीलू मोदी : अब अपने नेता श्री त्रिपाठी जी को बुलाइये।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : तो सभापति महोदय, मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक कमेटी बिठाई जाय : चौधरी चरण सिंह के खिलाफ मेरे पास 40 आरोप हैं और उस कमेटी के सामने मैं उन को रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं अपने नेता से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वे आप से इस बात का निवदन करें कि आप इस हाउस की एक कमेटी बनायें और मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि यदि आप ने हाउस की कमेटी का एलान नहीं किया तो मैं हाउस के सब लोगों से अपील करता हूँ और बताना चाहता हूँ कि यदि आप उस का एलान नहीं करेंगे तो कल से हम इस हाउस में धरना देंगे और सदन को चलने नहीं देंगे।

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): Mr. Chairman; on Thursday, the 10th

August you gave the ruling giving your own views on the Resolution—I will not use the word "Ruling"—that the Government should indicate to you the one course the Government would like to take of the two courses which were suggested in the motion which was adopted by this House on the 10th August. And we on this side of the House tried to impress and we still impress upon you the significance of the words 'forthwith' and 'without delay' used in the Resolution. We expected that the Government will take some decision and communicate the same to you by today. On this side of the House, however, we expressed also the view that the Government should come out with a statement on Monday as to which course they had decided to take. But, surprisingly we have read in the Hindustan Times yesterday in a news item which says that despite the Rajra Sabha Resolution the Union Government is opposed to the suggestion of the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry to go into the allegations of corruption. Sir, this brings up a question of propriety also. It has been our complaint also all throughout that the present tendency has been that the Government will inform the country, either directly or indirectly. And the press will come to know that Mr. Advani had made certain suggestions to Mr. Morarji Desai, obviously confidential inter-departmental correspondence or communication which the Parliament is not supposed to know. We will not know about the things but the whole country will know. The Government is functioning in a manner that Members of Parliament will not know about important things. This is a matter of gross Parliamentary impropriety with the Government that the House is kept in the dark on important matters but public statements are made on such matters without taking the House into confidence.

So far as your observation on the motion on that day is concerned it is clear that the Government should indicate to you either of the two courses of action. The Government's mind is

clear from this report, or even alternately ....

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: On a point of order.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Let me conclude. If the Government does not come forward with any indication to you we make this demand to you that you constitute a committee today. Whether the Government will consider it recommendatory or mandatory will be looked after when the Committee is constituted. But the main date of the House casts a mandate upon you to constitute the Committee. You should constitute the Committee. On this side of the House we want the business of the House to continue.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE (West Bengal) : Sir, on a point of order.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir, our party has always taken the stand that We want the business of the House to continue but the co-operation must be based reciprocally. The Government cannot expect that we will always co-operate with them in getting the Government business passed if they do not respond and respect the collective will of the House which has been expressed by the Resolution. Therefore, Sir, if an impasse is created tomorrow in this House, then I think the blame will fall squarely upon the Government for the attitude taken by them. Therefore, I submit that you ask what stand they have taken on the two options. If not, we would urge upon you to constitute the Committee today. And after whatever steps you have taken we will see later on whether it is recommendatory or mandatory.

Secondly, Sir, I want you to observe that the Government tendency of completely bypassing the Parliament not disclosing important matters to Parliament while disclosing things to the whole of the country, should be avoided. We are made a laughing-stock before the whole country. People come

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

and ask as to what is happening and we have to tell them that "we are Members of Parliament but we do not know anything. We only read as you do from the newspaper reports."

SHRI SANKAR GHOSK: On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra) : Give me only two minutes, Sir. (Interruptions)

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: On a point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you not sit down for a minute? (Interruptions) How many from each party want to speak?

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA (Bihar): There is no question of party. (Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: All of us want to speak.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not hearing me. (Interruptions) Let there be order.

SHRI PIARE LALL KUREEL URF PIARE LALL TALIB (Uttar Pradesh): You should have appointed a committee.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Kureel, please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI PIARE LALL KUREEL URF PIARE LALL TALIB: It is an insult to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't take down. I have not allowed him.

(Shri Piare hall Kureel Urf Piare Lall Talib continued to speak)

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh) : Sir, have you taken note of what the hon. Member has said?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You also cannot be any exception. Please sit down.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, why don't you allow me two minutes' time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not hearing me at all. That is the difficulty. You want that I should hear you but you don't want me to be heard. Therefore, what I am suggesting is, if it is the suggestion from this side that the Government should indicate, then you must allow and give an opportunity to the Leader of the House to indicate. Instead of that if you go on talking and raising points of order, what is the fun in it? I do not understand that at all.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, before he indicates, I want to make an appeal to him. (Interruptions) Why don't you give me one minute, Sir?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Let him indicate, Sir.

SHRI PILOO MODY: The indicator is over there, Sir.

**विपक्ष के नेता (श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी):**

मान्यवर, . . . .

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : मान्यवर, मैं आपसे यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या नेता सदन कुछ कहने वाले हैं। अगर कहने वाले हैं तो वह कह लें और हम लोग सुन लें फिर हमारी बात सुनें। यह सदन का मामला है और ऐसा मामला है जिसे हम छोड़ नहीं सकते। क्योंकि हमारी धारणा यह है कि लोकतंत्र का दावा करने वाली सरकार ने इस सदन के साथ अच्छा बर्ताव नहीं किया है। इसकी उपेक्षा की है, इसकी अवहेलना की है, इसका अपमान किया है और लोकतंत्र की हत्या की है। मान्यवर, आपकी अध्यक्षता में हम आपसे यह उम्मीद नहीं करते थे कि इस सदन के साथ इस तरह का बर्ताव होगा। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बहुत गम्भीर मामला है और जितने सदस्य इस पर बोलना

चाहते हैं उनको बोलने की आपको इजाजत देनी चाहिये । सदन का मामला है इसलिये आपको उनकी बात सुननी चाहिये । अगर सदन के नेता कुछ कहना चाहें, मान्यवर, तो कह लेने दोजिए उसके बाद जिस पार्टी के जितने सदस्य बोलना चाहें उनको बोलने की आपको अनुमति देनी चाहिये ।

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition says that whoever wants to speak must be given an opportunity. (Interruptions) The Leader of the Opposition said that whoever wants to say something, let him say.

SHRI KAMLAPATI TRIPATHI: Sir, I have said that if the Leader of the House wants to speak, let him speak first and, afterwards, you should allow us to speak.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, it is for you to evolve the procedure and we will abide by that. (Interruptions)

But the question is no longer -----

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA): Every party has a leader and the leader is selected to put forth the point of view of that particular group and, Sir, if you permit the leaders to say, if they have anything to say-----

(Interruptions) SOME HON.

MEMBERS- No, no.

DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA: Then you don't believe in your leaders. (Interruptions)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: All of us are concerned You are not taking a decision.

(Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, I want to submit to you, as the custodian of the prestige and honour of this House, as the person who is the custodian of the norms of parliamentary democracy of this country, as the person who is the custodian of fair-play in this House, that the issue no longer is that of the corruption of Kantibhai Desai. It is no longer an issue of allegation on Mr. Morarji Desai. It is no longer an issue of allegation on Charan Singhji. Sir, that no longer is the issue now. It is a very simple issue. And the issue is, you having admitted a Motion and the Motion having been passed by this House, is it open to the Government to throw that Motion to the dust-bin and reduce this House to a pure debating society, as it were? We have passed something, and it means nothing to the Government! Sir, how will it affect the dignity, the prestige, the honour of this House if this House was not competent in law? If constitutionally it was not warranted, the Motion should not have been admitted at all. Sir, we have not censured the Government. We have not expressed lack of confidence in the Government. All that this House has done is to conform to certain highest norms which exist in any parliamentary democracy; to maintain certain standards of integrity and purity, this House has exercised its right. If that right is to be defeated, if that is to be trampled under the feet of this Government, then, Sir, a very sacred duty is cast upon you, and that is for upholding the right of this House, upholding the prestige of this House, upholding the dignity of this House. Sir, we look up to you and that is why we are making this submission. I was unfortunately not here in this House when you gave the ruling the other day. But I submit for your consideration, is it not clearly implied in your ruling that if the Government were not to accept the constitution of a commission of inquiry, they must accept the appointment of a 15-member committee? If it is implicit, whom are you are wait-

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

ing for? Do you have to wait for the consent of the Government? If that is to come, then this House has no meaning in the country. Sir, it commended itself to the founding fathers to establish this House so that there ought to be some moderation and maturity in the affairs of the country. Now, if you in your wisdom have admitted a Motion and this House in its wisdom has passed a Motion, then that Motion has to be upheld whatever be the cost this House may have to pay. I only submit that it cannot be a monopoly rule in this House. There has to be a certain degree of consensus. That is what we are asking for.

Ultimately, there is one more thing. Has the Leader of the House thought it his duty, firstly, to prevail upon the Government? The Government had given an assurance to the Law Commission. If this House was not excluded from the authority and right to pass a Resolution, it should be a binding force on the Government to constitute a commission of inquiry. An assurance had been given by the Government that it will be very unlikely that this House ever passed a Resolution which will not be accepted by the Government. May I ask the Leader of the House as to what he has done to implement this resolution of the Government? Is it not in complete violation of the responsibility cast upon him as the Leader of the House? Is it not a breach of the dignity of this House and a solemn assurance given by the Government that, if a Resolution is passed, it is unlikely that the Government will not constitute a commission of inquiry? What has happened to this solemn pledge and promise? Be that as it may, let the Government do whatever it wants to do. So far as we are concerned, we look up to you and it is a duty which is cast upon you. Could you also allow this Government to throw this Motion to the dust-bin and turn this House into merely a debating society? If

that is not to be done, my respectful submission to you is that you warn them here right now that if by tomorrow morning they do not constitute a commission of inquiry, you will appoint a 15-member committee. If that is not done, then we submit, it would be the gravest act of injustice, the gravest act of indignity that would be inflicted upon this House. That is my respectful submission.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: A point of order. This question raises the question of the rights of the House. Sir, so far as the right of the House to appoint a committee is concerned, it is sought to be frustrated by the argument that this resolution is not mandatory, but recommendatory. Sir, this question requires full discussion in this House. Sir, I would ask you; Is the House incompetent to appoint a committee? I will go stage by stage. Is the House incompetent to appoint a committee? That is the first question. Sir, is the House incompetent to say that the Chairman will constitute a committee. That is the next question. Can the Government say that it is recommendatory or mandatory? I am only on the question whether the House can constitute a committee. The House can constitute a committee. On the second question, the Chairman can appoint a committee. Then, if a committee of the House is appointed, what is the position? Sir, these questions, whether the recommendations are mandatory or whether they are recommendatory, have come up in this House again and again. What is the position of the recommendations of the committee.

Sir, on the last occasion, a question was raised in this House. It was said that this House can only pass a resolution and that this House can only regulate business, and that the remaining functions of the House are those of a debating society. It is mere expression of an opinion. The House has the supreme power to appoint a committee. If a committee is appointed, what are the

functions and rights of that committee? There are so many books on that question. I may first quote from the book of Kaul and Shakdher what the effect of the recommendations of a committee is when a committee is appointed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Of which House?

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: It is of the Upper House. The question must be very clear. What is mandatory? Are the recommendations of a committee mandatory? I am not on the other question. I am reading from Kaul and Shakdher's book, "practice and procedure in parliament", second Edition, page 655:

"The recommendations of a parliamentary committee are normally accepted and implemented by the Government."

I want to ask the Leader of the House; Does he want to go back on this convention? Then I go to page 706:

"The recommendations of the committee are treated with respect by the Government and are accepted and implemented by the Government."

Sir, I will read another page which will clinch the issue. Sir, it is page 719.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is applicable?

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any committee?

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: Yes, this is a committee of this House (*Interruptions*) This is a committee of the House. This is very important. I read from page 719.

"Although technically the recommendations of a parliamentary committee are not formally described as directions by the House, they are

m practice regarded as such by a long standing convention."

Are you going to give go-by to that convention?

Then I will quote from the "May's parliamentary practice." What we are asking is that you constitute a committee. Do you not have the power to constitute a committee? Does that committee not have the power to call for the records? Does that committee not have the power to call for the records? Does that committee not have the power to ask anybody to give evidence before it? Sir, this resolution says:

"....calls upon Government to seek forthwith the guidance and advice from a Committee comprising of fifteen members of this House to be appointed by the Chairman, Rajya Sabha\_\_\_\_\_".

I am not on the question whether it is mandatory or recommendatory. I am on the question whether you have the power and whether the House has the power to appoint a committee. You have the power to fix the composition of the committee. That committee has the power to examine that question. Can you stop the examination of this question if this committee wants to examine documents? If this committee wants to call witnesses, can any one refuse to come? I am reading from the May's book from page 139. (*Interruptions*) it is being said that the House cannot appoint a committee. It will be absurd, it will be complete derogation of the rights of the House to say that it cannot appoint a committee. (*Interruptions*).

Sir, I understand that these Members are anxious..... (*Interruptions*) I am on this question if the House has the power to appoint a committee. I am not on the wider question whether a Private Member's resolution is mandatory or recommendatory. I am not on that question at all. I am on the simple question if the House has the power to appoint

[Shri Sankar Ghose] a committee. If the House has the power to appoint a committee and if the House appoints a committee, the committee has certain powers; and if the committee wants certain records or correspondence, its orders are mandatory. Otherwise, it is breach of privilege and contempt of the House. I will read from May's Parliamentary Practice:

"Disobedience to the orders of a committee is a contempt of the House by which the committee was appointed.

The following are instances of contempt by disobedience to the orders of committees—

(i) disobedience to orders for attendance of persons made by committees duly authorised in that behalf;

(ii) disobedience to orders for the production before committees of papers or other documents."

Now, if a committee is appointed....

SHRI PILOO MODY: What about disobedience to the Chairman?

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: You are disobedient to the Chairman. You are denying the Chairman the right to appoint a committee. You are denying the right of the House to appoint a committee.

Therefore, I am respectfully saying that I am not on the general question whether a Private Member's resolution is binding or not. No. I am on a much simpler question; I am on the simple question whether a committee can be appointed, whether the committee can ask for records, whether the committee can call witnesses to come and give evidence. The report of that committee will be placed before you. And if the Government disagrees, then the House will act further. But do not stop that democratic process. Do not flout that convention, which is a long standing convention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sezhiyan

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, a Private Member's motion adopted on the 10th instant and your ruling given on the 17th instant are being subjected to much discussion, criticism and confusion that can be avoided. Sir, Mr. Salve who moved the motion said today that the motion consisted of two parts and the second part asked for the appointment of two commissions of inquiry, and that when the motion was adopted by this House, it could have been honoured by the Government. That is his contention.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: First part.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Please give me time. After I conclude, you can raise it.

The other day also I raised this point that resolutions are of three types; (a) resolutions of a statutory nature, (b) resolutions of a procedural nature, and (c) resolutions of a recommendatory nature; and I said that this resolution fell under the third category of "recommendatory nature". This was contested by the other side. They said that I was denigrating this House. My contention is that even if a resolution is passed by the other House, which is not statutory and which is not procedural, it will be only recommendatory. He quoted some authors. I shall quote from "Parliament" by Ivor Jennings—page 363:

"Private members' motions then are part of the technique of propaganda. They enable 'the opinion of the House' to be taken." Therefore, a Private Member's resolution enables us to take the opinion of the House.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: It is not a Private Member's motion. That is different.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Sir, I then come to A. V. Dicey on the Law of the Constitution. He is one of the most important authorities -----

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Is he arguing against the appointment of the committee? What is he arguing?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: One second. I will allow you. When your Members are speaking —

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: I only want to understand whether he is arguing against the appointment of the committee *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What was the other Member doing? He was also quoting an authority. Similarly, he is quoting authorities. You don't want any authority to be quoted by the other side?

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Is he arguing against the appointment of the committee. That is the point.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: A. V. Dicey, one of the best authorities on the Law of the Constitution, says:

"Resolutions of either House of Parliament:

"The House of Commons, at any rate, has from time to time appeared to claim for resolutions of the House, something like legal authority. That this pretension cannot be supported is certain."

So, even if the House of Commons in England, which enjoys more powers, more supremacy, than the Parliament of India which is circumscribed by the Constitution, passes a resolution, it will not be mandatory on the Government. He says:

"The resolution of neither House is a law." Only when a law is passed, it becomes mandatory. If a resolution is passed it does not become mandatory.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: The issue is not whether it is binding on the Government. The issue is whether it calls upon him to form a committee and whether he is bound by it or not.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I will just finish. Mr. Sankar Ghose quoted Kaul and Shakhder. Let me also quote Kaul and Shakhder. On page 553 they say.

"Resolutions may broadly be divided into three categories:

1. Resolutions which are mere expression of opinion by the House:"

The first category is resolutions which are mere expression of opinion by the House.

"Since the purpose of such resolutions is merely to obtain an expression of opinion of the House, the Government is not bound, as convention has it, to give effect to opinions expressed in these resolutions. It entirely rests on the discretion of the Government whether or not to take action suggested in such resolutions."

And then they quote two resolutions of the Houses of Parliament. The form of such resolutions has been,

"This House is of the opinion that Government should introduce necessary legislation to adopt a uniform policy with regard to sales tax prevailing in different States of India."

The resolution was passed, but the Government did not implement the resolution. The honourable Member Mr Sankar Ghose had not read fully the Kaul and Shakhder; if he had, he would have understood the question fully. He only quoted:

"The recommendations of a Parliamentary Committee are normally accepted and implemented by the Government."



[Shri Era Sezhiyan]

The next sentence be conveniently omitted:

"If in regard to any recommendation the Government hold a view different from that of the Commi-tee, the Government has to apprise the Committee of the reasons that may have weighed with them for not accepting or implementing the recommendation."

Therefore, the Committee's recommendation is not mandatory. I have been associated with the Public Accounts Committee for a long time. A Parliamentary Committee, we know, has got all the powers and privileges of the House. I quote from the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee which is one of the premier statutory committees, one of the Standing Committees of Parliament. This is the 158th Report of the Public Accounts Committee of the Fifth Lok Sabha on the rag scandal pp. 101-102..

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI (Assam): Sir, I am on a point of order....

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Please let me finish.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: I am on a point of order. I am not a lawyer. But I am making my point of order.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since Mr. Sezhiyan has already started speaking, let him finish. You can raise your point of order later.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: Only against his speech I am raising my point of order .....

MR CHAIRMAN: No, please sit down

(Interruptions)

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN. Sir, in this report the Committee gives its finding:

"Having regard to the facts narrated above which strongly raise suspicion of mala fides and having

regard to the discrepancies in figures of imports of rags, contradictions in regard to various other matters, an almost total inaction of the various authorities concerned despite their awareness of malpractices right from 1965 and the limited scope of the CBI enquiry, the Committee are constrained to observe that the malady is far more deep-seated than what meets the eye.

(Nothing short of a high level enquiry into the entire matter under the Commission of Enquiry Act by a Commission presided over by a Supreme Court Judge, preferably sitting, would bring to light the true magnitude of the loss to the exchequer by way of loss of customs duty and penalty, under invoicing of goods, misdescription of goods and the various malpractices indulged in by both the official and trade interests and those who are responsible for permitting these abuses. Accordingly the Committee recommend that such an enquiry

should be instituted forthwith..... "

(Interruptions)

This recommendation was made by a Committee of Parliament on 28th April, 1975... (Interruptions). The Committee made this recommendation on 28th April 1975 by saying "accordingly the Committee recommends.... (Interruptions). This was on the 28th April 1975. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee is sitting here. That happened to that recommendation? This was.....

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN-. Let him finish.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: My point is that a Parliamentary Committee made a recommendation for the constitution of an inquiry committee to go into the scandal.... (Interruptions)-

SHRI N. P. CHAUDHARI (Madhya Pradesh): On a point of order.....

(Interruptions )

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: The whole issue... (Interruptions).

SHRI PILOO MODY: There are 20 speakers from the other side. There is only one speaker from this side.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GO  
SWAMI: Thank you \_\_\_\_\_

SHRI N. P. CHAUDHARI: I stood  
/first. I am on a point of order.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI:  
I am speaking now. I do not belong to this  
side or that side....

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Let me finish  
first. I am on a point of order

SHRI N. P. CHAUDHARY: I am on a  
point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is also on a point of  
order.

SHRI N. P. CHAUDHARY: But he cannot  
make a speech.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I was only  
quoting authorities.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI:  
Mr. Chairman, you fix a time limit. Do not  
allow anybody to do filibustering.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I am finishing.

SHRI N. P. CHAUDHARY: I will not  
allow him to continue. Nobody can make a  
speech on a point of order. It is wrong. That is  
why I am rising on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: After he finishes.

SHRI N. P. CHAUDHARY: I have a right  
to make a point of order at my time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is also on a point of  
order.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I will not make a  
speech. Here is the Public accounts  
Committee demanding a commission of  
inquiry forth with. That was on the 28th April  
1975. To his recommendation the  
Government gave a reply on December 16,  
1975. The reply runs as follows:

"In view of the position explained above, it will  
be seen that all that has happened with  
regard to the import of rags is already  
fully known in all its aspects, remedial

action wherever called for has been taken and  
those against whom there is *prima facie* case  
are being proceeded against. Having regard  
to these factors, the Government are of the  
view that there is no need for further  
enquiry".

Therefore, Sir, the two PAC Reports are there  
where in the decision was given to appoint a  
committee "forthwith". But the Government,  
about seven months later rejected it.  
(*Interruptions*). Only two points more, Sir,  
and I will finish. Sir, they say that the House  
passed a Resolution, a unanimous Resolution  
or a majority Resolution and that when the  
House passes a Motion, it should be imple-  
mented. They have quoted the British House  
of Commons. I can also quote two instances  
from the British House of Commons.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: The whole thing is  
becoming haywire.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): Sir,  
how long will he take? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Sir, in 1953-54, a  
Select Committee was appointed by the  
House of Commons to go into the...  
(*Interruptions*).

SHRI PILLO MODY: You people must  
listen to him. Otherwise, you cannot speak.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN:.. . financial  
facilities of the Members of Parliament and  
the Select Committee of the House of  
Commons unanimously recommended an  
increase in the pay  
of the Members of Parliament .....

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PILLO MODY: Sit down please.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Sir, in 1953-54, a  
Committee of the House of Commons made a  
unanimous Report and gave it to the House.  
But Mr. Winston Churchill, who was the  
Prime

[Shri Er<sub>a</sub> Sezhiyan]

Minister then, came before the House and said that he was not implementing the Report given by the Select Committee stating that this was a matter of opinion. Then the House of Commons went into the question again on a Private Member's Motion and it was passed on the 24th May 1954. A Private Member's Resolution was discussed in the House of Commons and by a majority vote the House passed it again the recommendations of the Select Committee. Again, Sir, Mr. Winston Churchill came before the House a month later... (*Interruptions*)

— and stated that that was a opinion of the House on record. Sir, like the British Parliament, a State Legislature in India also decided on an issue like this and I would like to quote an instance to make my point and then I am done. Sir, in 1953, in the then Madras State Assembly, there was a Motion which was rejected by the Legislative Assembly, and a Motion of the same point was passed by the Legislative Council. Diametrically opposite stands were taken by the Council and the Assembly. Therefore, Sir, at that time, the then Chief Minister, Shri C. Rajagopala-chari....

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal) :  
But the Lok Sabha has not done anything now.

SHRI PILOO MODY: They have run away; they withdrew it.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Sir, I am talking about the relevant points only. Diametrically opposite stands were taken by the Assembly and the Council. The Motion was passed by the Council and rejected by the Assembly. At that time, the Chief Minister of Madras, Shri C. Raja-gopalchari said:

"Laws are made by acceptance of Bills in the two Houses and assent of the Governor. Resolutions passed by the Assembly fall

under three categories: (1) Resolutions which become part of the law of the land; (2) Resolutions passed by the House in the matter of con- ^ trol over its own proceedings; (3) Resolutions which are mere expression of opinion",

(*Interruption?*is)

SHRI B. N. BANERJEE (Nominated): Sir, at least on a matter like this, on a matter relating to the procedure, our views must be heard. Why are we here then? We are not here for hearing the shouting.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: So, Sir, this was the view given by the Madras Government then.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Sir, I am on a point of order.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I will reply to your point of order.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Sir, he has to yield to me. He has to yield. I am on a point of order. Sir, is it open to the House to be bound by the observations made in a State Legislature?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you finished?

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Is it open to the House, the Rajya Sabha of this great country, to be bound by the decision or observation of a State Legislature?. I want a ruling on this. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PILOO MODY: This is the great Rajya Sabha of the great country of India.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: Sir, I would like to reply to his point. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Sir, I expect a ruling from you. You cannot deny me the ruling. It is a very pertinent question. It is a very pertinent question which I have raised. You cannot deny me the ruling. You

"have to give the ruling. He has no right to speak now. I want your ruling.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: I am replying to your point only. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Madhavan, I will reply to your point. Mr. Madhavan, on this question, Shri C. Rajagopalachari made this point.... (*Interruptions*). This was published in a journal of the Parliament.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Sir, I want your ruling.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN: My appeal to you would be this..., (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Sir, I want ruling. I insist upon a ruling... (*Interruptions*). Sir, you are silent (*Interruptions*) I insist upon a ruling. I insist upon an immediate ruling. He should not be allowed to speak.... (*Interruptions*) I am entitled to a ruling. He cannot proceed further. You cannot proceed.. (*Interruptions*) You are allowing him to speak. First, give me your ruling.. (*Interruptions*) It is a very pertinent question. The hon. Minister was quoting an observation made in a State Legislature some time ago. This House is sovereign and is not bound by the ruling or observations made in the State Legislature. That is my point of order. I am entitled to a ruling.... (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Madhavan, my request is that it is better that you go to your own seat, with those people who have tempted you to speak.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: I have come here because from there I have a better view. I am a back bencher.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can raise any number of points of order. You have full authority and every right to raise a point of order. I have the right also to give a ruling. But do

not listen to others. And, please be in your seat ----- (*Interruptions*).

Now, will you like to hear an Independent Member, Mr. Banerjee, or are you interested only in raising points of order?.. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI B. N. BANERJEE: Sir, the procedure that is adopted by you is not a correct procedure, and it is amounting to wastage of valuable time of the House. Sir, this is not the stage when we should discuss what is the effect of the Resolution or even what is the effect of the recommendation. Let us follow the sequence of events.

A Motion was admitted. It was challenged that the motion was wrongly admitted. That is beside the point now. You admitted the motion. The House discussed the motion. An amendment was moved. The amendment was accepted by the majority of the House. So, Sir, up to this stage the matter is over. There is a Resolution before you. Now, there was a discussion as to what is the meaning of this Resolution. This has been discussed from different political angles. Now, Sir, I would try to be completely non-committal in this matter.

Now, Sir, your observations earlier on 17th may be called a ruling, it may be called a direction or it may be called an announcement. Some say that it was a ruling. Different interpretations have been given. Sir, you are under pressure from the opposition as to why you are not appointing the parliamentary committee as contemplated in the first part of the Resolution. To that, your defence, excuse me if I am using the word 'defence' is that you are not doing it because as you understand, there were two alternative recommendations and unless the Government have indicated to you their stand on either of the two alternatives, the appointment of a committee by you at this stage would be infructuous. Then the House asked you how long they were to wait for

[Shri B. N. Banerjee]

the committee and told you that you must obtain the reaction of the Government by Monday at the latest and let the House know what you were going to do. During the weekend, we see reports in the newspapers. I buy one newspaper, i.e. *Statesman*. It seems that the Government has taken legal advice. I do not know from where it was taken. It is the practice with every Government that whenever they want to do something, they just give a feeler through the newspapers. I have been here too long. I do not blame the Janata Government. That was done also by the Government of Mrs. Gandhi and others. They do not come to the House. They do not think that it is not proper to make an announcement outside when the Parliament is in session. Every Government which is sitting on this side, is doing the same thing. It is a fact that cannot be denied. This news has emanated. We only want to know what the correct position is. Therefore, at this stage, without going into all this discussion, the course open to you is clear. You will have to ask, if you have not already asked, what the reaction of the Government is. They might have told you during the weekend. You may not like to disclose. We want to know what is the Government's reaction and whether they are accepting the first alternative or the second alternative. It is quite clear that they are not going to accept the second alternative. Then it boils down to this. What is their attitude to the first alternative? They say that it is recommendatory. Let that be said clearly. If they say that they are not going to accept the first recommendation also, then, before your ruling, it may be necessary to go in for a discussion, as to whether you should appoint a committee or not and what the powers of the committee will be. At this stage, this discussion is absolutely irrelevant and you have to call upon the Leader of the House, if you have not already done so, to tell you what the reaction of the Government is and whether they are going to

accept the first or the second alternative. It depends upon the reply of the Government. If they say 'yes' to the first alternative, your task becomes easy and you appoint a committee. It is quite clear that they are not going to accept the appointment of a commission of inquiry. You should forget about that. Then, though it is hypothetical, they may not accept the first alternative also, I hope they will not do it. The Government consists of very responsible persons, particularly the Leader of the House who has a great respect for Parliament\*. For political reasons they may not accept the first recommendation also.

Then, at that stage, it will be your duty to decide whether in spite of that you are going to appoint a committee or not. At that stage, it may be very necessary for you to hear the view points of various sides of the House. You cannot solely be guided by what the opposition has said. You have to see whether the Resolution, as adopted, compels you to appoint a committee. At that stage, please hear everybody concerned at length before you come to a decision and at that stage it may be necessary for you to hear the various sides about what the powers of this committee will be and whether this Resolution is mandatory or not. This will come at a later stage. Let us proceed step by step and ask the Leader of the House what the indication from the Government is.

श्री एन० पी० चौधरी : माननीय सभापति जी, मैं दूसरे वक्ताओं की तरह से बहुत समय आपका नहीं लूंगा। बहुत थोड़े में आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य जो अभी बोले हैं उनके भाषण पर मैं पाइन्ट आफ़ ऑर्डर उठाना चाहता हूँ। वे दूसरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट भी पढ़ कर बता रहे थे। मेरा कहना यह है कि अभी वह कमेटी बनी ही नहीं है, इसलिए उसको कोट करना गलत बात है और उसका कोई मतलब नहीं है... (Interruptions)

इस सम्बंध में पिछले हफ्ते जो बहस चली थी उस में काफी गरमागर्मी भी हुई थी। उस पर काफी सोच-विचार के बाद एक निर्णय हुआ और उस निर्णय पर एक आदेश दिया गया, निर्देश दिया गया कि 15 सदस्यों की एक कमेटी बनाई जाये या एक कमीशन नियुक्त किया जाये। इस प्रकार से दो आपश्न दिए गए। हम लोग यहां पर यह सुनने के लिए बैठे हुए हैं कि हमारे सदन के नेता और सत्तारूढ़ दल के नेता क्या इन दो आपश्न में से किसी एक को मानने के लिए तैयार हैं और अगर वे 15 सदस्यों की एक कमेटी बनाना चाहते हैं तो उसकी घोषणा कर दें और अगर वे एक कमीशन की बात स्वीकार करते हैं तो उसकी घोषणा कर दें ? हम लोग उन की बात सुनने के लिए यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं। अगर वे इन बातों को स्वीकार नहीं करते हैं तो मजबूर होकर सदस्यों को उत्तेजित होना पड़ेगा और आपको कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ेगा। मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जब तक इन बातों पर कोई फैसला नहीं होता है, मैं यहां पर बैठ कर इस विषय पर सदन की कार्यवाही चलने नहीं दूंगा और अगर आवश्यक हुआ तो धरना भी दूंगा और इस सत्तारूढ़ दल को निर्णय करना पड़ेगा। चैरमैन साहब ने एक विषय पर अपना निर्देश दिया है, उसका उन्हें कोई फैसला करना चाहिए और इस बात की घोषणा करनी चाहिए कि दो आपश्न में से वे किस को मानते हैं। इसलिए मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि इस विषय पर सदन का जो समय है वह बर्बाद न किया जाये। आप इनको निर्देश दें कि या तो ये लोग 15 सदस्यों की एक कमेटी नियुक्त करें या कमीशन नियुक्त करें। इन दोनों आपश्न में से वे किस को एक्सेप्ट करते हैं, उसकी घोषणा कर दें और इस विषय पर सदन का समय बर्बाद न करें।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : अगर ये लोग कमेटी नहीं बनाएंगे तो हम हाउस को चलने नहीं देंगे... ( *Interruptions* )

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: We would like to hear the Leader of the House.

श्री आर. डी. जलप आदरगांवकर : (महाराष्ट्र) : इस बारे में लीडर आफ दि हाउस को क्या कहना है, उसको हम सुनना चाहते हैं... ( *Interruptions* )

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : श्रीमन्, ये लोग हाउस में डिक्लेयर कर दें कि कमेटी बनाना चाहते हैं या नहीं ?

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point, of order.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, let us hear the Leader of the Opposition again.

SHRI KAMLAPATI TRIPATHI: Sir, in the very beginning I have requested you to ask the Leader of the House to speak and tell us as to what he wants to do. And whatever he says after that, you must allow us to speak on that. That I requested in the very beginning and I re-request you again. Sir, you please ask the Leader of the House to tell us what he wants to do now. This matter cannot be left at this stage. The Government has a responsibility to run the House. If they want to run the House, the Leader of the House must come up and tell us what he wants to do. Otherwise, it will be impossible for us to get on like this.

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA (Gujarat): Sir, I am on a point of order. ( *Interruptions* )

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Please ask the Leader of the House to speak.

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA: I Sir, I have never raised a point of order. ( *Interruptions* ) This is for

the first time, I am standing on a point of order. Kindly hear me. (Interruptions)

1 P.M.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : भ्रष्टाचार के सवाल पर, प्रधान मंत्री के बेटे पर, चौधरी चरण सिंह के परिवार के ऊपर भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप लगे हैं...

(Interruptions)

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA: Sir, I never rise on a point of order. But I want to make a point of order now.

(Interruptions)

LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI LAL K. ADVANI): Sir, I am willing to be guided by you as to how the House should be conducted. But I would not be a party to a Member of this House who is wanting to make a point of order being shouted down, and someone else being allowed to say something. If you direct me, Sir, I will speak at any moment that you like. If a Member from this side wants to make a point of order and you have permitted him to do so, I would request you to ensure that he is allowed to have his say.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Sir, I want to raise a point of order on what the Leader of the House has said.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of this confusion, the House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at two minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at three minutes past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : उपसभापति महोदय....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Now let us proceed. And

before we proceed, let us hear the Leader of the House.

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : उपसभापति

महोदय...

SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA:

Sir, I am on a point of order -----

(Interruptions).

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : उपसभापति

महोदय, नेता सदन अपना वक्तव्य दें...

(Interruptions)

इतना तक वह नहीं देंगे...

(Interruptions)

विदेश मंत्री (श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी):

नहीं देंगे तो सदन नहीं चलने देंगे ?

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : सदन चलाना

आपका भी काम है ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह तो दोनों तरफ से चलेगा नहीं तो नहीं चलेगा ।

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, you have now asked the Leader of the House to make his observational

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is a matter about which this House has been discussing various implications and the Government has always maintained that wherever there is a difference of view point and difference of interpretation between the Government's opinion and the opposition's opinion, it is for the Chair to decide and determine which is the correct view point. On the 10th of August, this House adopted a motion which motion in the Government's view was a recommendation made to the Government. That recommendation was in the alternative: Either do this or that; we recommend that either this be done or that be done\*. Immediately thereafter following the Government's expression of its opinion or interpretation observations were made in this House that the Government does not come into the picture at all. And the motion adopted was addressed to the Chair.

It had called upon the Chair to constitute a Committee of the House. Thereafter for a week exactly, because it was up to the 17th, I again stood up on behalf of the Government and said, when there is a difference of interpretation all the Opposition members have given their opinion, the Government also has given its own opinion, it is for the Chair to determine what exactly is the implication of the Resolution adopted, because a motion when it is put to the House and a decision is taken on it, it becomes a resolution; this is an accepted parliamentary norm everywhere. This morning the discussion went on over and over again. I could cite numerous instances, numerous without number, starting from Ivor Jennings and Erskine May, and Kaul and Shakhder and A. N. Mukherjee, to show how all resolutions whether of this House or of that House, 'except of two categories which were referred to by my colleague Mr. Sezhiyan, are recommendatory. But I feel that that is not the stage at all. Today, we are at a stage where the Chairman has given his interpretation, he has already said that the motion adopted by this House on the 10th of August is a recommendation made to the Government. It is a recommendation made to the Government, but again and again it is being said: A mandate has been given to you the Chair, why don't you do it? Then I don't come into the picture. If the House is of the view that it is a mandate given to the Chair, then the Government should not be called upon to say anything, it is for the Chair to do anything that he wants to do.

But the Chair came to the conclusion that it is not a mandate, that it is not addressed to the Chair, it is addressed to the Government and it is a recommendation. A recommendation means, even if it were a single recommendation, the Government would always treat it with respect and after duly considering it give its

opinion whether the recommendation acceptable to the Government, whether the recommendation is not acceptable to the Government or whether the recommendation in part is acceptable to the Government or the recommendation is acceptable to the Government in some modified form. This is how, even if a recommendation were a single recommendation, the Government would react.

Now, here a recommendation has been made to the Government in an alternative form, this or that. It is on the 17th of August that the Chairman gave his final decision that the Chair does not come into the picture, not at this stage at least, only the Government comes into the picture and the Chair requested me as Leader of this House to indicate what the Government proposed to do. I said on that day, and this morning again I went to the Chairman and conveyed to him that the Government is considering the matter in all its implications, from all points of view and at this stage I would like simply to say this that the Government would indicate its response to the Resolution within this week.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I would like to make a submission or the point made by the hon. Leader of the House.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, I would request you and through you I would request the House and also the Leader of the Opposition that after I have made this categorical statement—I have not said 'indefinitely' because all along it has been said that the Government may not take a decision, the Government may put it off indefinitely—I have made a definite statement and said that the Government is considering the matter carefully, will consider the matter from all its aspects and will come forth with its response on this Resolution within this week. I would request you, and through you, request the Opposition also that hereafter the proceedings of the House be



[Shri Lai K. Advani]

allowed to continue in a proper manner. I may even say that when any request is made, I may even say that when any request is made by a statement, saying that until and unless this is done the proceedings of the House will not be allowed to function, is it in conformity with the dignity and decorum of this House which again and again is being held at bay? So far as the Government is concerned, so far as the ruling party is concerned, from the very first day on issues of this kind which are emotionally surcharged, which have political overtones and implications, it has been our earnest endeavour to see that so far as the dignity of this House is concerned, it is honoured fully, absolutely, without reservation. Therefore, once again I would plead with the Opposition Members and all Opposition parties to bear with me and see that the proceedings of the House are conducted properly. Otherwise we will go over and over again the same ground.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I am on a point of order. I would like to draw the attention of the Chair to the fact that the whole issue....

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, I would say it is for you at this stage-----

*(Interruptions).*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I have listened to the Leader of the House. I am on a point of order. I hope he will allow me to make my observation.

The Leader of the House has completely misconstrued the whole thing. The subject on which we agitated this morning was not to know the Government's mind. On the 10th, the Motion was passed. On the 17th, the Chairman came out -----

SEVERAL HON'BLE MEMBERS: "What is the point of order? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I am not yielding. On the 17th, the Chairman came out with his observations. In his observations, he urged upon the Government to indicate, which of the two courses the Government was going to accept. Sir, if you go through the Resolution and the language of the Motion, you will find that two alternatives are given to the Government.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, may I submit....

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am not yielding. He may be the Leader of the House. I am on my legs with your permission. I should make my point and then the Leader of the House may say whatever he may like to say.

So far as the Motion is concerned, it gives two alternatives to the Government.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, we are covering the same ground.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: It is not the same ground. Mr. Advani, it is not the same ground. The two alternatives are—(a) either to sit forthwith with the Committee nominated by the Chair, and seek advice and guidance from the Committee; (b) or to appoint two Commissions of Inquiry.

My submission is to the Chair, not to the Government. As a result of the Motion, it was incumbent upon the Chair to appoint a Committee of 15 Members of this House. If the Committee is appointed, then the second part of the Motion comes—which option the Government would like to have. There is no Committee. We do not know whether the Government is going to sit with the Committee and seek its advice and guidance\*. Because the Committee has not been appointed, how can you indicate to Government which course it is going to accept? According to the text of the Resolution, the first issue was to nominate the Committee and thereafter

The Government was to decide whether they will sit with the Committee or they will straightway appoint two Commissions of Inquiry. Therefore, unless the Committee is appointed, unless the Committee is nominated by the Chairman, the courses of action left to the Government are not yet open. The Government does not come into the picture at this stage. First, the Committee should be nominated; then the Government should indicate whether they are going to sit with Committee, or they are going to appoint two Commissions of Inquiry.

The second point is, the Resolution was passed on the 10th of August. On the 17th, the Chairman came out with the observation that he would like to know from the Government which course the Government is going to resort to. And on the 21st again the Leader of the House, who is the representative of the Government, is coming and telling us that they will take some time to consider the implications of the issue. In between, through the Press the whole world knows what the reaction of the Government is. Through the press, they are manipulating and telling people that the effect of the Resolution is recommendatory; they are not going to accept the Resolution; they are not going to seek the advice of the Committee nominated by the Chair and so on and so forth. But so far as the Chair is concerned, so far as this House is concerned, this Government is not going to tell which of the two courses they are going to take. Therefore, my submission to you—it is not to the Government; I am not pleading with the Government at this stage—is, let the Committee be nominated. That is incumbent upon the Chair. The Chair has no option, because by a majority decision of this House, the Chair has been requested to nominate a Committee of 15 Members of this House. When the Committee of 15 Members of this House is nominated by the Chairman and the Committee actually sits, then it will be open to the Government either to sit with the

Committee to seek its advice and guidance, or to appoint two Commissions of Inquiry to look into the question. I do not know how all the arguments put forward by Mr. Era Sezhiyan ' will be appreciated because where is the Committee? With whom is the Government going to sit? Whose guidance is the Government going to seek. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Chair and we earnestly beg of you let the Committee be first appointed, and after the Committee is instituted it will be known to us whether the Government is going to sit with the Committee or the Government is going to appoint two Commissions of Inquiry or the Government is going to do nothing...

SHRI PILOO MODY: Not only is he wrong, he is giving a wrong interpretation.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: It is not wrong interpretation, Mr. Piloo Mody. This is correct interpretation. I am not repeating. Let the Committee be first instituted by the Chairman and then you can know from the Government and the Government can indicate which course of action they are going to resort to.

DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA: Are you going to allow every Member to speak?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I really want to know what you are discussing now. If we know it then we can proceed accordingly.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Would you kindly allow me to speak? I am not on this discussion. I have got a different point to make. I am not on this discussion at all. I want to make a point relevant to that part..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Relevant to what?

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Relevant to the statement made by the Leader of the House and a

[Shri Arvind Ganesh Kulkarni]

request to the Janata Party as well as our own party. Should I make it, Sir?

SHRI BHAURAO DEVAJI KHOBRAGADE (Maharashtra): No.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If we have to discuss this every party and every side will get notice and will get a chance to speak. Therefore, let us first know what is proposed to be done.

SHRI B. N. BANERJEE: Two Members in succession, three Members in succession, like this speaking is not a fair way.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: please leave it to me to regulate that.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this morning all parties in this House expressed their views on the position. Thereafter it was insisted again and again that the Leader of the House should say what is the Government's position. It is because of that that immediately after the lunch break I stood up to indicate very clearly what is the position because I appreciate the views expressed. But now if that is going to be the point at discussion once again it is for you to determine. But I And nothing new in whatever is being said now he-cause everything that is being said in the shape of points of order has been said *ad nauseam* from the very beginning, so many times, umpteen times. Now it is for you to give the ruling. For example, the point of order raised is whether it is incumbent upon the Chair to appoint a Committee of 15 Members. It is for you to decide because the viewpoints have been expressed. The Chairman has to decide. We have no objection.

SHRI PILOO MODY: The Chair has given the ruling.

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी (सांघ्र प्रदेश) : सभापति जी से मैंने कई बार कहा कि हम को भी बोलने का मौका दिया जाय, लेकिन मुझे एक बार भी बोलने का मौका नहीं दिया गया।

श्री उपसभापति : आप को पूरा बोलने का मौका मिलेगा।

(Interruptions)

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, मैं यह कहना चाहता था कि इस हाउस में कोई प्रोसीजर रहेगा या नहीं। हम कई दिनों से देख रहे हैं और उधर के सदस्यों को सुनने के बाद एक बात मेरे दिल में आयी है उसे मैं माननीय सदस्यों को बताना चाहता था। वह जबरदस्त से दस मिनट वा अपनी बात कहने को उठते हैं और जब हम अपनी बात कहने को उठते हैं तो हम को बोलने नहीं दिया जाता है। तो आखिर हम लोगों को कुछ कहने का हक है या नहीं। मैं इतना ही कहना चाहूंगा कि इस सदन में कोई क्लस और रेगुलेशन है या नहीं। यहाँ का कोई प्रोसीजर है या नहीं? चेयरमैन को इस के बारे में मोचना चाहिए। वह लोग एक ही बात को बार बार दोहराये जा रहे हैं। (Interruptions)

अभी कई सदस्यों ने अपनी बात आप के सामने रखी और फिर वे उमो चीज को उठाने जा रहे हैं। इस पर बहस हुई है, सभी ने उस पर अपने विचार रखे हैं, हम लोगों को ही बोलने नहीं दिया जाता। एक पार्टी के चार लोग बोल लेते हैं, पहले त्रिपाठी जी बोले, फिर राय जी बोले फिर सल्वे साहब बोले और वे वही बात बार बार कहते हैं। मुनते-मुनते कान पक गए हैं। मगर हम ऐसा चाहते हैं कि कोई प्रोसीजर होना चाहिए। यह नहीं कि इस सदन को जैसे चाहें चलाया जाए इस सदन की जो मर्यादा है, सदन की जो डिगनिटी है उसको कायम रखना चाहिए। लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं कि जो मन में आये वह कहते चले जायें। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि हमारी जो फीलिंग है वह आप जानें और इस हाउस को आर्डरली कंडक्ट करें। इस चीज को दोहराया नहीं जाए। इस चीज को कहीं न कहीं खत्म करना चाहिए।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : श्रीमन्,...

श्री पीलू मोदी : बोलो, बोलो, बोलो ।

SHRI KALYAN ROY: The party is sick of the leadership.

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : मान्यवर, मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि अभी हमारे नेता ने सदन में यह कहा कि भ्रातृ काल इन विषय पर काफी बहुत हो चुकी है और यह मांग की गई थी कि हम अपना वक्तव्य दें। तो हमने अपना वक्तव्य दे दिया। अब इस पर फिर बहस नहीं होने चाहिए। मेरा आपसे निवेदन है, मान्यवर, कि सदन का पूरा अधिकार है कि जो वक्तव्य नेता सदन ने सदन के सम्मुख उपस्थित किया है उस पर वह अपनी प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त करे। इसलिए जब उन्होंने वक्तव्य दिया है यहां तो हम सब को यह अधिकार है कि हम अपनी टीका उसके ऊपर करें। अपनी आलोचना, अपनी प्रतिक्रिया उसके ऊपर करें। मान्यवर हम आपसे प्रार्थना करते हैं कि हमें पूरा समय दिया जाए कि हम इस वक्तव्य के सम्बन्ध में हमारे जो विचार हैं वह हम प्रकट करें।

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मोय (आंध्र प्रदेश): श्रीमन्, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता था...

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh): How is it relevant, Sir?

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Point of order, Sir.

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मोय श्रीमन् मैं निवेदन यह कर रहा था कि सदन की कार्यवाही और इस सदन के बाहर की कार्यवाही जो चल रही है उसको अलग नहीं किया जा सकता। दुर्भाग्य से या सौभाग्य से इस सदन की कार्यवाही से बाहर की कार्यवाही जुड़ गई है और वह इस प्रकार जुड़ गई है इस प्रस्ताव को लेकर या ध्यान दें या न दें इसको लेकर या इस प्रस्ताव को लेकर जिस प्रस्ताव में दो अंश रखे गए थे, इनको मैं इसलिए नहीं दोहराना चाहता कि सत्ताधारी दल के नेता आडवाणी जी उस पर

नाराज होते हैं, इसलिए मैं उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहूंगा हालांकि वे सदन के नेता बने जाते हैं और हैं भी हालांकि वह बहुमत में यहां पर नहीं हैं। बहुमत में होना यहां का श्री विकल्प अजीब सा है जो कि आसानी से समझ में नहीं आता है और सत्ताधारी दल यहां पर बहुमत में नहीं है.....

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप बहुमत में हैं मगर सत्ता में नहीं हैं।

(Interruptions)

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मोय तो मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि इस प्रस्ताव को लेकर बाहर की राजनीति जुड़ गई है और उससे सरकार भी प्रभावित हो रही है। मेरा केवल निवेदन यह है कि क्योंकि आप स्वयं श्रीमन् अखबार तो आप भी पढ़ते होंगे या स्टाफ वाले आपको बताते होंगे कि यहां पर एक जनता पार्टी के नेता ने अध्यक्ष पद से छेड़ने की बात कही।

... (Interruptions) ... इसी पर मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : श्रीमन्, पाइंट आफ आर्डर। श्रीमन्, पाइंट आफ आर्डर रेज किया है मैंने....

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मोय : मेरी व्यवस्था भी इसी पर है।...

(Interruptions)

\* श्री उपसभापति : आप पहले इनको बोलने दीजिए, फिर बोल लीजिए।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : यह तो तक्रार हो रही है, यह पाइंट आफ आर्डर नहीं है। मैं कई दफा कह चुका हूँ।.....

(Interruptions)

श्री उपसभापति : उनको बोलने दीजिए, उसके बाद आप बोलिए।

श्री बुद्धि नथी : श्रीमान्, व्यवस्था ही जब इस पर है तो माननीय अटल जी मैं कहूँ क्या ? मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि इस प्रस्ताव को लेकर राजनीति के दोनों ओर चल रहे हैं। सरकार कुछ से है इस तरह का खैरा अपनाने हुए है जिसे खैरा की आज उ कि लिए जानकारी रखता कोई बड़ी बात नहीं है। प्रश्नकार में उनका प्रतिक्रिया आ गई। आज अगर वह अवसर में बनाया गया है, उ को सरकार नहीं स्वागत तो है तो मैं ने 17 तारीख को भी यह कहा था कि सरकार का इसी तरह का समान अध्येता। फिर भी सरकार का इसी तरह का खैरा अपनाने। तो श्रीमान् मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न आप पर है इस नते में कि जब प्रस्ताव पारित हो गया और सरकार को स्वीकार कर रही है तो फिर आपका कार्य हो जाता है क्योंकि सदन के आप भी अंग हैं कि आप पन्द्रह सदस्यों की समिति को नियुक्ति करें। उक्त नियुक्ति के रास्ते में न संविधान आता है, न कोई रुक आता है, न कोई नियम आता है और सरकार अगर आवेगा तो उ को नहीं जाने दिया जाएगा। व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है कि इस प्रस्ताव को लेकर आज राजनीति में उधन-धुल हो रही है इसलिए आपसे हम नम्र निवेदन करते हैं कि जोघ्रातिजोघ्रा आप 15 मई को कमिटी का निर्माण करें। अगर उत्तको नहीं करते तो फिर हम को मजबूर आप करते हैं कि हम यह मांग बारबार इस सदन में उठाते रहे और इस से सदन की कार्यवाई में रुकावट आती है तो वह जिम्मेदारी हमारी नहीं होती है।

श्री श्री सत्यनारायण गेह्लो : पॉइंट आफ आर्डर रोज करता चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन के बारे में काफी बहस हो चुकी है और उसी के ऊपर बहस जारी करने के लिए बेयर इजाजत देंगे या नहीं, इसको रूनिंग में चाहता हूँ।

श्री जगदीश प्रताप सायन (उत्तर प्रदेश) : विरोधी दल के नेता न प्रस्ताव रखा है कि सदन के नेता के वक्तव्य पर टिप्पणी करें।

क्या हम लोग टिप्पणी के बारे में विचार कर रहे हैं और यदि विचार कर रहे हैं तो हम सभी को बोलने की इजाजत दी जाएगी। या नहीं। यह मेरा पॉइंट आफ आर्डर है।  
(Interruptions)

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: sir, May I submit to you, and through you to the Ltader of the House, the great anguish with which we are going through this type of work in the R'ajya Sabha, which is really telling on the people's faith in democracy? Sir, I was away for eight days to my home town. I was all along being asked by the people and the workers of my party what type of work is going on, what type of matters are being discussed here. Sir, I appeal to you, and through you to the Leader of the House, and particularly Mr. Piloo Mody, that the people's faith in democracy should not be eroded by anybody's action, whether by those belonging to the Janata Party or the Congress Party to which we belong. Sir, why I say this is because I am very much disturbed today by the statement made by Mr. C. B. Gupta, that a sum of Rs. 80 lakhs was collected and he had authorised somebody...

AN. HON. MEMBER: Rs. 90 lakhs,

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Whatever may be. Sir, I know in Marathi it is said: "Saathi buddhi nathi", i.e. the people become insane at a late age. I have got great respect for Mr. C. B. Gupta because he was a leader of my Congress Party when it was a united Congress Party. But, sir, it does not become Mr. C. B. Gupta to disclose this thing. It is just like a married couple describing the exploits on the road. It is never done. This is not the culture. That is why, Sir, I say that the people's faith in democracy should not be eroded by the utterance\* of Mr. C. B.

Gupta that he had authorised somebody to collect money. Having said that, there is a greater relevance for j "the demand that we are making, that there must be some type of a commit- } tee or a commission, or whatever you may decide upon. But I would request, through you, the Janata Party to see that it is in their own interest to solve this problem and not allow thus dirty linen to be washed in public be- I cause there are many C. B. Guptas in their party. We have got no right to criticise Indira Gandhi and Sanjay Gandhi. What moral right have I got to do that when you are disclosing the same thing? And you w—e criticising that when you were here on this side. With all seriousness.... (Interruptions) Please shut up Mr. Pillo Mody....I would request and submit to my colleagues who are her.> that now this tangle should be solv •ed. I make a very relevant sugge.; tion. Sir, as the Leader of tb«? House has said, the decision will be made available within a week. B'al Friday is a holiday. So you must direct the Leader of the House that it will be made available on Wednesday; if not on Wednesday, on Thursday. 11' that is done. I would request the Leader of the Opposition here to H-cept the suggestion. Get the decision on Wednesday or Thursday. Otherwise, going again to the next week means that Parliament is going to be prorogued on the 31st. {Interruptions} I would request that the Leader of the House should accept that he would disclose it positively by Wednesday •or Thursday and the Leader of the Opposition should also accept it, and we shall allow this House to proceed with the business so that we do not waste our time and make a laughing stock of ourselves in the people's eyes. I would request him also to ask Mr. C. B. Gupta, fo heaven's sake, to shut his mouth; he is too old to talk about these things.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: Sir, I have been standing to speak on this point since morning. I will take only one minute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What are we going to discuss? (Interruptions)

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: I will take one minute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minute is all right.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: I will make only a factual comment.

The Leader of the House \_\_\_\_\_  
(Interruptions)

श्री नानेश्वर प्रसाद शाहो (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
आप अपनी भाषा में बोलिए ।

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : उप-भाषति  
महोदय, सदन के नेता श्री आडवाणी जी ने जब इस विषय पर एक मोशन सदन में आया था उस वक्त भी उठ कर कहा था कि 10 तारीख को इस पर वक्त होगा । जिस दिन यह बात कह गई थी कि उस दिन वक्त के लिए चार दिन बाकी थे । जिस दिन सदन में इस विषय पर चर्चा हुई उसके 11 दिन के बाद आज वे खड़े हो कर यह कह रहे हैं कि एक सप्ताह से इस बारे में गवर्नमेंट की प्रतिक्रिया जाहिर करने के लिए आरंभ लेंगे । मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक गवर्नमेंट का सवाल है, गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर कोई भरोसा नहीं है । यह गवर्नमेंट डिलेइंग टेक्टिस एडॉप्ट कर रही है ।

DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA; He is repeating the same thing.

SHRI PILOO MODY; I walk out.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: All right you walk out.

यह कह रहा था कि यह सरकार अपनी प्रतिक्रिया जाहिर करने के लिए डिलेइंग टेक्टिस एडॉप्ट कर रही है । जहाँ तक कमेटी के एडॉप्ट का सवाल है या कमेटी की बहाली का सवाल है इस बारे में सब लोगों की राय है कि यह बात बिल्कुल सफ है कि इस सरकार में सरकार नहीं आती है ।

[Shri Anant Prasad Sharma",

यह काम आपको करना है, चयर को करना है। ऐसी स्थिति में इस बारे में गवर्नमेंट की प्रतिक्रिया आए या नहीं आए, उसके बिना आप एक कमिटी का निर्माण करें और मेरी राय है कि कल तक इन कमिटी का निर्माण हो जाना चाहिए। जब तक कमिटी की एसाइन्मेंट नहीं होती है, इस तरह से सदन की कार्यवाही नहीं चल सकती है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Members very well known what the Chairman said on the 17 th August, 1978. He said:

"Two courses, therefore, seem to be open to Government, namely, either they should seek the guidance and advice from a Committee of the members of Rajya Sabha or forthwith appoint two separate Commissions of Inquiry.

"This matter was also raised in the House yesterday. I am of the opinion that in terms of the Motion the question of appointment of a Committee by me would depend on the indication from the Government as to which one of the two alternatives mentioned in the Motion is acceptable to them. The appointment of a Committee at this stage without knowing the mind of the Government would be infructuous I would, therefore, request the leader of the House to let me know what course the Government propose to adopt in the matter."

The Leader of the House has just said that he would give the reaction of the Government with respect to the observation of the Chairmen within this week. Points have been raised that it should do it soon and also others that a committee should be appointed straightway. But, in view of the observation of the Chairman, I would request the House to kindly wait till the Government announces its reaction in this respect and then we will see what is to be done later.

Now we have a number of important matters which are pending. The calling attention motion is there, and I would request that we proceed with the business.

श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी : मान्यवर, अभी नेता सदन ने इस सप्ताह की अवधि दी है। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि 10 तारीख को यह रिजोल्यूशन इस सदन ने पास किया और आज 21 तारीख है। 11-12 दिन हो चुके हैं और तब से बराबर इस सदन में इस प्रश्न को उठाया जा रहा है। अब तक सरकार की प्रतिक्रिया जो कुछ निकली वह यह निकली कि यह तो रिकमेंडेटरी है, हम चाहे इसको मानें या न मानें। कमीशन तो हम बनाने वाले नहीं हैं और यह रिकमेंडेटरी है इसको मानें या न मानें। चेयरमैन ने कहा, मान्यवर, आपका कहना सही है कि कौन सा रास्ता पकड़ना चाहते हैं, सरकार यह बताए; क्योंकि बहुत दिन हो गए हैं। यह कहे हुए भी चार-पांच दिन हो गए हैं। सरकार को मौका नहीं मिला कि इसको समझे और अपनी राय दें। सारा प्रश्न टाला जा रहा है। मान्यवर, इस सदन के अधिवेशन के बहुत थोड़े दिन रह गए हैं और फिर इस सप्ताह के अंत में कह देंगे कि यह हमें मंजूर नहीं है। चेयरमैन साहब का कहना यह है कि हमें जब तक सरकार नहीं बताएगी तब तक कमिटी की स्थापना करना इनप्रवच्यूस है। मान्यवर, यह मामला ढीला पड़ता जा रहा है इसलिए इस सदन में हम लोगों को क्या करना है, कुछ समय में नहीं आता। अभी एक मित्र ने कहा कि थोड़ा समय और दे दिया जाए। हम चाहते हैं आज का समय और दे दें और कल यह बताएं और कह दें कि हम नहीं मानते तो फिर चेयरमैन साहब से हमारी बात रह जाएगी कि इस पर उनकी क्या राय है कमिटी बनाना है या नहीं बनाना है। उसके बाद सदन सोचेगा कि आगे क्या करना है। मान्यवर, यही मेरा आपसे निवेदन है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we come to Call Attention. Shri Ajit Kumar Sharma.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है . . .  
(Interruptions)

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA: What about the Government's reaction, Sir?  
(Interruptions) MR. DEPUTY

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : मेरा यह कहना है कि 10 तारीख को प्रस्ताव पास होने के बाद दो बार इमरजेंसी केबिनेट मीटिंग हुई। जनता सरकार . . . (Interruptions) उसमें उन्होंने कोई निर्णय लिया। उपसभापति महोदय अब यह बात चल रही है कि चौधरी चरण सिंह अगर भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप वापस ले लें तो (Interruptions) कार्पूरी ठाकुर ने कहा है कि . . .

CHAIRMAN: This is point of order.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA (Assam): I rise to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs...  
(Interruptions)

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : भ्रष्टाचार का आरोप वापस ले लें तो उनको केबिनेट में जगह दे दी जाएगी। उपसभापति महोदय, कार्पूरी ठाकुर एक नया फार्मूला तैयार कर रहे हैं अगर चौधरी चरण सिंह भ्रष्टाचार का आरोप वापस ले लें तो केबिनेट में स्थान दे दिया जाए। कार्पूरी ठाकुर केन्द्रीय सरकार . . .  
(Interruptions)

श्री उपसभापति : आर्डर प्लोज़। इसमें कोई प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर नहीं है। यह रिकार्ड में नहीं जाएगा।

(Shri Kalp Nath Rai Continued to Speak)

श्री उपसभापति : प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर नहीं है, मैंने पहले कह दिया है।

(Shri Kalp Nath Rai continued to speak)

श्री उपसभापति : इस में प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर किस बात का है ?

(Shri Kalp Nath Rai continued to speak)

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA: I beg to call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the serious situation...

(Shri Kalp Nath Rai continued to speak.)

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, स्थान ग्रहण कीजिए।

श्री भोष्म नारायण सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभापति जी, नेता सदन कुछ कहना चाहते हैं।

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, some Members of the Opposition had conveyed that perhaps: the statement that I made at the outset was not fully understood or fully heard I would like to make it clear that I did not say that the Government would indicate its decision in a week. I said, the Government would indicate its decision this week. I was very clear about the words that I used—"this week." And "this week" means up to Thursday obviously, because on Friday we are not sitting.

SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH: Why not tomorrow? ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, let us come to Call Attention, please.