

**REPORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT RELATED PARLIAMENTARY
STANDING COMMITTEE ON EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

SHRIMATI PREMA CARIAPPA (Karnataka): Sir, I lay on the Table a copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following Reports of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on External Affairs:

- (i) Eighth Report on Action Taken on the Recommendations contained in the Seventh Report of the Committee (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants — (2005-2006) of the Ministry of External Affairs; and
- (ii) Ninth Report on Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in the Sixth Report of the Committee (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants — (2005-2006) of the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs.

CLARIFICATIONS ON STATEMENT MADE BY PRIME MINISTER

Alleged involvement of certain individuals in the matter which is currently under inquiry by the Justice Pathak Inquiry Authority

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the very outset, Sir, I have to express a certain degree of disappointment about the time frame in which we are obtaining these clarifications because certain timeliness for seeking clarifications is very important. The statement by the hon. Prime Minister was made on 2nd December. We are now able to seek the clarifications only on 15th December. Clarifications Sir have to be topical, not historical, otherwise, they are not clarifications, it will then have to be a special category of classification. I understand, Sir that the Prime Minister had obligations, his very able and hard-working Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs, informed us of those obligations. It is not uncommon for Prime Ministers when they have to leave the the country or have other obligations or there are visitors from abroad to mention it themselves to the House. The House is always very indulgent. The House has never stood in the way of the Prime Minister or any Minister, for that matter, in performing his or her functions. That is, of course, a small point, till the point of certain observations, which made us in the House feel whether we are of any value to the hon. Prime Minister, or are not of any value

and this leads, for example, to a second difficulty. The context in which the clarifications was to be sought, I find from reading the hon. Prime Minister's statement of 2nd December, has been missed. I had submitted this, Sir, in the House, on the 2nd December, early in the morning, itself. This is what I had submitted to you, Sir, in the morning of 2nd December.

“अभी हाल ही में, पिछले दिनों, दोनों सदनों में इसी वोल्कर रिपोर्ट पर जो बातचीत हुई है, उस पर दोनों सदनों में अपनी बात कहने का सबको मौका मिला है। सरकार की तरफ से भी कुछ बातें रखी गई हैं। जो नया तथ्य सामने है, वह सत्य है या नहीं, हम अपनी बात कह दें, सरकार से हम चाहेंगे, वह उनकी बात कहे।”

Therefore, the whole issue arose and so much about the original Volcker Report which was discussed in both the Houses. The issue arose because of a certain statement given both in a *Journal*, which subsequently appeared, as also on television. That was the issue. I find that, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister's statement, whosoever drafted it, of course, mentions that. But that is not the central part of what he said. He has then again gone largely on what the Volcker debate had already been about. It is not about the new facts that the television interview or the statement in the *Journal* said. That is why I must express disappointment with what the Prime Minister had said that day. He said it in the other House. Here we have the benefit of seeking clarifications. It is a privilege that this House has. We can play with that privilege or dilute it; that is for the House to decide.

But I have to express disappointment with the Prime Minister's statement. I find it rather a boxed-in statement. Regretfully, it sheds no light whatsoever on the नए तथ्य सामने आए हैं, I do not know what to call it, Sir. It is actually a kind of dense forest of ambiguity from which it is very difficult to find out what exactly it is that the hon. Prime Minister means. Let me illustrate. This new तथ्य and the.. Sir, I am waiting for the consultations to get over with the Minister of State. नए तथ्यों का जो मैंने उल्लेख किया था, what is it that the former Ambassador to Croatia said? He said this amongst other things. I have just two parts of what he said. They are now part of the *Journal* as also they are recorded on the television. One, he said, मोटी बात यह है कि... The green light to give these oil vouchers was given during this visit-the visit referring to the visit of the former Minister

of External Affairs, etc. And, the other thing, which he says is that this is all a hogwash; that Natwar never knew and the Congress Party never knew it. I find it necessary to point this out, because in whatever the hon. Prime Minister has said in his statement, he is consistently skirting this issue, not addressing the centrality of the new facts that have come up. Let me take the first paragraph of this statement. The first paragraph talks of "certain individuals" and certain transactions'. Firstly, it is not that certain individuals alone are there; as I said, what is mentioned by Mr. Mathrani, the former Ambassador, talks also of institutions. So, why should they limit it to "certain individuals" alone? The other day, the hon. Defence Minister rather agreed with what I said when he, I found a very strange definition of the Congress (I) party. He called it 'a corporate body'. Amongst all the various characterisation that I have known of a political party, at none of the times I have never heard it being called a 'corporate body'. I have known the Congress (I) party's description from Shri Debkant Barua—"party equal to an individual and an individual equal to a country," but that the party is now referred to as a corporate body is a very strange definition. Here, when the former Ambassador of Croatia has clearly stated what he has, for the Prime Minister to come here and say that the mention there is about certain individuals is, of course, quite coy, and he, in his coyness, is totally avoiding the issue that we are now facing and the new things that have been asserted by the former Ambassador.

Sir, I would be grateful if the hon. Prime Minister because what he has said in the first paragraph is factually incorrect and it is only proper if he now corrects it—clarifies and corrects it; moreover, when he says, 'certain individuals', very soon thereafter, he goes on and says about the Volcker Committee Report. That is why it is important that this factually incorrect "statement be clarified. The second thing is that when the hon. Prime Minister, rather modestly, mentions about Volcker, there of course, he says about Indian entities and individuals; I think it is in the context of his earlier statement. But it is both confusing and misleading when he says that the Government has been firm, consistent and clear". This is a very categorical statement and would otherwise be a very interesting and reassuring one. But let me, in a minute, cite to you the Government's record on this firm, consistent and clear; stand on the issue! The Volcker Committee Report was available on the website on the 27th October. We are here today on the 15th December; roughly 45 days have passed.

The former Minister of External Affairs, quite understandably, was the first to react very frankly when he said that these allegations were baseless and untrue." thereafter, a distinguished office-bearers of the Congress (I) party on 29th October said, "We categorically state that the reports are false and baseless. We consider it as an attempt to sully the fair name of the Indian National Congress...." "....and we are determined to take steps to safeguard the name, image and reputation of the Party". I would be entirely with any General Secretary of a party who stood up firmly and said, "This is what we intend doing". But, both of these high dignitaries of the Congress Party and, therefore, of the Government, having said what they did nothing happened. Therefore, awaited the Prime Minister's comment on this anxiously, and though he was then, I was informed, in the North-East on his way to Kolkata, what finally emerged in the papers on the 30th of October, Sir, which was by the Prime Minister's spokesman, and I assume that the spokesman was authorised by the Prime Minister to so inform the country, was, "The Prime Minister agrees that the facts mentioned in Table-III of the Report of the Independent Inquiry Committee", which is the Volcker Committee, "are insufficient to arrive at any adverse conclusion against the External Affairs Minister. The Prime Minister stands by him". Thereafter, the former External Affairs Minister said on the 31st, a day later, "The Report has as much validity as the Report by the CIA Director for the alleged existence of Weapons of Mass-Destruction in Iraq". I am citing these, Sir, to highlight how the Government has been firm, clear and consistent". These are consistent examples of rejecting all association with every aspect of the Report. Then, the Media Advisor to the Prime Minister, again, I am sure, authorised by the Prime Minister, on the 3rd of November, says, "The Government is determined to go to the root of the matter and establish the truth or otherwise of these unverified references. The matter is under the serious consideration of the Government". I won't go into what Mr. Bhim Singh, who is one of the other persons named there, says. I do, however, wish to go into what the ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): Sir, PM's statement came after ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wait. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: How can he go back...? (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please. Let him finish. *(Interruptions)* Please, take your seat. Let him finish.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, it is clarifications on the statement, not on the past history. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please. Let him finish. *(Interruptions)* Please take your seat. *(Interruptions)* Let him finish.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, the hon. Member cannot make a speech on the past history. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. You have spoken too much on the subject. *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): Sir, he can seek clarifications on the statement, but...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Yes, and not on what happened before that. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seats. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Sir, are we restarting the discussion, again?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we are not. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Then, what is this? He is talking on something else, and not on the statement. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seats.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, I am illustrating examples of what the hon. Prime Minister said—that our stand has been "clear, consistent and firm". I am trying to illustrate that the stand has actually not been clear; it has not been consistent and it has not been firm. If you go through these statements made by members of the Government, by the Prime Minister or, on his behalf, and, surely, the Media Advisor to the Prime Minister makes the statement only after consulting the Prime Minister...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am on a point of order.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (झारखंड): क्लेरिफिकेशन्स में क्या प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है?
...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have a tradition in this House, and I have also been a Member of this House, that when a clarification is asked for, it is limited to the statement that is made by the Prime Minister. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: When clarifications are sought, there is no point of order. *(Interruptions)* Let him finish. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Let me raise the point of order, Sir. *(Interruptions)*

श्री विक्रम वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश): सभापति महोदय, मंत्री जी इस हाउस के मेम्बर नहीं हैं।
...(व्यवधान)...

श्री अरुण जेटली (गुजरात): जब मंत्री जी इस हाउस के सदस्य नहीं हैं, तो ये प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर कैसे उठा सकते हैं? ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand): Sir, he is not a Member of this House. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: That does not matter. Let me raise the point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. *(Interruptions)* When he is seeking clarifications, there is no point of order. *(Interruptions)*

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (उत्तरांचल): सर, इनके प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठाने पर मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, please allow me. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat, Don't disturb. *...(Interruptions)...* Please take your seat. *...(Interruptions)...* Let him finish. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Please allow me to raise the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I request you to take your seat. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Please allow me to raise the point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please allow me, Sir ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: There is ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I will take my seat ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I request you to allow me to raise the point of order ...*(Interruptions)*... You must allow me to raise the point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: इनके प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर पर मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है। ...*(व्यवधान)*... यह प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर नहीं होना चाहिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: Sir, the hon. Minister is disturbing the debate. ...*(Interruptions)*... The Minister who is not a Member of this House cannot raise a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: उनके प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर पर हमारा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, he is not seeking clarification. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, you must hear me. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will take only one minute ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति: तो मैं क्या करूँ?

श्री कपिल सिब्बल: सर, इनको बोलिए कि वे बैठें।

श्री सभापति: मेरे कहने से बैठते ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I will not take more than sixty seconds.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: सर, इनके प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर उठाने पर मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: The Minister cannot raise a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*... See the rule book. The Minister cannot raise a point of order.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: सर, इनको प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर उठाने का अधिकार ही नहीं है ...*(व्यवधान)*...

डा० मुरली मनोहर जोशी (उत्तर प्रदेश): सारे सदन में डिसऑर्डर क्रिएट कर दिया है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: सर, प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर उठा ही नहीं सकते। ये बहस का जवाब दे सकते हैं, ये प्रिविलेज ...*(व्यवधान)*... ये बहस में इंटरवीन कर सकते हैं, प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर नहीं कर सकते। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: It is not a point of order. It is a point of disorder. ...*(Interruptions)*... Why should he create disorder in the House?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I must be allowed to raise it. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, they cannot stop me from raising a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, the Minister cannot raise a point of order in the House. ...*(Interruptions)*... The Minister has no right to create disorder in the House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: सर, इनके प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर उठाने पर मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (Jharkhand): Sir, I have a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I have a point of order. Sir, rule 258 ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I too have a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please let him finish. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, I have a point of order under rule 258.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under which rule? What is that? ...*(Interruptions)*...

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): सर, मेरा एक प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है। इस सदन में यह व्यवस्था रही है कि इस सदन की प्रक्रिया रूल और प्रीसिडेंट से चलती है। अगर आप सदन की डायरेक्शन 84, पेज 62 ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: वह मैंने देख लिया है।

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: दिनांक 24 अप्रैल, 1969 और दूसरा रूलिंग 161, पेज 126-127, दिनांक 25 जुलाई, 1985 को देखें तो जब कोई माननीय सदस्य क्लैरीफिकेशंस पूछते हैं तो वह डिसकशन में कन्वर्ट नहीं होना चाहिए और उसी विषय पर पूछना चाहिए जिस विषय पर स्टेटमेंट किया गया है ... (व्यवधान) ... विषय पर यहां पर क्लैरीफिकेशंस की अनुमति प्रदान नहीं की जानी चाहिए ... (व्यवधान) ... इसलिए मान्यवर ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, मैंने आपको सुन लिया है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: जिस विषय पर और जिस संदर्भ में वक्तव्य दिया गया है, उस संदर्भ में ही क्लैरीफिकेशंस टू दो प्वाइंट पूछे जाने चाहिए। जैसे पीठासीन अधिकारी की व्यवस्था पूर्व में भी रही है ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री विक्रम वर्मा: ये चेयर को चैलेंज कर रहे हैं ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: इसलिए मैं आपसे विनम्र अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा कि इस संबंध में आप डायरेक्शन दें और माननीय सदस्य को कहें कि वे केवल क्लैरीफिकेशंस पूछें ... (व्यवधान)...

श्रीमती माया सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश): सच कड़वा होता है, सुनने का धैर्य रखिए ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: और उससे हटकर जो उन्होंने बात कही है, वह सदन की ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI SHARADANANTRAO JOSHI (Maharashtra): Sir, the Minister who is not a Member of this House cannot raise a point of order. ... (Interruptions)...

श्री सभापति: सदन के ... (व्यवधान) ... एक मिनट ... (व्यवधान) ... मैं इस मामले को खत्म ही कर देता हूं ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, I have a point of order. ... (Interruptions)...

श्री सभापति: मैं खत्म ही कर देना ...(व्यवधान)... प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है।
...(व्यवधान)... एक मिनट बताएं ...(व्यवधान)... मैं यह चाहूंगा कि आपने जैसे कहा कि
भाषण नहीं हों ...(व्यवधान)... अपने क्वेश्चन का फ्रेम किस प्रकार से किया जाए, उसका
background देना माननीय सदस्य का अधिकार है और वे देंगे क्योंकि इसमें ऐसा नहीं है कि
वे नहीं बोलें।

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: सर, मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है।

श्री सभापति: अब काहे को बोल रहे हैं?

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: सर, प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है ...(व्यवधान)... Because he is a
Minister who belongs to the other House. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री सभापति: मैंने उनको भी मना कर दिया है और आपको भी मना कर रहा हूँ
...(व्यवधान)... नहीं, अब छोड़िए ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, he is raising a point of disorder.
...(Interruptions)... If our leader is not allowed to speak, we will not allow
the Prime Minister to speak. ...(Interruptions)... This is a point of disorder.
...(Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is allowed now. ...(Interruptions).. Please take
your seat. ...(Interruptions)... Please take your seat. ...(Interruptions)...
Now, the Leader of the Opposition.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, my friends, in fact, need not
demonstrate the agitation they have just demonstrated. I just wanted to
cite example of what the Government or the Members of the Government
have themselves said...(Interruptions)... It is quite contrary to what the
hon. Prime Minister has said about being consistent, clear and firm,
because the stand has not been consistent, because it has not been
clear, and even the clarification that I have to seek has to be illustrated
why it is necessary that the Prime Minister clarifies! For example, Sir, I
would not go hereafter to be quoting the former Minister of External Affairs,
but I do find it necessary to say that ...(Interruptions)...

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE):
Sir, this is the problem. You can refer to the statement made by the Prime
Minister. You cannot refer to the statements made not by the Prime

Minister, or by anybody else. That is clarification. (*Interruptions*) He just referred to the statement made by the Congress' General Secretary. He is now referring to the statement made by the former External Affairs Minister. When you seek clarification on the specific statement made by the Prime Minister, the clarifications must be confined to the statement made by the Prime Minister on the floor of the House. It cannot go beyond that. (*Interruptions*)

श्रीश्रुती सुषमा स्वराज: सर, वे प्रेजेंट स्टेटमेंट को रेफर कर रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान) ... मैं प्रणब दा से कहना चाहूंगी कि वे प्रेजेंट स्टेटमेंट को रेफर कर रहे हैं, उसकी काट बता रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान) ... काट कर रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान) ... उसकी काट बता रहे हैं ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, we can raise any point. ... (*Interruptions*) ...

श्री सभापति: आप बोलने दीजिए। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री राजू परमार (गुजरात): पहले डिसकस कर लीजिए, बाद में बोलिएगा। ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, we can raise any point, without being agitated upon it. I have heard hon. Pranab Babu, I have great regard for him, for his Parliamentary experience. To be necessarily agitated either in voice or...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am simply speaking loudly but not agitated.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I am very glad that you are not agitated. If you needlessly agitate, actually it is bad for health also.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: My health is perfectly all right.

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, ठीक है, प्लीज़ कनक्लूड कीजिए। ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I am citing example because the hon. Prime Minister has referred in his statement to the Congress Party, to Volcker, and then he said, "clear, consistent, firm..." I am citing only what the Members of Government themselves have said. I would say that it is not clear, not consistent and not firm. That is all that I am trying to do and not as the very hard working Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs

has said, "converting it into a discussion or a debate" and I am certainly not drawing any...*(Interruptions)*

कुछ माननीय सदस्य: सर, क्या पच्चीस मिनट का क्लैरिफिकेशन होगा?
...*(व्यवधान)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): सर, उनको बोलने दीजिए। लंच तक हो जाए यह डिबेट। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I think, these are the examples of absence of clarity. In regard to the Volcker Committee Report, I do not cite what the Former Minister of External Affairs has said, "The Volcker Committee is actually bullshit." Because it will be very difficult to sustain and ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (Rajasthan): Sir, this cannot be on record because it is unparliamentary. *(Interruptions)*

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: गोबर कहां से अनपार्लियामेंटरी हो गया? ...*(व्यवधान)*... गोबर तो पवित्र चीज है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री सभापति: उनके कहने से क्या होता है? वे कहते हैं-नहीं देना है, I have to decide what is Parliamentary and what is unparliamentary. *(Interruptions)* बैठिए ...बैठिए ...*(व्यवधान)*... प्लीज़ बैठिए। I have to decide what is Parliamentary and what is unparliamentary. *(Interruptions)* अब बोलने दीजिए इनको। ...*(व्यवधान)*... प्लीज़... प्लीज़ आप जल्दी खत्म कीजिए। बोलिए... बोलिए।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, further clarification that I seek from the hon. Prime Minister is ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री राजू परमार: सर, आधा घंटा हो गया है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I go to the next clarification that I seek from the hon. Prime Minister. The statement issued by the Congress Party and the Congress... *(Interruptions)*

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज: सर, ये क्या हो रहा है? ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री सभापति: आप बोलने दीजिए, इंटरप्शन मत कीजिए। आधा घंटा तो इंटरप्शन में ही चला गया है।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The Statement issued by the Congress on November 8, said that the Congress Party had no dealing in respect of any Oil-for-Food contract with Iraq or any of its agencies. This former Ambassador to Croatia said, 'It is a hogwash to say that the Congress Party did not know.' It would not suffice for the hon. Prime Minister of state that, 'I have left it all to the inquiry authority to establish.' We are seeking a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister on a statement that he has made here.

I, now, like to seek other clarifications. It is with regard to appointment of the former Ambassador to Croatia. No Ambassador can get appointed unless it has the approval of the hon. Prime Minister ...*(Interruptions)*... How was the former Ambassador to Croatia present here, through all this information, revelations from when the Volcker Committee Report first surfaced on the website? Then, he continues to stay in Delhi for some months, days or weeks. I don't know how? And, thirty-seven days after the Report first came out on the website, the former Ambassador has issued a statement to a television channel or a Journal whatever, I would, therefore, like to seek clarification on a point. We are discussing only that new incident, not the Volcker Committee Report. Volcker discussion had earlier taken place. Therefore, it is important for us to know who had appointed this person as the Ambassador and on whose recommendation.

Secondly, Sir ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: How is it relevant to the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh) Sir, I am on a point or order ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति: प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर बाद में ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I am, actually, on a point of order ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him finish ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I am on a relevant point of order ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him finish first ...(*Interruptions*)... Excuse me, let him finish first ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Please hear me ...(*Interruptions*)... Sir, this House had an extensive debate on this subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes yes. I agree with you ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: This clarification is confined, as per the rules, only to the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister.

Lastly, Sir, your own ruling 164 on this issue says that clarification cannot be sought for more than five minutes. He is giving a speech. He is not seeking clarifications...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is not necessary for everybody in the Ruling Party to behave as if all of them are Prime Ministers. The hon. Prime Minister is here ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री राजू परमार: सर, ये बार-बार पूछ रहे हैं ...(*व्यवधान*)... Sir, this is totally objectionable ...(*Interruptions*)... it should not go on record ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Sir, this is very objectionable to all the Members ...(*Interruptions*)... it is very* for him to say like this ...(*Interruptions*)... It should not go on record...(*Interruptions*)... He is continuously making remark-after-remark ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री सभापति: दो मिनट, दो, मिनट। प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर बाद में? ...(*व्यवधान*)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: सभापति महोदय, क्लेरिफिकेशन ...(*व्यवधान*)... Sir, please, expunge this from the record ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री सभापति: बैठिए, बैठिए। ...(*व्यवधान*)... प्लीज सिट डाउन। ...(*व्यवधान*)... दो मिनट ...(*व्यवधान*)... मैं देख लेता हूँ ...(*व्यवधान*)...

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Sir, this cannot go on record like this...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please sit down ...(*Interruptions*)... I will take care of that ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Clarification has to be provided ...(*Interruptions*)... I might remind everyday here—I am sure everybody knows—that the hon. Prime Minister, whom all of you have chosen to occupy that seat, is very capable of giving reply ...(*Interruptions*)...

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI MOTILAL VORA (Chhattisgarh): What is the relevance of this to his statement? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please come to your point on the statement ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I wish to know, the hon. Prime Minister has also stated ...*(Interruptions)*... This is the next clarification. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me finish about the Ambassador to Croatia. ...*(Interruptions)*... He is central to this clarification. Who appointed him? Is it correct that he was present here when the report of the Volcker Committee first surfaced? Is it correct that he continued to stay here, and thereafter, he went back to Croatia? Is it correct that he was withdrawn from Croatia? Why was he withdrawn? ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Jammu and Kashmir): That is a different subject. ...*(Interruptions)*... you have to confine yourself to ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. P.J. KURIAN (Kerala): That is entirely different. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति: आप बैठिए तो सही...*(व्यवधान)*... Please take your seat. मेरी सुनिए, Please listen to me.

PROF. P. J. KURIAN: That is entirely a different subject, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: Did we ask you, why was Uma Bharati suspended? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... मैं माननीय सदस्य से यह कहना चाहता हूँ ...*(व्यवधान)*... आप बैठिए तो सही ...*(व्यवधान)*...

PROF. P.J. KURIAN: This is irrelevant. ...*(Interruptions)*... There is a limit. ...*(Interruptions)*... There is a limit. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: There is a limit for disturbing. ...*(Interruptions)*...

*We are not going to tolerate it any more. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री सभापति: माननीय सदस्य, एक मिनट ...(*व्यवधान*)... बैठिए ...(*व्यवधान*)... आप कोई tolerate नहीं करेंगे ...(*व्यवधान*)...

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: रोज का * बना रखा है ...(*व्यवधान*)... रोज का, रोज का* बना रखा है...(*व्यवधान*)...

श्री सभापति: मेरी सुनिए, Please take your seat ...(*Interruptions*)... बैठिए तो सही ...(*व्यवधान*)... मैं देख लूंगा...(*व्यवधान*)... I will go through the proceedings. मैं माननीय सदस्य से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि clarifications के मामले में आप यह चाहते हैं कि dotted line पर clarification होना चाहिए, that is difficult...(*Interruptions*) मेरी सुनिए ...(*व्यवधान*)... एक मिनट, मेरी बात सुन लीजिए ...(*व्यवधान*)...

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: वह लिखकर हमको दे दें ...(*व्यवधान*)... Let them give us in writing. ...(*Interruptions*) We will read that out. ...(*Interruptions*)

श्री सभापति: अगर कोई बात ऐसी आती है, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आपको विश्वास रखना चाहिए कि जो भी बात आएगी, प्राइम मिनिस्टर उसका उत्तर दे सकते हैं, उनमें क्षमता है, इसलिए उनको चिंता करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है ...(*व्यवधान*)... आप बैठिए तो सही, आप बैठिए, please don't disturb me. इसलिए मैं माननीय सदस्यों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि clarifications की एक सीमा है, कितनी देर तक आप clarifications करते रहेंगे ...(*व्यवधान*)... मेरी बात सुन लीजिए ...(*व्यवधान*)...

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: सर, वह हर sentence पर disturb कर रहे हैं ...(*व्यवधान*)...

श्री सभापति: मैंने बताया है कि clarifications जितनी जल्दी हो सके, कर लीजिए।

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया: आप रिकॉर्ड मंगाकर देख लीजिए ...(*व्यवधान*)...

श्री सभापति: मैं रिकॉर्ड मंगा कर देख लूंगा, आप मुझे क्यों disturb कर रहे हैं? मैं खड़ा हूँ और आप बोल रहे हैं। इतना तो आप ध्यान रखिए ...(*व्यवधान*)... यह ध्यान नहीं है कि मैं बोल रहा हूँ और आप खड़े हैं। फिर आप मुझे कहते हैं कि आप इनको कंट्रोल करिए। जब आप ही कंट्रोल नहीं होते हैं, ये कंट्रोल में नहीं है, तो मैं किसको कंट्रोल करूंगा ...(*व्यवधान*)... ये जो ताली बजा रहे हैं, मेरे लिए थोड़ी बजा रहें हैं ...(*व्यवधान*) मैं माननीय नेता विपक्ष से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे अपना clarification चालू करें और खत्म करें ...(*व्यवधान*)... आप बैठ जाइए, please take your seat. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, the next clarification that I seek is about acting promptly. It is, of course, entirely a subjective matter that

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

why you decided was a prompt decision or not. This report, first time, appeared on 27th October on a website. The decision to appoint a retired Justice of the Supreme Court was about ten days later, if I am not mistaken. Thereafter, special envoys were appointed. Of course, the gazette notification, etc. take some time. I was concerned, Sir, when I came to know that Justice Pathak, unfortunately, but as quite often happens in Delhi had not obtained even necessary premises, from which to work. But that is one of the problems of Delhi. And, I don't think that the Government can be held accountable for that. And, if by the agitation that I see on the Treasury Benches, he has not ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: He cannot make that reflection. If we talk among ourselves, he cannot make that reflection. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: He is provoking us. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him finish. ...*(Interruptions)*... ऑपोजीशन का काम है प्रोवोक करने का, आपको प्रोवोक नहीं होना चाहिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I find it very strange, Sir, that I am advised at every step, not to be able to do this, that or the other...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति: आप जल्दी खत्म कीजिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, since you are saying कि जल्दी खत्म कीजिए ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: सर, इन्हें बोलने दीजिए। राज्य सभा में क्लैरिफिकेशन पूछने का एक रिकार्ड बनने वाला हैं ...*(व्यवधान)*... हम चाहते हैं कि इन्हें बोलने दिया जाए ...*(व्यवधान)*... क्लैरिफिकेशन का ...*(व्यवधान)*... हमारे लिए बहुत अच्छा रहेगा ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री सभापति: आप बैठ जाइए ...*(व्यवधान)*... इन्हें जल्दी खत्म करने दीजिए।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, you have said about acting promptly, and the appointment of the Special Envoy. Am I not correct, Sir? The hon. the Prime Minister with his experience, particularly, in the Finance Ministry, knows very well that the Enforcement Directorate functioning is rather exclusive. The Enforcement Directorate does not share what they have with other authorities also. That Paul Volcker, in fact, had said. And, this is a point that I had earlier also made as to why it was necessary to appoint a Special Envoy, when the permanent representative was perfectly capable and adequate for the purpose, and I find it interesting, Sir, that—in fact, when the Ambassador Mr. Nirupam Sen had met Mr. Volcker,

Volcker made it clear that they would not share the documents. It has been obtained from the Governments or entity on the basis of confidentiality and understanding, that they would not be sharing with others, in those cases that they were from concerned Government or entity would be required, Volcker told Sen that the Committee would share information only with investigating agencies. Now, if I am wrong, then I would be very happy to be told because the Enforcement Directorate's papers, Sir, are papers that are not shared unless exceptionally required. Here, the Prime Minister's statement is somewhat at variance with what the hon. the Minister's of State for Parliamentary Affairs had stated some days earlier when I had sought a clarification on this matter. तब उन्होंने फरमाया था, "मैं बताना चाहूंगा कि वोल्कर कमेटी ने ये पेपर्स डाइरेक्टोरेट ऑफ इन्फोर्समेंट को उपलब्ध करा दिए हैं", और उनके साथ दयाल साहब गए थे। उनको, इन्फोर्समेंट वालों को इसलिए उपलब्ध कराए because that is the entitled agency, which only underlines my point; what role, therefore, is Mr. Dayal performing? You can, of course, send him to Jordan or Baghdad or wherever, which our Ambassadors can also do there. Therefore, it is necessary for us to know what role is being performed by Mr. Dayal.

Sir, the hon. the Prime Minister has also said that one should not 'pre-judge'. I am afraid, Sir that when the Prime Minister—and this is about 'pre-judging', because the Prime Minister has said, 'don't pre-judge', and he has said, 'don't pre-judge earlier'. And, he has said 'don't pre-judge' in the statement also. Therefore, I want to know whether the hon. Prime Minister stands by what he says because during campaigning in Bihar, in Patna, he consistently said, 'there is nothing in this Report, and we don't agree with it'. And, I don't think I ought to act on the Minister of External Affairs who starts by saying that there is a pre-judgement in that. There is pre-judgement in not mentioning about the Congress Party. The 'Congress Party' is one of the mentioned entities. And, this is what also the former Ambassador to Croatia said. ...(*Interruptions*)... Therefore, it is very necessary that we know ...(*Interruptions*)... It is also in the Prime Minister's statement. Now, we are, therefore, intrigued by this. That is why I said, what I did, Sir. The hon. Prime Minister was saying about truth. He concludes his statement by advising all, and by asserting this commitment to "truth, probity and transparency". These are very laudable. These are values that we are all ready to be able to subscribe. But when they come in the context in which they come, they are very sad echoes.

We do not carry any conviction because I do believe that the Prime Minister is above all, that is why, I was disappointed with his statement. He has to demonstrate what he has himself stated. He has to demonstrate...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सभापति: ठीक है, ठीक है।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: प्लीज बोलने दीजिए। They do not want me to continue. ...*(Interruptions)*... इतनी जल्द मत कीजिए। आप नहीं चाहते कि मैं conclude करूँ?

श्री सभापति: मैंने आप से कहा कि जल्दी conclude कीजिए।

श्री जसवन्त सिंह: मैं conclude ही कर रहा था। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him conclude. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Therefore, when the Prime Minister talks of truth and probity it is a said echo. And it does not convince us because in the context of which he is saying, I really wish that in this particular context, particularly, about the former Ambassador to Croatia, the Prime Minister and the Government would demonstrate truth and transparency by acting candidly and clearly answering the clarifications that I have sought. Thank you.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the evidence of the Enforcement Directorate is crucial for the success of the Justice Pathak Committee. Sir, reports have appeared in a section of the Press that the former Union Minister, Mr. Natwar Singh, had stashed away large chunks of funds earned from crude oil vouchers in various Swiss Banks. In this regard, the Enforcement Directorate has collected some evidence. I want to know whether the hon. Prime Minister will inform the House of the nature of evidence collected by the Enforcement Directorate so far as funds from the Iraqi Oil deal kept in Swiss Bank are concerned. Will the Prime Minister allow a panel of leaders of both the Houses of Parliament to examine the evidence collected by the Enforcement Directorate? Moreover, the Enforcement Directorate functions under the Finance Minister, and the person being investigated is a very senior Congress leader. Sir, Parliament is very keen that no hush up is done by the Enforcement Directorate under the dictats of the Government of the day. Thank you.

(श्री उपसभापति महोदय पीठासीन हुए)

श्री उपसभापति: श्री शाहिद सिद्दीकी।

श्री शाहिद सिद्दीकी (उत्तर प्रदेश): सर, मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ। सर, मैं कोई लंबा भाषण नहीं करूंगा।

श्री उपसभापति: आप क्लैरोफिकेशन पूछिए।

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: सर, मैं एक छोटे से क्लैरिफिकेशन पर इतनी लंबी बात कहने की लीडर अपोजीशन जैसी क्षमता नहीं रखता। पहले तो मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी का धन्यवाद करना चाहता हूँ कि भारत के इतिहास में किसी भी मामले पर इतनी तेजी के साथ और इतनी ट्रांसपैरेंट इन्क्वायरी पहले नहीं की गयी। इस के लिए देश उन का आभारी है। लेकिन साथ-साथ ...(व्यवधान)... लेकिन साथ-साथ ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: आप बोलने दीजिए ना। ...(व्यवधान)... आप इनको बोलने दीजिए।

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: सब आभारी हैं, देश आभारी है। देश में वे भी हैं और आप भी हैं। ...(व्यवधान)... लेकिन सर, सारी इन्क्वायरीज का ...(व्यवधान)... सारी इन्क्वायरीज का इतिहास ये रहा है कि ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: नहीं, नहीं। आप देखिए। ...(व्यवधान)... अगर वे बोलें, तो आप क्यों एतराज करते हैं? आप बैठिए।

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: महोदय, इन्क्वायरीज का इतिहास यह रहा है कि उसको जिस तरीके से घुमाया जाता है, उसके बाद सदन के सामने, देश के सामने सच्चाई नहीं आती है। मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आपने इन्क्वायरी कराने में तो काफी तेजी दिखायी है और विदेश मंत्री जी का जो त्यागपत्र हुआ है, हम उसके लिए भी आभारी हैं। लेकिन, इसकी सच्चाई को सामने लाने की कृपा करें क्योंकि हमारा और सदन का यह एक्सपेरिमेंस है कि जितनी ज्यादा तेजी दिखाई जाती है, उतनी तेजी से इन पर परदा भी डाला जाता है। इसलिए मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह क्लैरिफिकेशन चाहता हूँ कि दयाल साहब जो पेपर्स लाये हैं, उनको अभी तक देश के सामने, सदन के सामने क्यों नहीं रखा जा रहा है? इससे यह गलतफहमी पैदा हो रही है कि इन्फोर्समेंट डायरेक्टरेट के द्वारा इन पेपर्स को पहले समझ कर, अध्ययन करके, देख कर कि इनके क्या नतायज हो सकते हैं, क्या अखरात हो सकते हैं, उसका जवाब क्या हो सकता है और इसको कैसे डायल्यूट किया जा सकता है, उसका रास्ता पहले देखा जाता है। उसके बाद उसको देश के सामने रखा जाएगा और इससे क्या होगा कि आपके ऊपर जो भरोसा है, आपने जो इन्क्वायरी करायी है, उस इन्क्वायरी पर जो भरोसा है, वह कम होगा। वह न तो आपके लिए अच्छा है ...(व्यवधान)... और न देश के लिए अच्छा है। इसलिए हमारी आपसे यह विनती है कि आप उन पेपर्स को देश के सामने रखें, सदन के सामने रखें और नहीं तो यह बताएं कि क्यों नहीं रख पा रहे हैं? क्या कारण हैं कि आप उसको नहीं रख पा रहे हैं? धन्यवाद।

۱۔ شری شاہد صدیقی ”اتر پردیش“: سر، میں آپ کو دھنیہ اودیتا ہوں۔ سر، میں کوئی لمبا بھاشن نہیں کرونگا۔

شری اُپ سہاجتی: آپ کلیرنٹکیشن پوچھئے۔

شری شاہد صدیقی: سر، میں ایک چھوٹے سے کلیرنٹکیشن پراٹنی لمبی بات کہنے کی لیڈر آف اپوزیشن جیسی شمتا نہیں رکھتا۔ پہلے تو میں پردھان منتری جی کا دھنیہ اود کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ بھارت کے اتہاس میں کسی بھی معاملے پر اتنی تیزی کے ساتھ اور اتنی ٹرانسپیرینٹ انکوائری پہلے نہیں کی گئی۔ اس کے لئے دیش ان کا آہاری ہے۔ لیکن ساتھ ساتھ..... مداخلت..... لیکن ساتھ ساتھ..... مداخلت.....

شری اُپ سہاجتی: آپ بولنے دیجئے نا..... مداخلت..... آپ ان کو بولنے دیجئے۔

شری شاہد صدیقی: سب آہاری ہیں، دیش آہاری ہے۔ دیش میں وہ بھی ہیں اور آپ بھی ہیں..... مداخلت..... لیکن سر، ساری انکوائریز کا..... مداخلت..... ساری انکوائریز کا اتہاس یہ رہا ہے کہ..... مداخلت.....

شری اُپ سہاجتی: نہیں نہیں آپ بیٹھئے..... مداخلت..... اگر وہ بولیں تو آپ کیوں اعتراض کرتے ہیں؟ آپ بیٹھئے۔

شری شاہد صدیقی: مہودے، انکوائریز کا اتہاس یہ رہا ہے کہ اس کو جس طریقے سے گھمایا جاتا ہے، اس کے بعد سدن کے سامنے، دیش کے سامنے سچائی نہیں آتی ہے۔ میں یہ کہنا چاہوں گا کہ آپ نے انکوائری کرانے میں تو کافی تیزی دکھائی ہے اور دیش منتری جی کا جو تیاگ پتر ہوا ہے، ہم اس کے لئے بھی آہاری ہیں۔ لیکن اس کی سچائی کو سامنے لانے کی مہربانی کریں۔ کیونکہ ہمارا اور سدن کا یہ ایکسپیرینس ہے کہ جتنی زیادہ تیزی دکھائی جاتی ہے، اتنی تیزی سے ان پر پردہ بھی ڈالا جاتا ہے۔ اس لئے میں پردھان منتری جی سے یہ کلیرنٹکیشن چاہتا ہوں کہ دیال صاحب جو پیرس لائے ہیں، ان کو ابھی تک دیش کے سامنے، سدن کے سامنے کیوں نہیں رکھا جا رہا ہے؟ اس سے یہ غلط فہمی پیدا ہو رہی ہے کہ انفارمنٹ ڈائرکٹوریٹ کے ذریعے ان پیرس کو پہلے کچھ کر، مطالعہ کر کے، دیکھ کر کہ ان کے کیا نتائج ہو سکتے ہیں، اس کا جواب کیا ہو سکتا ہے اور اس کو کیسے ڈائیکٹ کیا جاسکتا ہے، اس کا راستہ پہلے دیکھا جاتا ہے۔ اس کے بعد اس کو دیش کے سامنے رکھا جائے گا اور اس سے کیا ہوگا کہ آپ کے اوپر جو بھروسہ ہے، آپ نے جو انکوائری کرائی ہے، اس انکوائری پر جو بھروسہ ہے، وہ کم ہوگا۔ وہ نہ تو آپ کے لئے اچھا ہے..... مداخلت..... اور نہ دیش کے لئے اچھا ہے۔ اس لئے ہماری آپ سے یہ ہمتی ہے کہ آپ ان پیرس کو دیش کے سامنے رکھیں، سدن کے سامنے رکھیں اور نہیں تو یہ بتائیں کہ کیوں نہیں رکھ پارے ہیں؟ کیا وجوہات ہیں کہ آپ اس کو نہیں رکھ پارے ہیں؟ دھنیہ اود۔

”ختم شد“

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Maharashtra): Sir, bearing in mind that demand for clarification must be extremely brief, I only wish...*(Interruption)*...

श्री उपसभापति: दिग्वजय सिंह जी, देखिए। हाऊस का डेकोरम बनाए रखिए। प्लीज, बीच में बात मत कीजिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, I wish to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether the same Mr. Anel Matherani — I hope I pronounced his name right—had, more than two years ago, addressed a letter on this very issue, to your predecessor in office, Shri Vajpayeeji, that an inquiry was made in the department on that letter and that it was found that the result of the inquiry will be a can of worms and embarrassing to the interests, which the Prime Minister then held dear, and the inquiry was dropped. Will you, Sir, assure this House that you will trace this letter, produce it before the House, and along with all the notings on the file, which have been made in respect of that letter and the subsequent inquiry?

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, my first point of clarification before you is this. So far as my clarifications is concerned, I want to know whether this House today has set a precedent based on which the timing of clarifications in future would be decided. This is the clarification I seek from you, Sir, whether this will be a precedent for seeking clarifications in the future too.

My second clarification is—and I would not have dwelt upon it because he has already mentioned—whether the hon. Prime Minister would also take cognisance of the different interviews by different envoys, former envoys, to one media or the other and come to the House again with a statement, and will it be the practice of going to the Committee headed by a retired Justice and having a trial by an Inquiry Committee expeditiously, of all beneficiaries, rather than a trial by the media?

श्री उपसभापति: कुमारी निर्मला देशपांडे। आपके पास एक मिनट का समय है।

KUMARI NIRMALA DESHPANDE (Nominated): Sir, through you, I would like to express what the common man in India is saying. The common man is asking a social activist like me, "have you parliamentarians lost the sense of priorities. When great countries like China, Russia and other European countries have just ignored the Volcker Committee Report, why are you treating it as a holy book?" The common man is asking us.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: They are confusing Volcker to Golwalkar.
...(Interruption)...

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI (Kerala): Sir, first of all, we have to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for the very timely action and the intelligent response that he took towards this issue. Sir, I would like to seek a clarification from the hon. Prime Minister that there is a general feeling in the entire world that these so-called papers which are taken into consideration by the Volcker Report are forged. ... (Interruption)... I am finishing within one minute. Even in America, majority of people believe that when the American blockade took place many, many papers were forged and artificially made targeting the people, persons, parties who stood against the blockade. So, Sir, I would like to seek a clarification how can these papers be taken into consideration if this is the case. And, Sir, there are so many new revelations coming now. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister whether these new revelations will also be included in the area of inquiry. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Prime Minister.

डा० कुमकुम राय (बिहार): सर, एक मिनट। ... (व्यवधान)

श्री सभापति: नहीं, Please take your seat. Now, the Prime Minister ... (Interruptions)...

डा० कुमकुम राय: सर, आधा मिनट लूंगी। ... (व्यवधान)... सर, हमारी पार्टी से। ... (व्यवधान)... सर, प्रधानमंत्री जी उस संबंध में भी स्पष्टीकरण देंगे, जैसा पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री और पेट्रोलियम मिनिस्टर के विषय में एक पत्रिका में आया है। उस संबंध में भी प्रधानमंत्री जी स्थिति स्पष्ट करेंगे। ... (व्यवधान)

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, my statement on 2nd of December was not a *suo motu* statement. It was made because the hon. Leader of the Opposition wanted me to take note of some statements attributed to the then Indian Ambassador to Croatia and he asked I should clarify the Government's stand. Sir, with all sincerity, if he reads my statement clearly, I have done precisely that and I would read out what I stated. "As for the statements made today, — the reference is to the statement of the then Ambassador to Croatia — and I am told are likely to be published in a magazine later and later on

they were published in *India Today*—they certainly relate to the transactions under investigation". The transactions under investigations are the transactions which are the subject matter of inquiry by Justice Pathak and I had clearly and unambiguously stated that "the Enforcement Directorate will take cognizance of the recent statements attributed to the Indian Ambassador to Croatia and pursue its investigations". These investigations are in progress. The Enforcement Directorate is doing its duty. The matter is under investigation. There is nothing else for me to state on this case. Thank you.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: We are completely in the dark...(Interruptions)...

श्री उपसभापति: सदन की कार्यवाही अपराह्न दो बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch
at fifty-nine minutes past twelve of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at one minute past two of the clock.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

GOVERNMENT BILL

The Appropriation (Railways) No. 5 Bill, 2005

रेल मंत्री (श्री लालू प्रसाद): माननीय उपसभापति जी, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ:-

“कि रेल के प्रयोजनार्थ वित्त वर्ष 2005-2006 की सेवाओं के लिए भारत की संचित निधि में से कतिपय अतिरिक्त राशियों के संदाय तथा विनियोग को प्राधिकृत करने वाले विधेयक पर, लोक सभा द्वारा पारित रूप में, विचार किया जाए।”

The question was proposed.

श्री प्यारे लाल खंडेलवाल (मध्य प्रदेश): माननीय उपसभापति जी, माननीय रेल मंत्री जी “विनियोग (रेल) संख्यांक 5 विधेयक, 2005” लेकर इस सदन में आए हैं और वे चाहते हैं कि रेलवे के खर्चों के लिए संचित निधि से कुछ और पैसा लिया जाए। यह सदन आपको पैसा देगा, जितना मांगा गया है, उतना देगा और यदि और जरूरत होगी तो और भी देगा। लेकिन माननीय मंत्री जी, खर्चा करने के साथ-साथ रेलों में जो महत्वपूर्ण समस्याएं हैं, उनकी ओर सरकार का तथा रेल मंत्री जी का ध्यान जाना चाहिए।

उपसभापति जी, हमारे देश में रेलवे एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सरकारी उपक्रम है। लाखों लोग प्रतिदिन इससे यात्रा करते हैं। यह देश की एकता और अखंडता का प्रतीक है। परन्तु अफसोस की बात यह है कि इतने लम्बे समय के बाद और माननीय रेल मंत्री जी के द्वारा बार-बार कई प्रकार