

- (4) A copy of the Income-tax (Fifth Amendment) Rules, 1997 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. S.O. 224(E) in Gazette of India dated the 19th March, 1997 under section 296 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

[Placed in Library. See No. L.T. 1893/97]

12.05 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Eighth Report

[English]

PROF. PREM SINGH CHANDUMAJRA (Patiala) : Sir, I beg to present the Eighth Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

12.05½ hrs.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

Second and Third Reports

[English]

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri) : Sir, I beg to present the following Reports (Hindi and English versions) of the Committee on Government Assurances :

- (1) Second Report on requests for dropping of certain assurances.
- (2) Third Report on the implementation of the assurance in respect of Purulia Arms Dropping.

12.06 hrs.

MOTION RE : QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, only yesterday I have given notice about breach of privilege. I also met the hon. Speaker in this regard. He allowed me to raise it today. The matter is that it was published in the Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II, No.-1128, Dt.-1st May that —

[English]

"No. 1128 Arrest and Release of Shri Nitish Kumar

The following communication dated the 30th April, 1997, addressed to the Speaker, Lok Sabha by the Magistrate, Patna, Bihar was received on the 1st May, 1997 :

Shri Nitish Kumar, Member of Lok Sabha was arrested on the 28th April, 1997 under Section 151 of the Cr. P.C. by the Zonal Officer and Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Patna, Bihar for apprehension of breach of peace.

He was released on Personal Bond, the same day."

[Translation]

This is the Bulletin. Mr. Chairman, Sir, my notice of breach of privilege is on two points.

[English]

This is regarding intimation to Speaker regarding arrest, detention etc. and release of Member, Rule 229 states clearly and I quote :

"When a member is arrested on a criminal charge or for a criminal offence or is sentenced to imprisonment by a court or is detained under an executive order, the committing judge, magistrate or executive authority, as the case may be shall immediately intimate such fact to the Speaker indicating the reasons for the arrest, detention or conviction, as the case may be, as also the place of detention or imprisonment of the member in the appropriate form set out in the Third Schedule."

[Translation]

The term "shall immediately intimate" means the intimation of such facts within 24 hours or the same day itself. It does not mean that intimation should reach after three days. He himself said that I was arrested on 28th April and the intimation thereof was sent by the District Magistrate on 30 April which was received here on 1st May i.e. after three days of his arrest. Contrary to this, it should have reached within one, two or three hours. Bihar is a part of the country and it is not out of India. Then why was not this intimation sent immediately ? This is a matter of breach of privilege(Interruptions)

My second point pertains to a false information.

[English]

It says, 'He was released on Personal Bond, the same day.

[Translation]

I did not execute any Personal Bond and nothing like Personal Bond was required. Nobody else on my behalf can give Personal Bond. I also did not execute any Personal Bond.

The fact of the matter is that when C.B.I decided to chargesheet the people involved in fodder scam, we also decided to take out a procession. On April, 28th we were marching in a procession on the streets of Patna where we were arrested at Dak Bunglow Crossing. When we enquired on what charges we were being arrested, we were merely told that we were being taken under arrest. After the arrest, at a distance of two furlong, we.....(Interruptions) I am finishing within one minute. We were lodged in the Kotwali at a distance of only two furlong from the site of the arrest. When we enquired about the reasons for our detention in the Kotwali, the police official present there come before us with folded hands and said that it was a matter of his livelihood. The District Magistrate had ordered him to detain us for half-an-hour more. We realised that since he was a junior officer and incase we would go out from there, he may lose his job and, hence, we remained there. After half-an-hour he told us that now we were released and we can go back to our

respective places. We went back to our homes. When I came here, I saw in the Bulletin that I have been released on Personal Bond. But where is that Personal Bond? It is a malicious intention to defame us. This is a misinformation which has misled the House. It is clearly written in "Kaul and Shakdher".....(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You need not go into the details. I am telling you.....

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : I want to make my submission. It is in the interest of the House. So, please give me one minute's time.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Minister of Home Affairs has already been requested, on 06.05.1997 to furnish comments, officially. Therefore, you need not go further.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : There is no question of Home Ministry in it. In "Kaul and Shakdhar", fourth edition, page no. 246, there is a clear mention.

[English]

about presenting false, forged or fabricated documents to the House or its committee. I quote :

"It is a breach of privilege and contempt of the House to present false, forged or fabricated documents to either House or to a Committee thereof with a view to deceive them."

[Translation]

This is true that I did not execute any Personal Bond then why any comment is expected from Home Ministry. I will resign right now from the membership of this House, if I had executed any Personal Bond. Nothing can be more big false than this one. This has been done by some indecent officers in order to bring defame to me, insult me and misled the House. The District Magistrate sent the information after a gap of three days which is the contempt of the House. This is against the laid down rules and constitutes breach of privilege. I would insist to proceed further with the case.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Nitish Kumar, you know that on such matters, we always get the official version certified and then only we proceed further. Accordingly, the Speaker has already referred this matter to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs for his comments. When we receive his comments, we will go further. How can we do it now? Let us go to the next item — Zero Hour.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : What official version is there in this, it is simple. Whether this intimation is correct or false.....(Interruptions) since I am saying that I did not furnish any Personal Bond.

[English]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : Sir, I am not on the facts of the case which are by themselves very disturbing. I am only on the substance of the matter — the substance relating to the privilege of a Member of this House — the privilege arising firstly, from a delayed submission of information about detention and secondly, that submission which is factually in error. Therefore, it is deliberately misleading the House.

Now, your suggestion that this has been sent to the hon. Home Minister, I am afraid, with due respect, misses the point. The hon. Home Minister comes in, when the Government has to explain if it has either failed to do or has done something. In this case, the issue is squarely and only of privilege and the factors involved are the hon. Member, this House and the Chair. In this case, there are only two options open — either this House should decide the issue of privilege now without reference to the Privileges Committee or to refer it to the Privileges Committee.

In the first case, the House can take cognizance of the matter. This is as per the rules. But if, however, you feel and if the hon. Members feel that the House should not take care of it, then I do urge you to refer the matter immediately to the Privileges Committee and not to the hon. Home Minister. The hon. Home Minister does not even come into the picture. There are only two courses open — either the House seizes of the matter and immediately dispose of the matter or it may be referred to the Privileges Committee. This is what I urge you to do.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Nalanda) : I just want to say only this much. Whatever is said now, is adding insult to injury.

[Translation]

Such messages are sent deliberately. The District Magistrate has deliberately misled this House. The hon. Member has stood on his legs to say that he did not furnish any Personal Bond and if it is false, it has been concocted by the District Magistrate. Better if we ask for the facts in this regard either from the state Government or the said District Magistrate or from the Home Minister of that state. Only after that a decision can be taken about this matter. If the House fail to take a decision in this matter and if you deem it fit then better to refer the case this moment itself to the Privilege Committee. This is a matter of the honour and dignity of the House. This is not someone's personal matter.

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum) : Sir, I want to make a submission. As he has very correctly — as he normally does — summed it up, there are two issues. One of the issues is delayed submission. If the submission is delayed, we can immediately call for action and no proof is necessary. If it is a fact that he was arrested on a particular day and any communication reaching the Speaker has been delayed, immediately it causes a censure. That is one aspect. The other aspect is, he is making an assertion that what they have said regarding personal bond is an untruth.

Now, I do not think there is any scope of a reference to the Home Ministry at all. If his assertion is true, then he has to be punished.....(*Interruptions*)... Why do you not bear with me ? I do support that the matter should be referred to the Privileges Committee immediately. There is no scope. If you feel hesitant, then a reference to the hon. Speaker may be made.....(*Interruptions*)... It is all right that he is in the Chair but he has conceded few things in life.....(*Interruptions*)... The matter does require an immediate reference and whether it is there or not is a different matter altogether. It has to be referred to the Privileges Committee in order to uphold the prestige of the House and the Members of the House. There is no doubt on that.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (Latur) : The facts are before this House and I do think that on the basis of the facts which are presented to the House, it is not difficult for us to come to a conclusion that a breach of privilege has been committed because we can rely upon the assertions made by Shri Nitish Kumar here.

There are two facts. One is, information is delayed and the other is that the bond was not executed by him. We can rely upon him on these two facts. But generally, the practice which is followed by this House is this. We do not punish anybody without hearing him. If this august body, this Parliament, punishes any officer or anybody without hearing him, then I think, it would not be proper. So, generally, the procedure which is followed by us in this House is, the moment a notice is given, it is sent to the person against whom the notice is given and we call for the information. Generally, we get the information saying that they regret for what they have done. The expression of 'regret' is sometimes accepted and sometimes not accepted. In my opinion, in this case, if the notice is given, if it is sent to the Home Minister, it means it is sent to the State Government and through the State Government, it will go to the officer who had not informed this House as he was expected to inform. Now, if the officer expresses regret and begs for pardon, it is for Shri Nitish Kumar, this House and the Presiding Officer to accept that expression of regret. If he comes to the conclusion that it is not sufficient and he should be called to the bar of the House and punished – if that is decided in the wisdom of this House – then, we can do that also. But I do think that the judiciary or the Parliament or any other body which is sitting on judgement on anybody should not proceed against anybody without hearing him. I do think that it would be keeping with the dignity of this House to come to a conclusion properly. I have no doubt in my mind and I know Shri Nitish Kumar. I know what he is saying must be 100 per cent correct and he will ultimately win. But this body should not take any action without hearing the officer. Otherwise, it will not be proper. It may be left for the House to decide.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : We are saying that it should be sent to the Privileges Committee.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, he is our respected former Speaker. Taking it to the Privileges Committee does not mean taking an action. He may express regrets about delay.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have had your say. Please be seated. Now let me hear Shri Sharad Pawar also.

....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR (Baramati) : Here, the hon. Member, Shri Nitish Kumar, has made a categorical statement that he has not given any bond.

And the House has been wrongly informed that he is released on bond. I think, it is a clear-cut case and we should send it to the Committee of Privileges. I do not say that you take action against any officer. The Committee of Privileges will definitely send a notice to the concerned officer. That Committee will give an opportunity to him. He will get an opportunity to say what exactly he wants to say. There should not be a direct action. But when the hon. Member is making a categorical statement here that he has not given any bond and if the House has been informed, otherwise, I think, it is a fit case. We should send this matter straightaway to the Committee of Privileges.

[*Translation*]

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad) : Sir, whatever has been said by Shri Nitish Kumar ji, I extend my full support to that because I have suffered such humiliation. I, through you, want to let this House know that whenever such incidents take place, the matter is enquired into and the report thereof is submitted. One such incident occurred with me when a police officer in Ahmedabad slapped me in front of everyone on a square of the city. That time Shri Shivraj Patil was sitting in the Chair. I raised that matter before him. The report was sought and submitted but with the narration that no such incident took place.

[*English*]

I have lost the power of hearing from the left ear because of slapping by that police officer. We had asked for a report. The report had come from the Government. That was a political report that that sort of an incident had never taken place. So, I plead that this sort of an incident, or whenever such a thing happens, should be referred to the Committee of Privileges where the concerned officer should also have an ample opportunity to defend himself. Why are we not unanimous on this issue ?

[*Translation*]

Whenever such incident takes place, matter should be referred to the Committee on Privilege. Asking for a report is not proper, for it gives a chance to the culprits to protect themselves. Therefore I extend my support to Shri Nitish Kumar ji.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI (Howrah) : Sir, in the case of Shri Nitish Kumar ji, at least his arrest was intimated but when we were arrested on the 25th and released after two hours, report regarding our arrest was not intimated.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUNDER LAL PATWA (Chhindwara) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the matter pertaining to privileges given to the M.Ps. is a very sensitive issue. Under the circumstances in

which M. Ps. are required to discharge their duties, very often such kind of situations arise. Being in the chair, you are responsible for protecting the special privileges accorded to them. The Home Minister or the Government is not responsible for protecting their rights and also not empowered to do so when such a categorical statement has been made, it becomes your responsibility to take a decision in this regard and immediately refer this issue to the Privilege Committee. Instead of sending a notice to the Home Minister and seeking his opinion, this matter can be taken up by the Privileges Committee itself. Shri Sharad Pawar has just said that referring a matter to the Privilege Committee does not amount to awarding the punishment. The matter has to be referred to the Privileges Committee for investigation and you have to take a decision in this regard. The Home Minister or the Government have no role in it. You are responsible for protecting those privileges, not the Home Minister or the Government. There is no need to debate this argument further. You can take a decision yourself on the basis of statement made by Shri Nitish Kumar. You have to take a decision immediately and refer the matter to the Privilege Committee.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the entire House is has a unanimous view in this matter. The way Shri Nitish Kumar has raised this matter and challenged that if what he has said turns out to be untrue he will resign his seat. It is very much apparent that whatever he has stated is true and his sentiments have been hurt. It could be possible that there may have been a delay of a day or two but he has submitted a personal bond.

He has certainly given a personal bond and there is no mistake therein. Then this has been said to insult him. Hon'ble Shivraj Patil has referred to the conventions of the House. There is no denying about that. But this is also true that sometimes such circumstances arise when the House has to take a decision immediately. Even if there may have been some mistake in the first case but on the second time, the intention was to insult Hon'ble Member. Hence you should exercise your rights and refer the matter to the Privileges Committee.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA) : Sir, I am sorry I was in the other House. I did hear neither the discussion on the report nor the statement of Shri Nitish Kumar. I am hearing about it now from the other Members. From what I gather, the report of the police has been flatly contradicted.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The intimation to the Secretariat was delayed. It reached here two days later. That is one thing.

Secondly, with regard to the personal bond which has been referred to here, it has not been given at all. There are the two things.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Apart from the two days delay, he has categorically denied the question of giving any personal bond, whereas the police says that he gave a personal bond.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Speaker has referred this matter to you for your comments.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Sir, my comment is that if these two things are involved, then, I think, the matter should go to the Privileges Committee....(Interruptions)

COL. RAO RAM SINGH (Mahendergarh) : Sir, I want to say something.....(Interruptions)

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : Sir, now there is no point in debating this issue. When the hon. Speaker referred this matter to the hon. Home Minister for his comments and the hon. Minister is unanimous with the view of the House and has said that the matter should go to the Privileges Committee, the matter should end there....(Interruptions)

COL. RAO RAM SINGH : Sir, I am sorry to say that I have a different view on this subject. The hon. Member has been insulted. He has made a categorical statement. In this way we are cutting our own hands. Shri Harin Pathak has said that no action was taken when he was insulted. Now again you are referring it to the Privileges Committee.

Sir, I think, the House is unanimous that we should take a decision now and summon that officer....(Interruptions) We should summon that officer here. Otherwise we would be a party to denigrating the privileges of our own Members....(Interruptions) Shri Nitish Kumar has said that he is prepared to resign. Are we doubting his words? What further enquiry would the Privileges Committee make? We must trust one of our own colleagues. We should summon that officer and should ask for his explanation....(Interruptions) That is my view.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Patna) : It would be against the tenets of natural justice to give punishment on basis of one sided views.....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : Sir, since you are yet to take a decision on the subject, I would once again like to plead before you that a very serious matter was taken up earlier in this Session concerning the conduct and statement of the former Secretary-General, Lok Sabha, Shri Subhash Kashyap. I had moved that privilege motion. The hon. Speaker....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

That is not a separate matter. He has insulted the House. Why refer to it as a separate case? This is my opinion about all such cases we are unanimous in this regard. Kindly listen to us first. Do not discriminate in this regard.

[English]

Sir, I would only like to request you that there was a commitment by the hon. Speaker that he would ascertain the facts from Shri Kashyap and inform the House whether the matter would be referred to the Privileges Committee or not. I only desire and would like to submit to you that the matter should be decided very quickly at least by the end of

this Session because the matter is still alive and people are making mockery of Parliament. That is not fair.

I must submit that it should be done before the end of this Session. He has condemned the Speaker, and the Members of Parliament of both the ruling as well as the Opposition Parties in a language which I cannot explain to you. If we still keep quiet and nothing is done, I am very sorry about it. Col. Rao was talking about the rights and privileges of the Members. But this gentleman has condemned the entire Parliament.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We should find out whether the comments have been received or not; if not, action has to be taken.

....(Interruptions)

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ D. CHAVAN (Karad) : Let us have your ruling, Sir. How long can we go on discussing it ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : If this matter is to be referred to the Privileges Committee somebody will have to move the motion and the motion has to be accepted by the House.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : I will have to read this motion then.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I beg to move :

"That the matter relating to the alleged delay in sending the intimation regarding arrest of Shri Nitish Kumar, M.P., on 28 April, 1997 in Patna, Bihar and furnishing of a factually incorrect information in this respect to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, by the District Magistrate, Patna, be referred to the Committee of Privileges for examination and report."

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai North) : I support it.....(Interruptions) I am on a point of order(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Do not talk like this.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Mr. Chairman, please listen to me.....(Interruptions) What sort of justice is being done ? Atrocities are committed on a dalit woman and we are not even allowed to raise the matter. Do we have any rights or not ? You speak of women's rights but in this case atrocities have been committed on a dalit woman.....(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may sit down. When I am standing, you cannot stand like this.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : You speak of dalits but you are giving punishment without having listened to the other party. Please listen to the facts of the case and thereafter you may take a decision but please ask for a report in this regard. It is necessary to find out the truth only

then decision should be taken. Please refer the matter to the Privilege Committee and give them the punishment. If they are punished, they are prepared to undergo punishment also but such an injustice should not be done to a dalit and helpless woman.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The matter is being referred to the Privileges Committee. The officers concerned or anybody can appear before it.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have asked for a report you are referring it without asking for the Report first. It can be referred to the Privileges Committee at any stage.....(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, this is the mood of the House.

....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : The motion has already been moved. This is such a serious matter.

....(Interruptions)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (Barrackpore) : He has not done anything wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not saying anything.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : If there is a dissenting voice, it should be heard.....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I gave him the floor.

....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record.

....(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : I asked him if he has to say anything.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Mr. Chairman, Sir, we seek justice.....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : If you wish to say something, you may do so.

[English]

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : Instead of sending it to the Privileges Committee.....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : He has been given the floor but he is not saying anything.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the incident that is under discussion.....(Interruptions)

SHRI LALMUNI CHAUBEY (Buxar) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, you have decided to refer this matter to the Privileges Committee just now.....(Interruptions)

*Not Recorded.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : The decision has not been taken as yet(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may sit down. When I am standing, you cannot stand like this. Let me hear him.

....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You do not allow anybody to speak in the House.

....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. CHAIRMAN : If you want to say something, you may do so.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : My submission is that in case the prestige and dignity of any Hon'ble Member is threatened, it is not as if we are asking you not to take any action in this regard but when action is being taken against certain persons the Collector and the officials(Interruptions) Please listen to me....(Interruptions)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, what my point is that we should definitely pay attention to all the aspects of the case and give natural justice. If you take any decision without listening to them, it will not be justice....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please listen to him first.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want that report should be sought through the Union Home Ministry to find out the truth. Thereafter you will be able to take a decision on the basis of the Report. Ms. Rajbala Verma is a very dynamaic officer, a dalit woman. We speak of dalits and women's right but injustice is being done to them. In my opinion, if any biased action is taken against her, it will not be a justice.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is my humble request to you that you should give a sympathetic consideration to the matter before taking any decision in this regard and you should take into account the fact that that lady is innocent. It is possible that there may have been some lapse in submitting the Report or some wrong decision may have been taken. But please find out the truth before taking any decision. It will be against the principles of natural justice to take a decision without having listened to what the other side has to say about it. It is not right to rely on the version of just one party. Hence my submission is that I support the motion moved and the matter raised by Hon'ble Shri Shivraj Patil. If you had taken a decision after having investigated into the matter, your action would have been more justified. I request you to ask for a detailed Report and then take any action and in that case, it will be acceptable to all of us.

MR. CHAIRMAN : As Shri Shivraj Patil has stated that this is the convention of the House that comments are sought in the case of violation of privileges. When I sought the comments of Minister of Home Affairs, he himself said that the matter should be referred to the Privileges Committee directly. He is not taking any decision in any case. In this regard, the House may.....

AN HON'BLE MEMBER : You have to take the decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN : This decision has been taken that this is a matter of privilege.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : This is a matter of your discretion. You may seek the comments of the House and Hon'ble Minister but the decision has to be taken by you.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please listen to me.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : I am already listening to you and I seek justice.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is the opinion of all the leaders of the House that this matter should be referred to the Privileges Committee. Referring the matter to the Committee does not mean giving punishment to anybody. All the proofs would be submitted there. If punishment is recommended, the matter would be taken up once again in the House. Hence the motion moved by Shri Jaswant Singh and seconded by Shri Sharad Pawar is being put to the vot of the House.

[English]

The question is :

"That the matter relating to the alleged delay in sending the intimation regarding arrest of Shri Nitish Kumar, M.P., on 28 April, 1997 in Patna, Bihar and furnishing of a factually incorrect information in this respect to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, by the District Magistrate, Patna, be referred to the Committee of Privileges for examination and report."

The Motion was adopted.

[Translation]

SHRI LALMUNI CHAUBEY (Buxar) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the matter which I am raising today is not a matter to be discussed in brief because it has wider implication.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, certain news items have been published under various headings on the Front page and Editorial page of Hindi Daily 'Jansatta' on 4th, 6th and 7th May. The news is that the Prime Minister, Shri I.K. Gujral has stated in an interview broadcast through Star TV last Friday that the American fighter planes were allowed to be refuelled at the Indian airports during the Gulf war. Replying to the adjournment motion moved in Lok Sabha, the then Prime Minister Shri Chandra Shekhar said that he had allowed the refuelling. This newsitems have raised certain suspicious. The people of the country would like to know as to who had allowed it. Why this matter is being raised now ? What is the secret behind raising the matter now ? A very heated discussion was held in the House on this matter on 22 February 1991 and a adjournment motion was also moved by Shri A.K. Rai in the House as to who had permitted the refuelling of American fighter planes at Indian airports ? The C.P.I., C.P.M. and Congress party members had created a furore and criticised Shri Chandra Shekhar.