

[Shri Basu Deb Acharia]

than others. Then why do we need competition ? Why should we open the insurance sector not only to the private sector but to the multinational companies also ? I would like to know whether we are submitted to the dictates of the United States. In the past we used to receive threats of Super 301 because the United States and other developed countries have been pressurising that our insurance sector should be opened to the multinationals.

As a result of that, the Malhotra Committee was set up and it submitted its report. the main purpose was how the insurance sector can be opened to the multinational companies. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Mr. Speaker Sir, it is 4 o'clock now !

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, Mr. Acharia, you can continue next time. We will take up the next item now.

16.01 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Fourteenth Report

SHRI KRISHAN LAL SHARMA (Outer Delhi) : Sir, I beg to present the Fourteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

16 03 hrs.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Serious situation arising out of recent development in Bihar—Contd.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) : I Beg to move that. . . "the House be adjourned."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, since Shri Indra Kumar Gujral has assumed the charge of Prime Minister, every day he has been delivering a speech on corruption. Corruption finds a mention in his every speech. I would like to quote a few lines from his speech which he delivered on 22nd April while participating in the debate which is as follows :-

"My one promise is that until and unless I am head of the Government, my Government will adhere to transparency. This Government will make its all out efforts to be an accountable Government."

In spite of this all, he has always been required to speak on the issue of corruption. But the tone in which he used to speak earlier in respect of accountability seems to have changed now. Now the accountability is being placed on people. It is being said that corruption has seeped into veins of the people which required an organised drastic measures by the people to root it out. This can be the language of a 'Jan Nayak', not of a person who is holding the highest office in the Government. He admitted that some drastic measures are required to be taken to eradicate corruption.

[English]

"Admitting that corruption has seeped into the veins of the nation, the Prime Minister, Shri Inder Kumar Gujral on Sunday said that something drastic needed to be done against those occupying ministerial positions and facing corruptions charges."

[Translation]

It means that we have to take some drastic action in the cases of corruption. It is evident that such drastic action will be taken at the administrative level. There is no harm at all in mobilising public support against corruption but it is not fair to hold only people responsible for snowballing corruption and turn a blind eye to our duties. If we continue with this approach, we will fail to mobilise the public support against corruption.

The Prime Minister alongwith other dignitaries of the country was present in a get together which was held to plan out a function for celebration of the 50th anniversary of our independence. This celebration will begin from the 9th August from Mumbai and culminate on the mid night of the 14th August when we will be trying to recollect our 50 years old memories. But the get together function was marred by the issue of corruption which was raised there most frequently and even the Prime Minister had to make a mention in this regard in the beginning of his speech. He said that some measures are required to be taken to fight out corruption. But what actions the Government propose to take is known neither to the House nor to the people of this country.

In one of his recent speeches, the Prime Minister accepted that corruptions is hindering the process of growth. If hard earned money of the people is swallowed by scamester by induling in scam after scam in some states then wherefrom will come funds and resources for development ? More importantly if things go like this then how will you create the much needed zeal in minds of the people to inspire them for lending their support in nation building task. If our leaders indulge in loot and we are asking our farmers, workers and employees to discharge their duties honestly, it is going to bear us no fruit.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, how unfortunate is it that the practices which we were following so far in the cases of corruption, is now being challenged. The tradition was that whenever a statesman in power was charged with corruption and prima facie he was found involved therein he used to step down till investigations were completed and the matter decided by the Court.

People used to step down voluntarily. This practice was followed since the time of Shri T.T. Krishnamachari till recent part when Hawala scams took place. In Hawala case also, people against whom charges were made resigned voluntarily from their respective offices. Such persons included Shri Yashwant Sinha, the leader of Opposition in Bihar Legislative Assembly. There was no need for him to resign as he was the leader of opposition. If he wanted, he could have continued in his office but our norms are different. We told him not to stick to his Chair but to resign and he resigned. Advani ji delcared that unless he was acquitted of the charges, he would not contest any election. Only yesterday some of our more friends charged in Hawala case have been acquitted by the Court. But this is the first time well established tradition is being challenged.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Chief Minister of Bihar was saying as to why should he step down ? He was also saying that he would prefer to hang himself rather quitting his office. There was time when people fighting for freedom of their country were hanged. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Patna) : Your submissions are baseless. . . (Interruptions)

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA (Samastipur) : Atalji your submissions are not based on facts. You are speaking baseless. It is not fair to level wild charges against anyone without adequate evidence. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I do not think if it requires any evidence. You are free to say that Lalooji did not say anything like this. You are free. . . (Interruptions)

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : I am saying nothing. It is you who is saying all these things. My symission is only that you should not speak anything which bears no relevancy to your Motion for it would not be proper to level ill found wild charges against anyone. Till now nobody has taken even any cognizance of these allegations but you are making such allegations against him. Moreover, recent development is that he has been elected by the Majority of the MLAs as the leader of the House but you are not taking this fact into account rather you are making direct allegations against him which is absolutely baseless.

We were having a lot of respect in our hearts for you, Atalji but we never thought that you would be making baseless allegations against him. . . (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : You have made your point.

[Translation]

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : If you have any evidence against him to substantiate you charges, please place the same before us then we will readily accept your charges. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Chairman, Sir, Now I am going to place the evidence. Today Laloo Prasad Yadav accompanied by others approached Patna High Court for obtaining anticipatory bail. The matter has been decided by the court. I want to quote here a part of the judgement given by the judge. What more proof is required.

[English]

"If the evidence is to be believed."

[Translation]

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : Your submission is not to be taken as proof because this matter is subjudice. It has been certified not by the Sureme Court but by some lower court. We will not consider it as an evidence unless and until it is decided by the apex court. For, if you consider it as an evidence, then the same criteria will apply on all the persons who have been charge-sheeted. How can it be taken as a proof unless and until confirmed by the Supreme Court ? Therefore, how can we discuss this

[Prof. Ajit Kumar Mehta]

matter which is subjudice ? You have deviated from your principal Motion to go on speaking on a different subject.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Prof. Mehta, it is enough.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I think, the Leader of the Opposition is speaking with full responsibility. He has to authenticate that quotation and, I think, he is doing it with full responsibility. I cannot doubt that.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please have patience. You will have a chance to reply.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Patna) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I request you to kindly read out the Motion moved by him. . . (Interruptions) Kindly read out the Motion moved by hon'ble Atal Bihari ji. . . (Interruptions) Whether there is any mention about any scams or any Chief Minister therein. . . (Interruptions) The rules provide that we can-not hold any discussion on a Chief Minister or Governor or Minister . . . (Interruptions) No discussions can be held on it. . . (Interruptions) Please read out the Motion. . . (Interruptions) The Motion is before the House and we have no objection in holding a discussion thereon but how is he speaking on an issue which is beyond the subject. . . (Interruptions) So far as the recent developments in Bihar are concerned, the whole of Bihar to faced with flood situation. . . (Interruptions) Why do not you hold a discussion thereon ? More than 70 people have died in floods. Crops worth crores of rupees are getting destroyed all over Bihar. That is a serious development. . . (Interruptions) But that is not being discussed here. . . (Interruptions) Bitten by political bug, all of you are after one man. . . (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : You will get the full opportunity to speak.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You may give your reply later.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I will give you full opportunity to give you reply.

(Interruptions)

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, if things go as per the rules laid down, then it is understandable, otherwise. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI RAM KIRPAL YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, many people have been Chargesheeted. . . (Interruptions).

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : The Parliament is not meant for holding discussions by keeping aside the rules . . . (Interruptions).

The House is not meant for discussing anything and everything under the sun. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing is going on record now. Vajpayee ji. You Please continue.

(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will be responsible for whatever I am quoting from the verdict of the court. This is a part of that judgement. There should be no doubt in mind about this judgement. The Union Government will have to handle the situation arising out of that judgement. The Governor of the State will consider over the matter. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing is going on record.

(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing will go on record. I have not permitted you. You will have enough opportunity to reply. I am going to given you a chance to reply.

(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please do no disturb the proceedings, Professor. I will give you a chance to reply.

(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : You do not have to argue I think.

*Not Recorded.

You will have a chance to reply to all the points. Listen carefully, have a pen or a pencil and a paper, note down all the points and then later on you can reply to those points.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I have permitted the Adjournment Motion. We are discussing the Adjournment Motion. Please listen. Have patience. Note down the points. You can reply at a later stage.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : I have followed your instructions.

MR. SPEAKER : O.K. you have always followed my instructions but right now, please sit down. Thank you very much.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Hon'ble Atalji is requested not to go beyond the subject. . . (Interruptions) I do not know for how many years you have performed the job of teaching the people. What sermons we can preach you. You are a very senior Member who commands our full respect. Therefore, Please listen to my request . . . (Interruptions) It is going beyond the subject. . . (Interruptions).

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : Please do not say anything with political motivations. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : This is not something beyond the subject. It is very much pertaining to the subject . . . (Interruptions).

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : The subject is recent development in Bihar. . . (Interruptions) We were expecting that he would not indulge in discussions motivated just by political interests. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Whenever a Member is not right, I am here to warn the Member that : he is going out of the rules. You do not have to worry about them. The best thing is that it is better to listen to the debate. You give a good reply. I am sure you will be able to give a very befitting reply.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this judgement has been delivered today itself by justice Dhaliwal while dismissing the anticipatory bail petition. I was quoting a part of that which was interrupted in between. I want to put the record straight.

[English]

"If the evidence is to be delivered, *prima facie*, then it is a clear case of systematic loot of public money over the years depriving the poor people of their share." . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you provoking ?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Sir, I quote :

"Therefore, it is a crime against the state. Therefore, the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

[Translation]

This is merely a part of a long story of corruption in Bihar. My friend was saying that I should speak on the situation prevailing in Bihar. Very soon I am going to dwell on that point. But they must understand whether corruption in Bihar is not a part of the situation prevailing in Bihar ? Whether it is not harming equally to the state ? This is not merely a question of scam but scams after scams. Neck deep corruption with the result that Government treasury is empty. No funds available for development ! No progress made ! Nothing in the name of Government. Panchayats elections have not been held. . . (Interruptions). *

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : This is all right that elections to Panchayats have not been conducted but who is to be held responsible for it . . . (Interruptions) That matter is subjudice, pending in the Supreme Court. You should understand it. . . (Interruptions) An appeal has been filed in the Apex court and on the basis of that, elections are being held in Bihar-at least understand this much. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government is making its all out efforts to save its leader and his Ministers. Split in the Janata Dal is their internal matter in which I do not intend to interfere but at the same time it is very necessary to strengthen the party system in a parliamentary democracy. And what is this attitude that

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

in case one's words are not listened to and heeded to in the party, he will break the party, paralyse the functioning of the Legislature, opposition Members will either be suspended or beaten up and made to free, and people with dubious character will be brought inside the premises of the Legislature. Whether, in such a situation, any corruption case can receive a fair trial ? Three MLAs from Bihar are in Behood prison and trying to change the witnesses in cases of corruptions and also trying to influence CBI. Though CBI is a central investigation agency but its director has been changed on their complaints. It is an unprecedented case that the culprit had registered a complaint against CBI for conspiring against him. Whether any proof was given against this allegation ?

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : It is also unprecedented that CBI is alleged for leaking the information. It has also happened for the first time that information were leaked to you.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Not only that but it also is being asked as to where it has been written in the Constitution that a person who has been chargesheeted should resign. But where it has been written in the Constitution that Chief Minister is free to loot or embezzle money. Every thing cannot be written in the Constitution. Several countries do not have even written Constitution. The country is governed by conventions, values and ideals. There is not only one case of corruption or one person found involved in corruption. It is also not a matter of any particular state but it has posed a serious threat to the democratic set up of the country. All the democratic institutions will be made crippled and ineffective if political power is centered in hands of a few criminals. Conspiracy of murder will be hatched against the person, who tries to oppose them. A situation is being created that no witness will be available in such cases. . . (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI BHAGWATI DEVI (Gaya) : Is he listening to the poor ? Today affluent persons are grieved over the progress made by the poor. We have seen what is in their hearts of heart.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the very first day, hon. Prime Minister had stated that nation would have to be saved. The country cannot be ruled by the Constitution but by the public's faith in the Constitution which has been hurt today. What the executive proposes

to do in such a situation. What is their plan ? This judgement of court is in my favour thus I am satisfied but is it proper to drag every matter to court. Can these matters not be solved within party or on front level ? Whether they all cannot persuade the Chief Minister of Bihar to resign for a few days and he would be acquitted if he was found innocent by the court. He can resign and wait for a few days till the matter is disposed of by the court.

SHRIMATI BHAGWATI DEVI : Since long the affluent class has been grabbing the land and houses of poor for just one kilogram of foodgrain (sattu) but it cannot happen now. . . (Interruptions) We also have the freedom of speech. If you will say something we will also speak. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : But so far no advice worked. Still there is time. His old socialist friends who has been associated him since the movement of Jai Prakash and Lohia can advise him. It is good that veering round to the proper course at long last. But I am worried that all the options are being closed.

Earlier also the charges of corruptions were levelled against Chief Ministers and if there was any prima facie case against any Chief Minister he was asked to resign. No one could deny to that or threaten to go to public or hang himself. A few days back Sharad Yadavji was saying that democracy can be maintained by avoiding public slander and following old traditions. How it can be done ? Executive should take decision if party fails to do so. But now a days tendency of depending on court is increasing. No one wants to be accountable and try to leave the matter to the court whether it is a case of allotment of governmental accommodations in Delhi or case of environmental protection.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Whether it is a matter regarding water-logging ?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I am discussing the matter regarding Patna. The State Government of Bihar is not concerned at all about water-logging.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Please also tell as to what is happening in your Maharashtra. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not mentioned in my speech as to what is happening in your Bihar. But I am very happy as you are calling

Maharashtra as my Maharashtra. . . (Interruptions). Shri Somnath Chatterjee reminded me about Patna.

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : We are trying to clear the water-logging on war footing. . . (Interruptions). Our intention is clear. We are doing our best. Though we are not responsible for this heavy rain which has broken records of last 25-30 years and caused this water-logging. We are trying our best and even then you are making complaint against it.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on point of order. I seek your protection. We want to listen to hon. Atal Bihari Vajpayee and also want to take part in this debate. But no one can make a speech amid interruptions. Will this continue further ? We should listen to him. It is not proper that Members continue to interrupt his speech.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : We have to interrupt when he is deviating from the subject.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Sir, I seek your protection. The House should be controlled and order should be maintained if standard of the debate is to be maintained. It is not proper that ten Members are interrupting his speech. We can make more noise and can interrupt their speeches too. . . (Interruptions) It will not be good if everytime his speech is interrupted. Please maintain the order in the House.

PROF. RITA VERMA (Dhanbad) : Will they keep on speaking if we are silent and the standard of debate will not improve if. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum) : Shri Nitish Kumar, they have rightly learnt it from you when you interrupted the Prime Minister yesterday. You remember what you did yesterday, please. Your own interruption is becoming wrong. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : What Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee is saying is absolutely right. They have learnt it from you. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : You remember what you did to the Prime Minister yesterday. They have learnt from your yesterday's behaviour. . . (Interruptions) You interrupted and prevented the Prime Minister from speaking. It is from you that they have learnt it.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : I have repeated the view point of the hon. Prime Minister. He himself has said it I had just spoken one sentence but what can I do if hon. Prime Minister also sat down.

SHRI ATAL BIHAR VAJPAYEE : Interruptions on every step cannot be tolerated. Order should be maintained in the House.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Yesterday, they had also interrupted the speech of hon. Prime Minister. . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Alright. It is enough.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : How can we listen when he is deviating from the subject. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Do not complicate matters. Sit down please.

[Translation]

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR (Faizabad) : How the debate will continue if they do not listen to you. The business of the House is still to be conducted for many days. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Do not interrupt. No interruptions now. It is enough. How can you do like that ? You cannot do like that.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Do not complicate matters now.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Do not complicate the matter now.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : What is this ? When I am asking them to sit down, you are starting and when you sit down they will start. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR : How this can be continued . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are getting annoyed with him. . . (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : Alright you can continue your cross talks. You can continue like this. . .

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You carry on !

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Good, very good ! You are doing very well ! Congratulations ! Wonderful job !

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Flood waters have entered Patna. The present Government is unable to drain out the water. The court has issued orders to take the help of Army. What is my fault in it . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : I know, that now there is not flood water in Patna. . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I know that you have knowledge about it. So, I was telling you to note the points and whenever you speak, give the answer. What you know about it, speak in the House.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Sir, I was telling the august House that if the Executive will not discharge its duty. The citizens will have no other way out than to knock the doors of the judiciary. The Executive should discharge its duty within its jurisdiction and the judiciary should confine itself to its own jurisdiction. But, if the issues hang fire, then what to do ? The fodder scam has been running for last one and half years. The process is complex. Delays are caused. How long cases of corruption will continue? If justice is to be done to the culprits, hearing should take place and judgement given quickly. If there is a need to make changes in the process, the Prime Minister should introduce a resolution, the House will support him. Two years ago people were implicated in a scam. I have just made a mention thereof. The verdict in respect of Yashwant Sinha has come today. Shri Motilal Vora, Shri Shiv Shankar and Shri Ajit Panja were acquitted yesterday. The case is pending for two years and they could not contest the elections. Instead of contesting the elections his wife contested. Later on the seat was lost. It is a different story. I do not want to discuss it. But the cases are prolonged. The United front cannot take any decision.

It should be decided at the party level that Article 356 is to be applied or not ? I have seen their common minimum programme. Nowadays it is referred on rare occasion. It is not written in the common minimum programme that [English] Article 356 should be abolished. [Translation] It is not written. Please think over the issues honestly which have been written in the common minimum programme. I would like to quote.

[English]

"On the second track, the United Front will immediately appoint a high level Committee to review and update the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission."

[Translation]

It is right.

[English]

It further says :

"The Committee will be requested also to go into the vital question of the devolution of financial powers from the Central Government to the State Governments."

[Translation]

It is also good, what has been said about Article 356 is as under :

[English]

"The scope of Article 356 of the Constitution has been interpreted and circumscribed by recent decision of the Supreme Court. Article 356 will be amended to reflect these decisions and to prevent the misuse of that Article."

16.41 hrs.

[SHRI P.M. SAYEED in the chair]

[Translation]

There is a mention to check its misuse. If it is applied in Bihar or so then will it be called a misuse, When there is no alternative. . . (Interruptions).

Do not compare Bihar with Maharashtra. . . (Interruptions) The Members Mumbai incident is a very mild one as compared to the manners that took place in Bihar. . . (Interruptions) Private armies have been formed in Bihar and massacre is taking place. . . (Interruptions).

KUNWAR SARVARAJ SINGH (Aonla) : What is happening in Uttar Pradesh ? . . . (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : Note that what you want to say and speak when your turn comes. If there is obstruction the debate cannot take place.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : If there is obstruction then I will not continue my speech.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, 40 Minutes have passed. Many members want that Atal ji should conclude his speech, but interruptions are being made for the last 40 minutes. I would like to request hon'ble Members not to make any such point which can't be replied to. If this continues, the discussion will remain fruitless. Shri Atal Ji's speech is being interrupted again and again. I would request the Members to listen to him patiently and allow him to speak. Thereafter whoever wishes, to speak may do so. . .

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Atal has managed to speak only for 5-10 minutes out of 40 minutes. This is not good.

Hence I would like to make an appeal to the Hon'ble Members that if they wish to make a point, they may do so when their turn comes. I will not tolerate such interruptions.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am discussing Article 356. I am not levelling any allegations. However I am making a demand that when there is no other alternative except this option, the situation warrant the use of Article 356. . . (Interruptions) The United Front has also not said anything about the abolition of Article 356. It is true that an Inter State Council has been constituted. The matter is under its consideration. It is essential to prevent its misuse. We can see the position in Bihar. Democratic institutions are not being allowed to function. There is no other alternative except moving the court. There was a way out which has not been adopted and such a suggestion was made by Shri C. Subramanyam in the session convened with regard to 50th anniversary of Independence. He said that the Governor of Bihar had gone through the chargesheet proposed to be filed against the Chief Minister. Charges have been levelled on the Chief Minister and a demand was raised to file a suit against him. Legal proceedings can not be initiated against a Chief

Minister so long as the Governor does not permit it. Governor enquired about the nature of charges and the chargesheet. The Governor kept the matter under consideration for 37 days.

He made an indepth study of the issue, sought the opinion of legal experts and the Advocate General and then he decided that this was a prima facie case and that a chargesheet can be filed in this case. Doesnot the Governor has any other duties thereafter ? Did thought not cross his mind that if a chargesheet is filed, it would be an impossible task to collect evidence against any such person who continues to hold the office of Chief Minister in any part of the country and especially in a state like Bihar. Around six people have been killed in suspicious circumstances. So, who would dare to give evidence against those charged ? Who would uncover the truth ? In view of the possibility of adverse impact on the witnesses, bail is denied in certain cases. Now bail has been denied which is a good thing. But did not Governor Governor think over this aspect ? Did he not consult the Union Govt ? Was Hon'ble Minister of Home Affairs not in constant touch with him with regard to the situation that will be created and will have to be faced ? The Governor has taken an oath under the Constitution to protect it. The Chief Minister and Minister, Shri C. Subramanyam laid stress on the point that the Chief Minister and the Ministers can hold office at the pleasure of the Governor and the Governor can withdraw the same at will. The Governor may seek their resignation. If his order are not complied with, he may take further step. However, so far this path has not been adopted. If it had been adopted, The capacity of the Executive to take a decision and take action would have been strengthened. It has been left to the court. Anyway, the case is sub-judice and I do not wish to go into details. If the party does not maintain internal discipline and the opinion of the people does not have any effect and the Governor also does not fulfil his duty, I do not see any other alternative except imposition of Article 356. But there are differences in the United Front. It has not been possible to take a decision due to differences. It is not a question of power. The democracy is being threatened. Democracy has not faced any such challenge in 50 years. Each and every authority is being challenged. Recently the Minister of Railways had gone there on a tour. I read this in the papers. I do not know as to how far this is true. The Railway Protection Force was required to provide security for the Minister of Railways. The responsi-

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

bility of providing security for the Minister of Railways could not be left to the State Government. An attempt was made to disrupt the meeting. So who will allow us to hold a public meeting ? A bomb exploded there. The Prime Minister say that the awareness should be generated in the people. Public is scared. . . (Interruptions) People are at the mercy of the mafias. . . (Interruptions) How can awareness be generated ? . . (Interruptions)

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE RAI (Sitamarhi) : Bomb was not hurled there. Do you know it ? The Parliamentary Committee may enquire into it. . . (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : His brother has been killed.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have not given you permission.

[Translation]

Whether his brother or son might have been killed.

[English]

Do not disturb. Let him continue his speech.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : When the discussion was initiated, my friend Shri Somnath Chatterjee had enquired about Article 356. If there is no way out, Art. 356 may be used but in less evil form. If the tenets of democracy are threatened, should we say that the provisions of Article 356 of the Constitution will not be used ? In such a case, it will not be misused but well used. There is nothing wrong with it.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : What will happen in the case of Central Government ?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I am coming to that. If the kind of circumstances that have been created in the State are created at the centre and we show leniency and do not show our concern for the democratic values and tend to leave everything to court, then a day will come when the court will direct us about what is to be done and what is not to be done in such cases.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am surprised over the viewpoint of the congressmen about Bihar. I would like to know that. The viewpoint they express in Patna and here in the House

are entirely different. There is difference in what they profess and what they practice. I am unable to understand this politics. The Laloo Yadav Government had lost its majority in the Bihar Assembly not just for one day but several days when Janta Party was divided, the government lost its majority. It had been challenged. They entered into Jharkhand agreement overnight. I would not like to dwell at length on the price paid. If any government is threatened in a state and the Chief Minister of that state or ruling party resorts to entering into an agreement with anti national elements to keep its majority, what would be the reaction. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not interrupt.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : They were against the formation of Jharkhand. So how did they accept this demand ? The Congress said that they will remain neutral. 'Ramaya Swasti, Ravanaaya Swasti'. They decided to remain neutral and the reason they gave was that they will not vote along with the Bhartiya Janata Party in the Assembly as that party is communalist whereas Congress is secularist and it will not like to vote from the same side as with the Communalists. When the issue of removing the H.D. Deve Gowda Government had arisen, they had voted along with the BJP. Did you do it or not ? The Congress wont introduce the Motion in Bihar and even if the Motion is introduced by anybody else, they might use this excuse not to vote. This won't do. Infact, it was not our Motion too. The Chief Minister had sought the Confidence. If you wish to remove them, it is all right. This is not politics. This is a very narrow minded game.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to conclude my speech. The objective of introducing an Adjournment Motion was to draw immediate attention towards the deteriorating position in Bihar. Discussion can be held under the Rule 184 or Rule 193 but the country had high expectations from the Parliament and this sitting. If we had not raised the issue of situation in Bihar on the very first day and thereafter as per your directives, we would have failed to fulfil our duties. It is not a question of putting the Government in docks due to inactivity on its part. The Prime Minister may say that he is helpless. There were only five Pandavas but here we have 15 Pandavas. I do not think that this will help resolve the problem. The United Front was formed and it is your responsibility to run it. As Hon'ble

Prime Minister stated in his very first speech that the State is threatened and rather I would go one step ahead to say that the Republic is threatened and we have to take steps to protect the Republic. The parties are secondary. Even after 50 Years of Independence, if people do not have the zeal to celebrate the festival of Independence, the politicians and the representatives of all the parties should introspect.

There is a need to launch a movement against corruption. It is said time and again that no compromise will be reached at any cost. That they won't compromise at any cost is their constant refrain but empty words do not suffice. The statements need to be supplemented with action. Not only speeches but appropriate conduct is also a requirement. The Prime Minister has stated that strict measures will have to be taken. What steps are proposed to be taken ? Why is it being delayed ? This Parliament Session will last only a few days. We will celebrate the Anniversary of independence. But if we are not very concerned about the future, we will not be able to create that zeal and spirit in the people which is required for celebrating this solemn occasion. That is why I have moved the Adjournment Motion to jolt the entire House into action.

I am grateful to you for having given me the opportunity to speak.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

"That the House do now adjourn."

Shri Tariq Anwar.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL) : Sir, I want to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Oh ! I am sorry. Yes, you can speak.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : It would be better if the Prime Minister could reply after listening to the other Members . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Why is it that whenever I rise to speak, you also stand up to speak ? What is this ?

I have told you many a times . . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : No. Shri Nitish Kumar, you are not to decide that. I have to decide.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. Yesterday also you did the same thing.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : The Prime Minister should give his reply after listening to all the members. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. I have called the hon. Prime Minister to speak now.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : The Prime Minister is not willing to listen to all the members. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I have already called the hon. Prime Minister to speak now.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : What does this mean. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may please be seated. Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Nitish Kumar, the hon. Prime Minister can intervene at any time.

(Interruptions)

*Not Recorded.

[Shri Nitish Kumar]

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, There is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : It will be better if hon. Prime Minister Speaks after listening to the viewpoint of all the Members . . . (Interruptions) Neither he want to listen to anyone nor he want to meet all the Members. We have tried to meet him time and again but he does not want to meet us. (Interruptions).

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : The Prime Minister wated to speak now and that is why, it was postponed. . . (Interruptions) Shn Atal Bihari Vajpayee has agreed to postpone it till four o'clock to enable him to be present here. . . (Interruptions) After this, now he is raising that point . . . (Interruptions) It is not fair. . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Nitish Kumar, in the morning, it was originally fixed for discussion at two o'clock. But it was at the instance of the Prime Minister that the hon. Speaker had fixed it at four o'clock so that immediately after the Mover of the Motion, he can speak. It was my fault that I called out the other hon. Member's name.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : No. Nothing of that sort.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Hon. Prime Minister please.

16.58 hrs.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Sir, I am grateful to you. I am also grateful to the Leader of the Opposition that he has drawn the attention of the House to this very vital issue. I think, on one point, all of us – I emphasise the word 'all' – agree that corruption is something which requires our attention. our urgent attention and also very firm attention

The first day when I spoke in this House seeking a vote of confidence, I had promised three things. I am glad and grateful to the Leader of the Opposition that he has

repeated all the promises that I had made. I repeat them again and I confrim them again.

I am also grateful to the Leader of the Opposition that while reminding me of my promises, he has not made an allegation that I am backing out of it. The main point today is – it is very important for us to keep it in mind – to see what is the Motion before the House.

He has at length spoken about Bihar. He has every right to do so and I will come to it. I think, it is important for us to talk about it and it is important for us to pay our attention to this. But one thing is very important and that is that, although in the end, he said that he has moved this motion to draw our attention to it. If it was the intention, then it should have been done under some other rule in the Rules of Procedure, and not under the Adjournment Motion, as my friend, Shri Somnath Chatterjee had pointed out.

17.00 hrs.

But anyhow, I will not take your time on that. As you know Sir, I have told several times and I repeat again that I have great respect for Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee for several reasons. One of the reasons is that he is very sober, he is very balanced, he is very prudent and he also is not known as an activist. Therefore, when he talks of passivity, I think, there is either something wrong with the translation of the word or there is something which English has confused him about. The main point basically is that from the day I assumed office and that was not long ago, from the first day I have been saying that any person in public life, be he a Minister or be he a Chief Minister or anybody who is charged for corruption should step down voluntarily. I have said it in public and I have demanded it in public. I have said it privately and I have also conveyed my message privately and I am saying again today that anybody who wants to act and work in public life should keep himself above all suspicion because unless we build that type of probity in our life, life can never go on. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that in this 50th year particularly all of us have to determinedly move about it. He has objected and I am surprised that he has objected as to why do I ask the public to cooperate. Is it not a fact or does he not know, because he also contests elections, that people come to him and tell him that for getting an electric connection, people have to pay money ? Do people not tell him, to get a map or a plan or anything approved, people have to pay money ? Does he not know

that every police station has complained against ? Does he not know that day-to-day life has become miserable, impossible and difficult because of corruption ? Does he not know it ? And if in that context, I had asked the public cooperation, did I do a wrong thing ? Can you possibly eliminate corruption only by attacking politicians ? Yes, it is important. All of us who occupy high office, it is important for us to remain above suspicion. Otherwise, we cannot possibly run democracy. I totally repeat what he has assigned to me that public life cannot be run without probity and morality. Morality is always very important and that was the essence of our freedom struggle. Gandhiji always talks of ends and means and those ends and means still matter to all of us. Therefore, I think, on this particular issue at least we should not have been divided. On this particular issue, I think, we should unitedly respond. He has just now drawn my attention to the judgement of the court and I have also received the message almost simultaneously as he did. And my response would have been there even when he would not have read it. I can only assure him that we will definitely respond to the situation. After all, Central Government has two agencies through which it runs. So far as States are concerned, CBI is often mentioned about. What is CBI ? The CBI is prosecuting Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav. Is it or is it not ? Is it not a fact that CBI is an Agency of the Government of India ? Is it not a fact that CBI's constructive responsibility for its actions, to this account, I am accountable to this House ? If that is a fact, then where does passivity come in ? At one time it was said that nobody should interfere in the functioning of CBI. It is correct. We have not. And that is why, we have let it go on and that is why we have been endowed as you have seen in the court itself. CBI has been the agency which has been resisting what is called . . . (Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER : Grant of bail.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : I sometimes miss the legal word and I start using non-legal words. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : So many illegalities are there.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Not illegal, non-legal.

I wish that an experienced man like Shri Atal Bihar Vajpayee should not have talked about Governor. Governor should not be discussed here. His conduct should not be discussed here. Governor is the Head of the State and

in that capacity, it is for him to decide what he wants to do and what he wants to say. To give permission, to withhold permission, to dismiss a Government or not to dismiss a Government are his own area of action and activity. I can only say and I have said it in public that we have not at any stage tried to tell the Governor as to what he should or should not do. My words should be taken for it. That is why when he gives permission, also a legal point arises. That legal point, I am told, was the advice given by the legal authorities. That is, when the Governor gives permission. I am not defending it. I am only explaining the legal position. This is the advice given to the Government by the Solicitor-General. He says, "In giving sanction for prosecution, the Governor does not pass any judgement on the guilt of the accused. Whether sanction is or is not necessary is determined by the references to the allegation, any complaint and no defence is asked for." He is quoting one case, called Hari Ram Case in AIR, 1939, etc., etc. I could place the details on the Table of the House so that the House could look at it. The allegation, therefore, is that whatever is true or is not true is to be judged by the Court.

While giving the permission, the Governor only gives the sanction for prosecution to see that there is some foundation for the charges so that the prosecution can proceed which it cannot in the absence of the sanction for the prosecuting public servant. That guilt of the accused is only determined by the verdict of the criminal Court in whose jurisdiction it may lie.

My purpose is not to defend anybody. My purpose is not to say whether it is right or wrong. My purpose is only to apprise the hon. Members of the house what the legal authorities have told us only this morning. I summoned him. I talked to him what is the position *vis-a-vis* Governor.

My friend, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, has also drawn my attention to what Shri C. Subramaniam said. I was also present. I also heard him. He had said, "Governor should have withdrawn his pleasure." He did not. That is something which I can neither defend nor see a complaint against. None of us can because it is for the Governor to decide whether he defaulted or did not default. My only one responsibility was, which I have discharged fully, against one of my Ministers. Permission was given to take action against him or prosecute him. I asked him to resign that very day and Shri Verma resigned. He is not in the Government. I discharged my responsibility fully that day.

[Shri I.K. Gujral]

Therefore, I upheld what I had been saying. Today, I can only say this thing and I will proceed from this. The point therefore is most important. Public life, I repeat, cannot be really advanced particularly in democracy unless we hold the morality as a person. The morality is extremely important for us. Therefore, we have to be very cautious on this that no finger is raised on us. I totally go with that and equally important for me is to say this. Again I repeat that the conduct of all of us is always under scrutiny. Each one of us sitting in this House or may be in the Legislatures lives in a glasshouse. They are all being observed all the time. That is why it is important for us to keep in mind the fact that people who have elected us or may elect us tomorrow again or may not, they are all the time watching us. And if somebody falls short of it, of course, ultimately people decide, but I am not passing on the buck. There is some responsibility that I have. But I am also more than that. It is the responsibility on my part that I uphold the rule of law.

I hope, nobody expects me to go beyond the rule of law. We have once experienced in this very House when the rule of law was flouted. And friends like Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and others were in jail for several months because they were not conforming with that big fiat. I do not want to rule by fiats. I do not want to become an authoritarian. I want to assert not my authority but I want to assert the regality or the majesty of the rule of law. And that is what we are all about.

If we do not observe the rule of law, then who else will? That is why I understand fully that where my area is and where the Court's area is confined to. This system has been built, I think, with great vision. The Constitution is a witness to that, an evidence of that. The judiciary has its own area. The Executive has its own area. And this Parliament has its own area defined. Therefore, we do not want to go beyond that.

But more important, I would repeat again and again, is credibility in public life. It is extremely important that we remain credible. I have and I can assure you again and repeat, both in private and in public I advised the Chief Minister of Bihar to step down. But he did not.

Now, after that, the question of article 356 arises. I think, again Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and myself both were present in the Inter-State Council meeting when the Chief

Ministers belonging to his Party, more than any others, were cautioning me again and again not to use article 356. They were saying again and again that article 356 should be used with caution. They were telling me again and again. . . (Interruptions) Please let me finish. The main point was when the Inter-State Council met under the Chairmanship of my colleague, the Home Minister, they identified two areas and there was an agreement that article 356 should be used when an external threat is there, or when there is a danger from terrorism and the State administration gets mixed up there. The third area on which there was a sharp difference was on the question of secularism. We, on this side believe that placing any State Government which does not believe in secularism under President's Rule should be justified. But I did not force it on that day also. Shri Vajpayee was sitting there and his colleagues were also sitting there and I said, 'all right, let us again persuade each other; let us again talk to each other'. But my believe is firm and that is, Indian unity can be sustained only on the basis of secularism. Unless we remain secular, we will not be able to keep this nation together. But some people do not believe in it. But then it is a matter of their belief. But we firmly believe in it. That is why we said that day that article 356 can be imposed only under those circumstances and we want to say it again.

Sir, I am not going to speak for a long time here. So, the main point which I would like to repeat and again I want to draw the cue from my worthy colleague Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee who said that there should be quick judgement. Yes, I have written to all the Chief Ministers. I have written to all of them requesting them to set up special courts for this purpose. Some of them have replied and some of them have not. Most of them who have not yet replied belong to your Party, not to my Party. All those who have assured me that they are setting up special courts or have set up special courts are from this side. I would like to urge upon you, please tell them; please ask them; please besearch them, please request them; go on your knees if you have to, to set up special courts so that the special courts dispose them off very quickly and everything gets quicker.

Therefore, one thing that I must say is that let us draw a distinction between legality and probity. Probity is important; but legality but legality is sacrosanct. We must not do anything which can smack or even smell of illegality. Because if this House starts doing it, then who else will

uphold the rule of law ? That is why, I feel, therefore, that this is more important for us to keep in mind.

The other point to which I would like to draw your attention to it after all, who has chargesheeted Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav ? The CBI. Whose agency is the CBI ? Centre's. In which Department of the Government of India does CBI function ? The Prime Minister's Officer. If this is passivity, I do not know what is activity. If there is passivity, that the Department functioning directly under my charge, not only does it chargesheet; but also does it oppose the anticipatory bail, then with what base, at what level and now am I accused of passivity ?

This is the Department which functions like this. Five IAS officers has been accused in this. I must explain that also. The permission of the Government of India has been sought. The Government of India have found that against two officers there is enough evidence and they should be prosecuted. One officer has retired. Therefore, it is for the CBI or anybody else to decide whether they want to prosecute him or they do not want to prosecute him. Against two officers, Government of India did not find enough evidence but all the same, again to uphold the rule of law I have referred this to the Attorney General. I have asked the Attorney General's advice as to whether the Government should or should not give permission. The Law Minister says that this is now under consideration. Therefore, I would only say that when we are thinking in terms of a situation, let us not play politics. This is not a political issue. This is an issue, you have rightly said, about the future of the public. This is an issue on which all of us should unanimously, in unity, raise our voice if we want a clean public life. I can only assure you, my language may or may not be soft, my determination is very serious. I have given this promise to you earlier and I repeat it.

At this moment, my friend has drawn my attention to the latest judgement given by the High Court. As a result of this, a new situation has arisen.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Whether warrants have been issued ?

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Why are you in haste and worried everytime.

I know that you have personal vendetta with Lalooji.

I know that Lalooji had been your supporter, guide, philosopher and close friend. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Hon. Prime Minister, Sir, it is not proper for you. You every well know as to what was your position there ? Should I tell here that how you got elected for Rajya Sabha from there. You know all that and how do you feel if I reiterate it here . . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Are you yielding to him, Mr. Prime Minister ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : The main point that I was saying, a situation has arisen. . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Nitish Kumar, he is not yielding to you.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Gujralji, you may need Laloo Prasad Yadav and not me ? . . (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions)*

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : I only want to say that it is his old habit to interrupt and disturb like this. . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yesterday also you did the same thing. The moment the Prime Minister stands up, you are disturbing him. This is not correct. He is not yielding. How can you speak when he is not yielding to you ?

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please, let him complete his speech.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : May I say. . . (Interruptions).

*Not Recorded.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, hon. Prime Minister has levelled allegations against us.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What was his allegation ?

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You are a senior Member. Please do not do such things. Yesterday also you did the same thing.

[Translation]

SHRI ANAND MOHAN (Sheohar) : Sir, . . . (Interruptions)* The Government should be dismissed. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Sir, he can be Dronacharya before Duryodhana, not we ?

[English]

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Sir, may I say, Shri Nitish Kumar is . . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : The unparliamentary word used by Shri Anand Mohan should be expunged.

(Interruptions)

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Sir, Shri Nitish Kumar is an old friend and I am very fond of him. Whatever I said was in a friendly spirit. I love him all the same.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : You, please withdraw your words. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Alright.

[English]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Thank you.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Sir, in conclusion, I would say that if I had spoken before the judgement, the judgement to which my worthy friend Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has referred to, I would have said that there are two or three options open all the time. One is persuasion, trying to draw attention to morality and probity. If our Party was functioning as it should have been, which unfortunately is not the case,

inner party pressures could have been built. Second, of course, was the other way about and that was if somebody who is being accused had realised for himself that it is in his own interest also to step down. He has not done it. Now, with the denial of the anticipatory bail a new situation has arisen. I can only assure that the Government will take due cognisance of it and will not be found wanting. But it will not act in a hurry because I must see to it that legality is preserved and the rule of law is upheld.

May I say lastly before I sit down that my commitment is to three points which I made in the beginning of my tenure ? We shall not spare anybody – be it anybody, belonging to this side or that side – who indulges in corruption, we shall not. We shall always be transparent. For transparency I have taken some steps further. You know that the Governments of India have been blamed in the past regarding kickbacks and all that. I am setting up an independent machinery to see that all major purchases pass through that transparent machinery. I am also setting up a machinery to see to it that anything purchased in India, particularly the larger equipment etc., imported from abroad, passes through that needle's neck so that probity is established.

I have said one more thing and I repeat it that I am against witch-hunting. You know what has happened in *havala*. I do not know if you view it as witch-hunting or not. Whether you support it or not, I do not know. But I promise one thing. I stand committed to upholding the rule of law and doing all my bit and all my might against corruption. Be it anybody, he may be belonging to any party, no accommodation and no room will be given for such a person. He has no place in our public life who does not uphold the probity, morality and also the high values for which this country fought and ultimately liberated itself.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Hon. Prime Minister, what will you do after his arrest ? . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI TARIQ ANWAR (Katihar) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, while Presenting the Motion, Hon. Atal Bihari Vajpayee mentioned the conventions and traditions of Congress Party. He also stated in his speech that it is the convention and tradition of the country. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee mentioned the convention and tradition followed by the Congress Party since the very first Prime Minister Late. Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru to Shri Narasimha Rao ji. He also mentioned Krishnamachariji, Malviyaji and Shri Pratap

Singh Kairon. Antulayji is present here. He also mentioned Hawala scam here. I would like to say that before serving the chargesheet to Minister and Governors from Congress Party, their resignations were sought. The leaders of Congress Party had tried to maintain sanctity in public life, moral values and ideals of this society in such a situation.

Mr. Chairman, the day on which Lalooji was served chargesheet by CBI, Congress Party cleared its position, Congress President Shri Sitaram Kesari made a public demand that Lalooji should resign from the post. It has been a convention of congress party that Ministers and Chief Ministers have resigned from the post in case chargesheet had been served to them. But on the one hand Atalji says that a person should resign from the post if he is chargesheeted but on the other hand President and Leader of BJP do not resign in the same situation.

Former President of Congress Shri Rao is present here. He had resigned the day, when he was served chargesheet. It is a convention of congress party . . . (Interruptions) on the one hand he talks about ideals but on the other hand a chargesheeted person is elected the President of his Party and has taken a country wide tour. . . (Interruptions).

We all respect Atalji I was hoping that during discussion on the menace of corruption in this House, in place of getting political mileage he would condemn corruption prevailing everywhere in the country. Purohitji is sitting here. He did not make any mention regarding the charges he has made . . . (Interruptions) He spoke nothing regarding corruption taking place in Rajasthan. When issue of corruption is discussed, it should be discussed in its entirety . . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Why are you standing ?

SHRI TARIQ ANWAR : Is it correct or not ? . . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Why do not you sit ? Why are you standing ?

SHRI SUNDER LAL PATWA (Chhindwara) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am on a point of order. Through I am a new Member of this house but this much I know that when the debate of the House is completed, the leader of the House gives his reply. It is a laid down convention. But this time, against this convention, the leader of Opposition has spoken and the Prime Minister gave the

reply. Now I want to know from you as to whether the Prime Minister would also reply to the debate which is currently continuing. Only one minute more . . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Will both of you be standing ? You may sit down, please. Why are you creating trouble ?

SHRI SUNDER LAL PATWA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am raising this point because we are witnessing a new event after every minute in this matter. Many such events will take place by the time this debate is over. When the debate started, there was on court warrant but just now, we came to know that court warrant has been issued. The point of arrest will also figure in the discussion. So, will the Prime Minister also like to give his reply to this debate ?

SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA NAYAK (Phulbani) : Where is the point of order in it ?

SHRI SUNDER LAL PATWA : I know that the Home Minister is also capable of giving reply to this debate . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA NAYAK : Patwa ji, please tell the rule under which you are raising this point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Patwaji, I have got your point but there seems to be no point of order in it. But, on behalf of the Government, this will be replied by the Home Minister who is available here.

SHRI SUNDER LAL PATWA : Reply can come not only from the home Minister but any Minister of the Government can give the reply. My point is whether the Prime Minister will come out with a reply to the fresh issues emerging out of this important discussion ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is upto the Prime Minister whether he decides to reply or not ?

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : You have been an M.L.A. and are an M.P. and you know that I have intervened in the debate. Reply will come from the Home Minister . . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : You sit down, please, where is the point of order ? We are moving towards disorder.

SHRI TARIQ ANWAR : It is true that in 1990 Lalooji was sworn in as the Chief Minister of Bihar with the support of BJP. That time he had kindled a lot of expectations in our minds and we believed in him as he was a product of the total Revolution called by Jai Prakash Baboo. During

[Shri Tariq Anwar]

that time, Lalooji used to talk of morality and ethics.
... (Interruptions).

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, farewell function is likely to start at 6.00 o'clock at Rashtrapati Bhavan and the Members are supposed to be there by 5:30 p.m., or 5:40 p.m., therefore, you should now adjourn this House till tomorrow when the debate will continue and Tariq Saheb may speak tomorrow . . . (Interruptions) Yes, the President is bidding farewell to the Hon'ble Members at a tea party. It would be his last tea party to the Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Chandra Shekharji, this Motion itself pertains to adjournment of the House.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : When the House has not been adjourned till five o'clock, it hardly matters now . . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Motions can be taken up tomorrow also ?

[English]

The Motion is such that it may not be.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : We will be discussing the same issue – be it tomorrow to today at five o'clock or eight o'clock.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : It will require certain amendments in the rules. If the House is ready, the rules can be amended and the debate can be deferred for tomorrow. But without these amendments, discussion on the Adjournment Motion can not be stopped.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is exactly what I am saying.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Then how will we discuss the matter tomorrow ? We have to waive the rules under all circumstances. There is hardly any difference whether it is held at 6 o'clock. Tomorrow the House is not going to sit continuously till 12 o'clock or two o'clock. This is a technical problem. At present, therefore, we should adjourn the House by waiving the rules . . . (Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER : If the hon. Speaker desires, it can be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN : O.K.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : What Shri Chandra Shekhar has said is a situation in which we all are. There is a tea being hosted by the retiring President of India. You will kindly understand that some of us have to be present and tonight, the Cabinet is hosting a dinner for the retiring President. In the morning when the issue was raised, somebody from that side said, I think he himself has said that perhaps the debate can spill over to Monday. If you permit and the rules permit, I have no objection.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Please read the rule. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, you propose it and the Government will support . . . (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Parliamentary Affairs Minister, you kindly be seated. Let us hear Shri Shivraj V. Patil.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may kindly enlighten the House.

[Translation]

DR. M.P. JAISWAL (Bettiah) : Where the Prime Minister is sitting ? Where is his seat ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : He can sit anywhere but you, please, sit in your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Is it a subject ? Please listen carefully what is going on.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (Latur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the point raised by the former Prime Minister Shri Chandra Shekhar ji and the point which is in our minds assumes much significance. The problem is that we cannot postpone this debate for the day unless the rules are amended. Even then our ruler provide a way out to this problem. In case of some unavoidable circumstance, the Speaker is empowered to use his inherent powers to find a way out. I have a suggestion which can be taken into account by the House. We should conclude this debate today itself instead of continuing it tomorrow. We should end it today and in between if one desires, one may go to attend the tea party for an hour or so. They can be given this facility. Another problem is that some of the Members of the Council of Ministers also wants to attend the function. I think that if all of them want to go for tea or dinner party,

they may go. Till they come back, we will continue the debate. If it is done so, the dignity of the House will remain maintained and we will also be able to bid our farewell to our outgoing President as well. So, from my point of view, this way rules will not require any changes. If we take this step, there would be no problem before us.

[English]

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR (Baramati) : This particular subject was raised before the hon. Speaker where the hon. Deputy leader of the B.J.F. was also present. The hon. Speaker has told us that this discussion will continue.

Those Members who would like to go for Tea certainly they can go. Nobody will raise the issue of quorum and tomorrow voting will be before Private Members' business which will start at 2.45 p.m. . . . (Interruptions) I am just telling you what the hon. Speaker has said. The hon. Speaker has also told us that there is a precedent. We have seen that there is a precedent.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : The hon. Speaker has told us that there is a precedent. There was an Adjournment Motion by Shri Somnath Chatterjee which was spilled over to next day and the debate continued for nine hours. It was done like that. So, it can be done. That is what he has told us. We went for this particular purpose what Shri Chandra Shekhar is saying. We also suggested that it should be postponed for the day. Shri Jaswant Singh was present there and this was told to us. I think, what he has told through inside his Chamber, if that a gist can be taken, we should continue the debate. Those who are willing to go they can go. He has also mentioned about the dinner of the Council of Ministers. He said that he has to go himself to that dinner. We have also got some important meeting at seven o'clock. We mentioned everything to him. But he said, 'let the debate continue and tomorrow for one hour there can be a debate. Then, Shri Indrajit Gupta will reply'.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani) : Mr. Chairman Sir, we cannot treat the Adjournment Motion so lightly. It is a motion to adjourn the business of the House today and, therefore, it should be taken up and it has to be completed today itself.

Now, the time of the House ends at six o'clock. At six o'clock this Motion gets talked out, it collapses. It fails to exist. It is that we talk it out because the House is in no position to extend the time further today. Therefore, at

six o'clock the Motion gets talked out. We must know this. The House must adjust itself that speakers who are to follow must adjust themselves to this particular exigency of the situation that at six o'clock the Motion will collapse. It will get talked out and, therefore, it cannot be put to vote and we will have to raise. Now, this is the situation and this situation has to be accepted. We accepted the situation knowing the rules. Knowing the rules we accepted that we can begin at four o'clock.

Therefore, these small points cannot take away the seriousness of a motion. Therefore, I submit that whatever discussion is to be there, please try to get it concluded within the fifteen minutes that we are left with, otherwise at six o'clock declare it as talked out and having collapsed.

. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Sir, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has given a very clear indication of what is coming. Kindly finish it by six o'clock. So, let him go and do the rest of the job.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not think that there is any need to create any further confusion over the matter. Is it an extraordinary situation? 'Yes'. This extraordinary situation has arisen because of the various obligations on account of the Head of the Republic retiring today and an obligation connected with his farewell. This matter was discussed by the hon. Speaker and when the hon. Speaker said that there is a difficulty about carrying on the Adjournment Motion tomorrow he said it mindful of the limitation of an Adjournment Motion.

Secondly, legally and in accordance with the rules, the time allotted to a normal Adjournment Motion is only two-and-a-half hours. Therefore, the time itself would normally be up till 6.30 p.m. So, till 6.30 p.m. this debate was to continue. Thereafter, even now, it is my proposal that under the inherent powers of the Chair the rule particularly about the Adjournment Motion for today be waived and the debate be continued tomorrow after 6.30 p.m. . . . (Interruptions). It can be done. . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : There is no specific provision. . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I, therefore, propose that under the inherent powers available to the Chair and in accordance with what was discussed with the Chair and the Leader of the Congress Party that this particular rule

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

be waived, the House can sit today till 6.30 PM and this debate on Adjournment Motion be concluded tomorrow. I propose it formally . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, the ruling of the Speaker is there that it is treated as an Adjournment Motion. Now let us very conveniently convert it into a discussion under rule 184 or 193 . . . (Interruptions). It can be done. It has already served their purpose. Now let it be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is your opinion about postponing it for tomorrow ?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Patna) : Sir, I agree with the views expressed by the hon'ble Members. Rule 62 clearly provides that in case the Speaker is satisfied that sufficient debate has taken place, he can use his inherent power. As per the rule, this Debate should end within two and a half an hour. So this debate, said by Shri Jaswant Singh ji, should end by 6.30 p.m. as it commenced at 4.00 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You are also saying the same thing.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Sir, Hon'ble Atal ji and hon'ble Prime Minister, both have expressed their views on this issue. Therefore, let us conclude the debate by 6.30 p.m. and we should not start some new convention which might create problems in the coming times. Under rule 62, this debate should come to and end by 6.30 p.m.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, generally debate on this Motion does not last far more than two and a half and hour but the experience of this House has been that such debates are conclude within two and a half hour. Sometimes such debate has lasted for more than even nine hours and Shri Somnath Chatterjee ji is not remembering that such debates have been carried on to the next day also. This is an extraordinary situation which has arisen because of the farewell of the President. He has hosted a tea party for the hon'ble Members, therefore, the House should be adjourned. The Speaker has got certain inherent powers in this regard. . . (Interruptions) You hail from Hyderabad and do not know the meaning of Hindi in 'Barkhast'. You might be knowing many meanings of an

English word but you do not know the meaning of 'Barkhast'. The word 'Barkhast' has got several meanings to convey . . . (Interruptions) O.K., use the English word 'Adjourn' and adjourn the House, please. Adjourn the House for today and continue the debate tomorrow. This is my suggestion.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is your suggestion, Mr. Minister ?

THE MINISTER OF TOURISM AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SRIKANTA JENA) : Sir, I agree with the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition and even by the hon. Prime Minister that we all want that this debate should be postponed till tomorrow. But, Sir, I fully agree with you that it cannot be done because the Motion is for adjournment of today's business.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : . . . it is happening for the first time.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Therefore, once the debate starts, If there is any adjournment, then the Motion is carried. That means the Motion is passed. Therefore, that is a stricture on the Government. How can I agree to this? I can never agree. Therefore, we have to complete this debate by 6.30 PM and we can also have a discussion tomorrow under rule 184 or 193, as suggested by Shri Somnath Chatterjee.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Tomorrow is Friday, Sir.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : This is my request to the movers of the Motion that this debate be held under rule 193.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir the Leader of the Opposition has made his point. He has got the

Adjournment Motion consented to by the hon. Speaker. He has moved it as an Adjournment Motion. After all, the hon. *Rashtrapatiji*, for whom all of us have the highest respect, has invited us. It is his last official function.

We would like to be there. Therefore, you convert it to 193. Let it be done by the consent of the Members. . . .(Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : My difficulty is that we have a list of 21 Members who want to participate.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, just a minute please.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : If not tomorrow, it can continue on Monday, You can continue it provided it is converted or you break all the rules. . . .(Interruptions) He will not like to break all the rules, since he was talking today of protecting the rules. You follow this rule. (Interruptions) Let Article 356 be not applied to our rules.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, my submission is that . . .(Interruptions) The objection could be to the word 'conversion'. Let us put it this way that this Adjournment Motion is over today and then a fresh notice has been given . . .(Interruptions) Just a minute . . .(Interruptions) And then we take it up under Rule 184 or Rule 193. It may not be taken up tomorrow as tomorrow is Friday. It can be taken up on Monday.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura) : How can it be ?

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : But this Motion has to end today. There cannot be any conversion . . .(Interruptions) There is no rule provided for it.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Mr. Chairman, please allow me.

MR. CHAIRMAN : May I appeal to all of you ? I have with me names of 21 Members who want to participate in this debate.

[Translation]

Atalji would you like to say something in this regional?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Chairman, Sir, it seems or if we have to take some extraordinary decisions. If it is placed under 184 . . .(Interruptions) If I will be empowered to reply to debate then I will be having no

objection at all.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : But, it cannot be treated as a precedent. . . .(Interruptions) You will get another opportunity to speak.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Sir, we all agree to it.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Mr. Chairman, I may be heard on this particular point . . .(Interruptions) It is a fraud upon the House.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, you adjourn the House now. With your permission, I am going out of the House.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR : We are ready to accept the suggestion made by Shri Atal ji but it's reply and discussion, both, should end tomorrow before the beginning of Private Member's Business.

[English]

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Sir, this conversion, at this juncture, will be a fraud upon this House. . . .(Interruptions) I will explain it in one minute . . .(Interruptions) The Adjournment Motion got precedence over Shri Sharad Pawar's Motion Under Rule 184. Had this been under Rule 184, then the priority might have gone to Shri Sharad Pawar's Motion under Rule 184. Now today, having given the precedence to the Adjournment Motion on the point that it is an Adjournment Motion and, therefore, it has the priority over the Motion under Rule 184 on Maharashtra issue, this was given. Now, in midstream, you want to change over your priorities. You want to retract. The House cannot be taken for a ride like that. . . .(Interruptions) It is a fraud upon the House. I, therefore, take a strong objection to such a method. . . .(Interruptions) There is no rule here for the House to withdraw like that.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT (Dausa) : Sir, the House is supreme. You put the proposal of Shri Vajpayee to the House. Let the House decide upon the issue. . . .(Interruptions).

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : There is no authority or rule here.

[Shri G.M. Banatwalla]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Banatwalla, you had your say. Please take your seat.

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN) : Our purpose has been served and I am happy to see that the leader of Opposition, Vajpayee ji and Sharad Pawar ji and all others from each side are unanimous and have expressed their views that the debate be placed under rule 184 and should be replied, voted and should conclude tomorrow before beginning of the Private Members' Business. Now we have reached a consensus. You may express your views on this issue but be mindfull of the limited time which is almost over now. Let us not remain in a fix.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let me put it to the consideration of the House. As per the procedure, this Motion has to be voted first.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : What is that Motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN : For a Motion under Rule 184 also, the consent has to be given by the House. Otherwise, how can we do it ?

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : You may seek the consent of the House . . . (Interruptions)

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI (Allahabad) : The opinion of the House is that the debate be placed under Rule 184 and the House be adjourned for today because everybody has to reach the President's House. . . . (Interruptions).

[English]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Nalanda) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I make a submission ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I fail to understand as to which rule we are discussing about ? Many things have been told regarding Adjournment Motion which have made

the matter vague. So, let us make it clear by referring to rule 61 and Rule 62 which provides that.

[English]

"The motion 'that the House do now adjourn' shall be taken up at 16.00 hours or at an earlier hour if the Speaker, after considering the state of business in the House, so directs."

[Translation]

Please listen Rule 62.

[English]

"The Speaker may, if he is satisfied that there has been adequate debate, put the question at 18.30 hours or at such other hour not being less than two hours and thirty minutes from the time of commencement of the debate."

[Translation]

Nowhere it has been mentioned that it should conclude today itself. There is no time limit fixed for this debate or it is upto the Speaker as to how much time is to be given to a Motion. The Speaker has got inherent power to continue the debate even upto the tomorrow night. This is a fact. If you want to adhere to rules then this is the rule.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, with all respect to my hon. friend, I would like to say that if this Motion is not disposed to today it will mean that every day's business will have to be adjourned. If the motion is not disposed of on the same day, then this Adjournment Motion will be continued on the next day.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We will be setting up a bad precedent.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : If it continues on the next day, then that day's business will have to be adjourned, because it has a censure element in it. In that case, every day the House would be adjourned not by the Speaker's decision, but because of a motion which is being brought by a Member of the House. It will be a recurring thing and every day there will be an Adjournment Motion. So, it has to be disposed of today itself and it is well established.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, a minimum of two-and-a-half hours discussion should be there and the Speaker must decide this point.

[Translation]

You have just now said that you have got the names of 21 members and if you give them 10 minutes each then in total it will be three hours and thirty minutes. So if House sits till late night, say till 12 o'clock, then we do not favour it. This can not be the interpretation of this rule.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We have to bring in some Motion to waive this rule.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : You may ask the hour in this regard. If the House as well as the mover of the Motion is ready, we have no objection thereto.

[English]

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think the discussion on the Adjournment Motion has concluded. This subject matter can be converted to a Motion under Rule 184 and that can be taken up tomorrow . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai North) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to say something. Shri George Fernandes has already read the relevant rule. When we had a meeting in the Speaker's chamber where all leaders were present, the Speaker also had said that it would be postponed to tomorrow. When he had said so and when we know the mind of the Speaker, I think, we are prolonging it unnecessarily.

MR. CHAIRMAN : If that is the inherent power, then we can continue this tomorrow also.

SHRI RAM NAIK : That is what is to be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Then, why should we mingle with all these things ?

18.00 hrs.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Unnecessary debate is going on. Sir, you have your own powers.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We are unnecessarily wasting the time of the House.

SHRI RAM NAIK : Sir, if you adjourn the House, the matter would be over.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, the position is very clear . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : The Prime Minister will have to act tonight so that the debate might become infructuous tomorrow.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, according to 'Kaul and Shakdhar' :

"The Speaker cannot postpone the voting to the next sitting even if a request is made to that effect. The House may, however, adjourn for lunch as usual for a brief interval. But the motion has to be disposed of before the House is adjourned for the day."

Therefore, Sir, I am requesting you to keep the motion alive and also allow us to attend to our almost near constitutional duty or propriety of paying our respects to the hon. President. Let the matter be converted into a discussion under Rule 184.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let me put it to the vote the House. Is it the pleasure of the House of convert this Adjournment Motion into a Motion under Rule 184 to be taken up tomorrow ?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : If it is a Motion under Rule 184, then the Motion with regard to Maharashtra should be taken up first. Otherwise, it is a fraud upon the House. Let it be clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Is there anybody else opposing this?

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Sir, it cannot be converted into a Motion under Rule 184.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We will have this discussion tomorrow.

18.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, July 25, 1997/Shravana 3, 1919 (Saka).