

| 1  | 2       | 3                    | 4  | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8 | 9 | 10  |
|----|---------|----------------------|----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|-----|
| 3. | 1995-96 |                      |    |     |     |     |   |   |     |
|    |         | Faridabad            | 92 | 128 | 128 | -   | - | - | 348 |
|    |         | New Delhi (M.B.Road) | -  | -   | -   | 112 | - | - | 112 |
|    |         | Total                | 92 | 128 | 128 | 112 | - | - | 460 |

12.00 hrs.

## PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

**Brahmaputra Board (Standing Committee)  
Rules, 1996***[Translation]*

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, under section 30 of Brahmaputra Board Act, 1980. I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Brahmaputra Board (Standing Committee) rules, 1996 (Hindi and English Version) published in Notification No. GSR. 112 in the Gazette of India dated 2nd March, 1996...*(Interruptions)*

[Placed in Library See No. LT.87/96]

*[English]***Central Motor Vehical (Amendment)  
Rules, 1996 etc.**

THE MINISTER OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI T.G. VENKATRAMAN) : Sir, I beg to lay on the table :

- (1) A copy of the Central Motor Vehical (Amendment) Rules, 1996 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 163(E) in Gazette of India dated the 29th March, 1996, under sub-section (4) of section 212 of the Motor Vehicle Act, 1988.

[Placed in Library See No. LT.88/96]

- (2) A copy of the Ministry of Surface Transport (Development Wing) Chief Engineer (Project Implementation Cell) Recuritment Rules 1995 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 131 in Gazette of India dated the 16th March, 1996 issued under proviso to article 309 of the Constitution.

[Placed in Library See No. LT.89/96]

*(Interruptions)***Annual Report and Review on the working of  
National Book Trust, India, New Delhi for  
1994-95 alongwith statement showing reasons  
for delay in laying these papers**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI MUHI RAM SAIKIA) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table:-

- (1) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English version) of the National Book Trust, India, New Delhi, for the year 1994-95 alongwith Accounts.  
(ii) A copy of the Audit Report (Hindi and English versions) on the Accounts of the National Book Trust, India, New Delhi, for the year 1994-95.  
(iii) Statement (Hindi and English versions) regarding Review by the Government of the working to the National Book Trust, India, New Delhi, for the year 1994-95.
- (2) Statement (Hind and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (1) above.

[Placed in Library See No. LT. 90/96]

*(Interruptions)**[English]*

MR. SPEAKER : All right, go slowly. We have time, go coolly.

*[Translation]*

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai-North) : The discussion on price hike of Petrol, L.P.G. and diesel is going on in this House. This discussion is likely to continue today. You must be aware. It was also discussed whether the price should be increased before presentation of Budget or not. In this connection, you and several other hon'ble Members have said that it is improper. It should not have been done, but I want to raise the question of propriety.

Hon'ble Minister of Home Affairs, Shri Indrajit Gupta, who is the senior most member of this House

and the Cabinet as well, has said at Madras that the price of L.P.G. will be reduced. That means he gave a statement outside this House in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Hon'ble Prime Minister had gone to Calcutta. Shri Gowda asserted :

[English]

"No plan to cut LPG prices."

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Naik, can we depend on this newspaper report?

SHRI RAM NAIK : Yes, Sir....(Interruptions)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Mavelikara) : Sir, we do not depend on newspaper reports in this House ....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Let him finish. I will come to you later on.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAIK : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Kaul and Shakdhar has said on the page No. 259 of his book.

[English]

'No privilege of Parliament is involved if statements on matters of public interest are not first made in the House and are made outside. Such actions are against conventions and propriety, but do not constitute breach of privilege'

SHRI SURESH KALMADI (Pune) : Sir, we will support that.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAIK : That is why I want to raise here a question of propriety....(Interruptions)

It is not proper that Hon'ble Prime Minister says something and Hon'ble Home Minister says something else. Therefore, I urge upon you that you should admonish the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. They should beg apology from the House because they have given such statements when discussion is going on in Parliament. Therefore, you should categorically say to them that they should not commit the contempt of House in this manner.

[English]

SHRI SURESH KALMADI : Sir, I fully support what Shri Ram Naik has said. It is a question of propriety and also of privilege. This was a very uncalled for statement, when the Parliament is in session I think nothing less than the resignation of the Home Minister is called for....(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh) : Sir, please allow me to speak....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Would you like to speak on this issue?

(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI : Yes, already I have given notice to raise this point of propriety. This point of propriety was raised on the first day of Session also. The veteran parliamentarian, the Home Minister, has made a statement at Madras on a topic which is being discussed in the House. As you know, the Home Minister has made a statement at Madras in his party office to the Press that the LPG prices would be reduced and a decision will be taken about it in a day or two. Further, he had added that this price hike is indirectly hitting the common man very hard. Of course, I congratulate him for that. He should have made all these statements on the floor of the House instead of making the statements to the Press. I would like to bring to the notice of the august House that this Government is a bundle of confusion and it is a bundle of contradiction. The Prime Minister one day prior to that has said that there will be no reduction in the prices of LPG. But the Home Minister is saying something else at Madras. And the Finance Minister says that there was a Cabinet meeting. And the decision to hike the prices was taken at the Cabinet meeting. But the hon. Home Minister says that he was not consulted on this issue. This is on record. He said, 'I was not consulted', while talking to the partymen and some other people here and there. This is the type of Government that we have today. I would like to say particularly that the Home Minister has committed an impropriety for which he should regret. He should withdraw the statement. He should apologise to the House. There is no collective functioning. There is no cohesion within the government. And this is the time for the Prime Minister also to get rid of such a Home Minister ....(Interruptions)

SARDAR SURJIT SINGH BARNALA (Sangrur) : Sir, we are discussing a statement made at Madras by the Home Minister, the senior-most Member of the House. Now, there is a mention of impropriety in this statement. Now, obviously there are two statements, the statement of the Home Minister and the statement of the Prime Minister. We do not know which one is true-whether the price of LPG is going to be reduced or not. This is the question being discussed immediately by the House. So, this has to be resolved by the Home Minister and the Prime Minister. The P.M. should come to the House and make a statement to the effect which one of the two is correct. The other one should apologise that he has made a wrong statement. That is my submission.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Ram Naik has raised a question of propriety that the hon'ble Home Minister had given a statement outside the House. Shri Indrajit Guptaji is the Home Minister of this country and as on date, he is the senior-most parliamentarian also. It is different that

his experience of being in the Government is even less than that of Shrimati Kanti Singh. But he has given a statement outside the House. Therefore, it should be seriously discussed in the House because it depends upon them whether they would join the Government or not. Shri Somnath Chatterjee decided that his party would not join the Government. He said that if his party joins the government, it would have to be accountable and follow the Government policies and give statements accordingly.

When business of the House started, Members of Congress Party stood up and raised another issue about the remarks made by him about the Congress Party that they have no other option but to support this Government....(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KALMADI : It is our internal matter.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : This issue has been raised in the House. I had asked you at that time that do not waste time of the House. Your former Minister had said at that time....(Interruptions)

SHRI SURESH KALMADI : We will settle it.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : I also gave this suggestion to them. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am concluding.

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : When Question Hour began, I said that it is your internal matter. Therefore, do not waste time of the House, and take a decision in this regard outside the House and if you are so much agitated, then you can withdraw your support. But just now what Shri Ram Naikji had said and later Shri Suresh Kalmadji on behalf of the Congress Party said, atleast the Home Minister should resign. From the other side, one hon'ble Member Shri Panigrahi said that the hon'ble Minister should withdraw his statement but when he was pressurised, he said 'yes', the Prime Minister should get rid of such a Minister. He further said that this Government is a bundle of confusion. I would like to ask them whether they are less responsible for this bundle of confusion, whether they are not equally responsible for that? If this Government does anything, they are fully responsible for that. They should not waste much time of the House and should take a political decision outside the House and make it public. This House should not be used for pressure tactics and for black mailing the Government. If you have something about the Government, take a decision in this regard outside the House. It is only our privilege who are sitting in the opposition. We are raising the question of propriety. Therefore, you cannot go both ways at a time. I said that day also that the Members of the Congress Party want to take advantage of being in the ruling party and also want to maintain their prestige by opposing them. This is not going to last long. You will have to take decision whether you want to remain with the ruling party or with the

opposition. You cannot go both ways. Therefore, the question of propriety may be kept reserved.

Shri Indrajit Guptaji can guide all of us and he has been guiding us. We have been listening to his views being on hon'ble Member. But I do not know what has happened now, whether it is due to age factor, less experience in running the government or whether his personal views come in the open which ultimately are going to be the views of the Government? I have great regard for him. He is a senior Parliamentarian and a veteran leader of the country. I would also like to know under what circumstances he made such a statement.

[English]

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. It is not just a question of propriety, but it is something more than that. The matter was raised in this House and the Cabinet defended the decision of price rise. Now, a responsible Minister of the Cabinet going outside and making a different type of statement is something more than the question of propriety itself. The Cabinet functions on collective or joint responsibility, a very great responsibility. But this statement of his was striking at the very root of joint responsibility; and therefore, I feel that it is like a constitutional crisis. The Cabinet is working in different directions. The Minister owes an explanation to this House. I do not want to take more time of the House. But I would say that the Prime Minister himself should come to this House and make a statement. Thirdly, I want to say that that Minister made a statement insulting all the 140 Members of the Congress Party in this House.

We are responsible Members of this House taking responsible decisions. It is not for a Minister to go out and say that the Congress is taking decisions because they have no other choice. The CPI takes decisions like that but not the Congress Party. It is an insult.

I want the Minister to apologise for that statement. We are 140 responsible Members as any other Member elected to this House. How can Mr. Indrajit Gupta go out and say that we are supporting this Government just because we have no other choice? We have a choice. We have taken a deliberate decision....(Interruptions)

I am not saying that he should resign. He should apologise to this House for insulting 140 Members of the Congress (I) Benches.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Kalmadji, do you still have something to say....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar) : BJP supported you....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Guptaji has rightly said that it was their compulsion.

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN (Chandigarh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Ram Naikji has put up one aspect of the propriety but I would like to bring to your notice another aspect of it. A discussion is going on in the House on this matter. Members from both sides are expressing their views. Some Members, though their number is very less are defending it but remaining are criticising it.

In his statement the hon'ble Prime Minister said that the prices would not be reduced but on the contrary, Shri Indrajit Gupta stated that prices would be reduced. This is one aspect of the contradiction. If the hon'ble Prime Minister has already made up his mind for not reducing the prices, I think it is the insult of the entire House. If it has already been decided, then the discussion which is going on here for the last two days is an insult to the House. I want the hon'ble Prime Minister and the Home Minister both to apologise to the House. If they do not do so then I would like to submit to the Members of the Congress Party that the entire House should adopt a Censure Motion against both of them so that nobody makes such statements in future.

[English]

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR (Mumbai North-West) : Sir, Mr. Ram Naik has raised a point of propriety in this House. I am more concerned with the statement given by Mr. Indrajit Gupta, hon. Home Minister. But very important point is that when we have been debating it under Rule 193. The discussion is incomplete. The Government has not expressed its viewpoint about this because Prime Minister has not replied the debate so far.

In-between Home Minister goes to Madras and makes a statement about LPG. I welcome his statement only because he has shown the sign of reduction in the LPG price.

On the same day, there was a different statement given by the Prime Minister of this country. In his statement, he had denied it. He said that there would not be any change in the price structure once declared. These are the two view-points of one Government.

The important question today is that the Prime Minister is not present in the House whereas Mr. Gupta is present here. I have nothing to say about what he has said about the Congress Party because both of them have got some understanding. Because of their understanding, he is at liberty to say anything. (Interruptions) I do not have to say anything. For God's sake, when Mr. Bal Thackeray is not here, do not take his name. If you want to say something else, you are welcome to do so.

[Translation]

SHRI DATTA MEGHE (Ramtek) : What is wrong in mentioning the name of Shri Bal Thackeray. It is a good thing. Whether it is wrong to say good thing? ... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR : He is not in the House.

[Translation]

You pretend to be saying good things but in reality it is not so.

[English]

So, it is necessary that either Shri Indrajit Gupta should maintain his statement or he should ask for pardon particularly when we are discussing the price rise of petroleum products in the House. Otherwise, he should resign from the post and the Prime Minister should come to the House and clarify the stand as to what are the differences between the two; he should ask Shri Gupta to resign because this is against the policy of their own Government and particularly when the discussion is being continued under Rule 193, one should not utter a word outside the purview of this House.

SHRI SOMANTH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Mr. Speaker Sir, surely, our most respected Member of the House, Shri Indrajit Gupta can look after himself and it is for him to do so. I do not know whether he has been reported correctly or not and what his views are. I am not going it but Sir. It is being raised on a question of propriety and so many advices have been given to Shri Gupta that he should resign. He is one of the senior-most respected leaders of the country. Therefore, all sorts of suggestions, advices and admonitions are coming galore, addressed to a very respected Member of Parliament in this manner. He is occupying a very senior position in the Government. ... (Interruptions) I know Shri Nitish Kumar's agony; one can understand his agony; the way he is now behaving in the company of the BJP and giving advice to others as to how they should conduct themselves. Let him look after his own affairs.

We consider to be the patriotic duty of the majority of the Members of the House to preserve the Government at this stage. Therefore, Sir, we are very keen that whatever difficulties and problems they have, they have to be settled down. We all know that it is a coalition Government but trying to take up a posture as though a heinous crime has been committed and coming out with all sorts of epithets for a senior Member of this House, I think, it is insulting the House itself. ... (Interruptions) it is my personal feeling. This question had been raised in a much different form. Therefore, my request is,

Sir, that normally it is a matter for the Government and the Prime Minister. The Home Minister and other Ministers are here and I find that he is eager to make a statement. So, all these strong words need not have been used here in this case. This is my humble suggestion.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Sir, at the very outset, I would like to remind my good friend, Shri Nitish Kumar that there was a time when there was Janata Government supported by the BJP without going to the Government. So, we have learnt some experience from them. They withdraw their support at a time. We shall also consider it at an appropriate time. This is not the time now.

Today, we are in a position. Shri Indrajit Gupta was one of the topmost Opposition leaders but as a Home Minister, he is a failure. Time and again, he is saying many things across the country about infiltration, one day he says, "People can come and go, what is there? There is no infiltration." Now, many things are happening. We do not want to go into all these things. We have been castigated in the national Press. (Interruptions). Sir, Please give me time, do not make me sit like that, I will finish. I am not going into the matter relating to LPG as all Members have said about it and it is up to him. It appears that Shri Somnath Chatterjee has already written a statement for him and he will read it out. Well, we accept it. (Interruptions)

Let me finish, I did not interfere when you were speaking. I have got full sympathy for this government but their Home is in trouble. Shri Taslimuddin went out and another is on the way of going out. Let me finish by saying one point. He made a statement about a matter which is pending in the court.

Sir, he is the Home Minister of the country. His position is not in the Opposition, his position is in the Treasury Benches. He cannot arrive at such forgone conclusions about a case which is pending before an appropriate Court. This is a very very serious matter. (Interruptions) he might be right or wrong. But no Home Minister of a country in the past has passed judgement about a case which is pending before a trial Court.

Secondly, we have given support to this Government and we would continue to support it. But that does not mean that we are the bonded labourers of the Treasury Benches. They have no authority to say as to how we are going to manage our Party affairs. If he wants I can walk out with my members from this House. Let him continue with the Government. It is a very irresponsible statement to make that 140 Members have no alternative but to support this Government. We have not interfered with their affairs. They could include anybody as Minister

as they like. But we are under no compulsion. Our compulsion is our conviction and our conviction is that the secular forces should be ruling this country, as Shri Somnath Chatterjee has also said. Shri Somnath Chatterjee has also rightly said that there are certain difficulties.

Sir, let us hope that this is the last time that any Minister of this Government make such irresponsible statement like this. I hope, Shri Indrajit Gupta, with his rich experience in this Parliament, would come out with an appropriate statement here in this House so that we could console our members and we do not have to take certain decisions which might not be pleasant for him and his Government. (Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South) : Sir, we want elections but not humiliation. (Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thought the issue was of propriety.

MR. SPEAKER : that is what I wanted to say to Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Sir, I am again back on the issue of propriety of Parliament principally because of what Shri Somnathji has said that to say anything about the propriety of Parliament in the context of what the hon. the Home Minister has said or is alleged reported to have said is, in fact, impropriety towards this Parliament.

Sir, I think, in his enthusiasms and zeal he has oversaid. I am sure, he himself also realises this. Now, as far as the Chief whip of the Congress Party and his very severe admonition to the senior-most Member of this House is concerned, I do not wish to rush in where, as the phrase goes, angels fear to tread. I do recollect very well, it is not very long ago that this very party on a trivial issue like two policemen standing outside somebody's house brought down a Government. I am reminded of all those things also. (Interruptions) the then Prime Minister lost his job because of two policemen from Haryana. Two policemen from Haryana had cost Shri Chandra Shekhar his job. (Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Please use appropriate phrases. I did not lose my job. You should not distort phrases. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Now the Congress party is in dilemma as to what it should do and what it should not do. It wants to attack without causing any injury. This dilemma of the Congress is not a new one. They may shout as much as they can but, they will not do anything. Therefore, I would like to request. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SARAT PATTANAYAK (Bolangir) : We know our responsibilities...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say something if the Members of the Congress allow me to speak...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Panigrahi ji, you are one of the very senior Members of this House. Please sit down.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : what is the issue? The issue is the Congress Party's confusion within its own ranks; its confusion vis-a-vis the Government; the Government's internal confusion. Each has to be separate. The Congress Party's confusion is its own responsibility. The government's confusion is the responsibility of the House. If the government is confused, makes confused statements, then certainly the House is involved.

Here in this case, a very senior Member, in fact the senior most Member of the House is reported to have made - while a debate is going on in the House - a policy statement, which policy statement his own Prime Minister on that very day contradicted and said that it was not correct. So, the first impropriety is committed by the hon. Minister and the second impropriety is committed by the hon. Prime Minister by refuting the point. If the Prime Minister had not made a statement, I would be happy to be told that he has not made a statement. Similarly, if the hon. Home Minister had not made a statement I would be happy to be told because it is also reported that the hon. Home Minister stand by both the Statements, whatever his party has said and what the Cabinet has said. That is at the root of the confusion of this Government.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : That is on that side.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : That actually is at the root of confusion. That is the impropriety that has been committed. Hon. the Home Minister owes an explanation to this House. It will be very simply resolved if he gets up and says that no such statement was made. The issue will be over.

AN HON. MEMBER : How can he say?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Let him say so. Let him also say that he made no observation about the President of the Congress Party, that the Congress Party is free to have whoever they choose, whenever they choose and whether they choose or not to choose. This also should be said.

Unless the hon. Home Minister's stand has been clarified, I am afraid we will very sadly continue to have this conclusion carried that an impropriety has

been committed and that impropriety is going unobserved. We are simply fulfilling our duty and I am sure it is the responsibility of the Government now to satisfy us on these accounts.

THE MINISTERS OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, two or three points have been raised by the hon. Members. Let me first take up the one questioning my alleged statement made in Madras regarding the pricing of LPG. Of course, if my statement was correct - which events have proved that it was not - many people here would have been happy.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : We would have been happy.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Certainly you would have been happy. I want to make it clear, firstly it was not a printed statement. It was said in a response to the way, you know, the Pressmen encircle people and heckle them. I never said that the prices of LPG will be reduced or is going to be reduced. What I said was, 'It may be reduced. The government is considering these matters'. I agree that while a debate is going on in the House on the same subject, and even if there is no debate going on, no policy statement should be made outside the House. It does amount to impropriety and that is a well established precedent in this House. It is for you to judge whether it was a statement of policy. What I had said was that the prices may be reduced, the matter is being considered. It is for you to judge whether saying that much also was an act of impropriety or not. Subsequently, the hon. Prime Minister, who is after all the head of this government, had very clearly contradicted whatever my alleged statement may have conveyed to the people and had made it clear that there would be no reduction in the prices of petroleum product. Naturally, his statement has precedence over anything I may or may not have said. He is the head of this Government. I can be accused by somebody of being not been able to understand the policy of the Government or being confused, something like that. I am willing to admit that as a way of criticism. But all I had said was that the prices of LPG may be reduced, the matter is under consideration. The Prime Minister has clarified subsequently that there is no such proposal and the prices will not be reduced. This being evident of a Government which is tied up in contradictions, so on and so forth, that is for the House and the people outside to judge. I do not want to go into the examples of what used to happen earlier.

Then, there are two other points. One is, that I am alleged to have said something which pre-judges or seeks to pre-judge a decision of the court when the proceedings are going on in the court. Mr. Dev has said that I have no business to come to any foregone conclusion about something which is at the moment going on before the court. I categorically



deny that I have made any kind of foregone conclusion about what may or may not happen in the court. I am not responsible. If you read half-a-dozen newspapers, I am sure you do, you will find half-a-dozen versions of my alleged statement. Every newspaper does not carry the same statement. Even regarding LPG, let me say, it did not appear like that in that form in every newspaper. It is very important things for the people of this country. If I say that LPG prices are going to be reduced, surely this is a statement which would have been carried very prominently in all the daily newspapers. It was not carried like that. You please see.

About this matter in the court, I categorically deny that I have ever said anything which amounts to saying the foregone conclusions as to what is going to happen in the court. How can I say that? I do not know what is going to happen in the court.

Thirdly, I wish to assure my friends.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali) : You must tell us, what did you say. You have said that there are several versions. You please tell us the real version. What did you really say?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I did not say anything about the court proceedings.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : You have said about the resignation of the former Prime Minister.

MR SPEAKER : Please, Mr. Lodha let the Home Minister answer.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : Sir, I am only saying that if he has said about the resignation of the former Prime Minister. *(Interruptions)*

MR SPEAKER : He is saying that he has said nothing.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : I only want to congratulate him because it was a right thing which he had said and should have said. The people of this country want to congratulate him on that point.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Members who are talking of propriety are behaving like this! Is it the propriety of the House? *(Interruptions)*

MR SPEAKER : Please, Mr. Lodha.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : If an hon. Member denies a statement, it is never questioned here. He was a judge in the court.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : Sir, we want to know what was his real statement.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Unfortunately he is a retired judge of the High Court not serving.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : That is why I want to congratulate him. *(Interruptions)* He has talked about the moral right, the standard which we want in public life. *(Interruptions)* A person who is facing the court proceedings should resign.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Lodha, please sit down.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I cannot submit to another Press Conference here, inside the House.

As to the third point, I wish to assure my friends in the Congress-I have very many friends here, of course they do not always communicate with me nowadays; they communicate with other people. I was expecting somebody to communicate with me when they were all so worked up about it. Anyway, nobody spoke to me. I am getting reports from my other friends. I wish to assure my friends in the Congress that I have no desire and I have no intention of interfering in the internal matters of their party. If any impression like that has been created by what I am reported to have said, I am sorry. There was no such intention. I will not interfere in your internal matters.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : It is all right.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Wait a minute. I must explain it. When I say, and I still say, that your party has taken a particular stand towards our Government which you have done under compulsion. I still stick to that.

SHRI PM SAYEED (Lakshadweep) : It was under conviction.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You may call it conviction. I do not know if all the 140 Members got the same conviction. I say, you were under compulsion because your Leader, the former Prime Minister in this House, on the floor of the Parliament during a debate on the Confidence Motion had categorically stated two things. That is a compulsion. It is a public commitment from which you cannot go back. One was that they will never support a BJP Government and the other was that if a Government of secular forces was formed, they will support that Government. This is a compulsion, this is a public commitment. *(Interruptions)* No, no, you cannot go back from that.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : Mr. Home Minister, it is not a compulsion, it is our conviction.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Sir, as far as I am concerned, when a man of the status of Shri Indrajit Gupta said "sorry" we have forgotten the whole issue and he can take his seat now. No further reaction is needed from him. The matter has ended. A man of his status saying "sorry" is more than enough.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I am waiting for you to say that you are also sorry. Anyway, Sir, I do not want to have any bad feelings between myself and my friends in the Congress. I have many friends in the Congress and I wish to assure them once again that there was never any intention or desire on my part to say something which would be interpreted as an interference in the internal matters of their Party. If such an impression has been created, for that I am sorry. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please, enough....(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, we appreciate the statesmanlike attitude shown by the Home Minister....(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM NAIK : Sir, we would like to know the version of the Prime Minister also....(Interruptions)  
The Home Minister has said that it is for the Prime Minister to say....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please allow me to speak.  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I know what I have to do.  
(Interruptions)

[Translation]

PROF. PREM SINGH CHANDUMAJRA (Patiala) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a matter of price rise. In Punjab, farmers have come out on roads to oppose the price rise....(Interruptions) people have come out on roads. Please allow me to speak on this important issue....(Interruptions) Please allow me to speak. I have given a notice in this regard.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I have to dispose of this issue first.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : No, no, I have not disposed of this issue.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : How can I give my rulings?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Barnalaji, I have to give my observations on the question of propriety.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : This matter has not been disposed of as yet by me. Will you allow me to dispose of this question?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Will you please sit down now?

[Translation]

SHRI MUKHTAR ANIS (Sitapur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, 300 new MPs have been elected to the Lok Sabha but no arrangements have been made for their accommodation. About 50 persons are compelled to live in single room. We want your protection. So far, House Committee has not allotted any accommodation to us. The Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the House Committee are sitting here....(Interruptions) No arrangements have been made for our accommodation. About 300 persons are staying in the place where we have been allotted

a room. I would like to request you to help us in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER : Discussion on the question of propriety is still going on. It has not yet been disposed of.

[English]

Hon. Members, only the other day we had spent a lot of time discussing the question of propriety. Again this matter has been raised today. The matter under discussion in the House is as to whether it was proper on the part of the Government to have made some statements outside the House. On this we have heard the Home Minister. I think the Home Minister was within his right to say that the Government may consider it, because at the conclusion of the debate the Government has to give a specific reply and naturally the Government will consider the pros and cons before doing so.

Shri Indrajit Gupta is one of the seniormost Members here and he himself had stated that he is fully aware of the questions of propriety that nobody should make any statement outside. I think we can't accept what the Home Minister has said. There is no question of breach of propriety here.

Now, I will come to the second question viz., the categorical and reported statement made by the Prime Minister. I do not know whether he had made that statement at all. I am not aware of it.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF TOURISM (SHRI SRIKANTA JENA) : On this question, let me make the position very clear. Even if you look at the newspapers also, the Prime Minister nowhere met any pressmen, yesterday during his Calcutta visit. He has not made any statement to that effect. Only some people met him and they said something outside which has been interpreted as if that is the Prime Minister's statement....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Has it been officially contradicted?

[English]

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : He has not made any statement.

MR. SPEAKER : I think it has been now clarified by no less a person than the Parliamentary Affairs Minister himself. I think the House should accept that. There is no question of any breach of propriety, I think the matter has been clarified by the Government very clearly.

SHRI ANANTH KUMAR (Bangalore South) : I have given a notice of breach of privilege regarding the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on Friday.