

STATEMENT CORRECTING REPLY TO USQ 5100 DATED 9-5-95 RE. SUBSIDY ON FOODGRAINS AND REASONS FOR DELAY IN CORRECTING THE REPLY. THE MINISTER OF FOOD (SHRI AJIT SINGH) : I invite attention to the English and Hindi versions of the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 5100 answered on 9-5-1995 regarding subsidy on foodgrains. The reply to parts (b) and (c) of the question was as under :—

"The difference between economic cost of foodgrains and their issue prices is paid to the Food Corporation of India as consumer subsidy. The economic cost comprises procurement cost and distribution cost. The central issues prices of foodgrains normally cover the procurement cost leaving the distribution cost which is paid to the F.C.I. in the form of subsidy. Thus the quantum of subsidy on wheat and rice depends on the quantum of distribution cost. Since the distribution cost in the case of rice is lower than wheat, subsidy on rice cannot be enhanced to the same level as for wheat."

*2. The corrected answer to parts (b) and (c) of the question may kindly be read as follows :-

"The difference between the economic cost of wheat and rice and the actual realisation on their sale is termed as 'subsidy' and is paid to the Food Corporation of India by the Government on the basis of actual expenses incurred. The main ingredient of the economic cost are Minimum Support Price, Procurement incidentals, landed costs in case of imports, interest, transportation and storage charges and losses. As these costs are variable and undergo change at regular intervals, the subsidy component for wheat and rice does not remain constant and varies from year to year and from commodity to commodity. The sales realisation also does not solely depend upon the Central Issue Price and may change on the basis of prices for open sale exports and other schemes of the Government for which foodgrains are supplied from the Central Pool.

The subsidy per quintal of rice from 1988-89 to 1990-91 was higher as compared to wheat. From 1991-92, however, the subsidy per quintal on wheat has been higher when compared to rice. There is no proposal under consideration of the Government to bring the subsidy on rice at par with wheat."

There is no charge in the reply given to part (a) of the question.

STATEMENT GIVING REASONS FOR DELAY IN SUBMITTING THE CORRECT REPLY

The reasons for the delay in correcting the reply is that information received from Food Corporation of India had to be checked and reconciled, with particular reference to a specific representation received from Andhra Pradesh.

11.02 hrs

AWARD OF LICENCES TO PRIVATE COMPANIES FOR OPERATING BASIC TELECOM SERVICES

...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum) : Sir, is there any announcement to make? Are the proceedings the House stalled today also? ... (Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South) : you are getting your T.A. and D.A. for this... (Interruptions)

DR. ASIM BALA (Nabadwip) : Are you not getting T.A. and D.A.? (Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, they are wasting the time of the House. They get their T.A. and D.A. for signing the register but they are not allowing the House to run. They should allow us to run the House in the interest of the people. A lot of money is spent for running this Parliament but all the money is wasted because of these people. If they have to raise something, they can raise it. They can raise their grievances. They can put their questions to the Government. But the way they are trying to create trouble, it is not the ethics of Parliament. There are so many issues on which we have given notice... (Interruptions).

An important Bill is pending. The Bill to benefit the physically handicapped and the mentally disabled is an important Bill. I have raised this issue earlier also. This is very good Bill and it has to be passed in this Session itself but because of this *hulla gulla* it could not even be introduced. ... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura) : Why do not you refer it to JPC (Interruptions).

[English]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Sir, what about the J.P.C.? ... (Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Is she asking for a Joint parliamentary Committee? I am very happy. ... (Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Where is the Chief Minister of West Bengal? Their *de facto* Chief Minister has said that the Government is for the contractors, of the contractors and by the contractors. ... (Interruptions) They are shouting because they have double standards. (Interruptions) Today, we are going to take up the Bill for providing equal opportunities to the mentally retarded... (Interruptions) It is before this House ... (Interruptions) We should not adjourn. Why should we adjourn the House? ... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRIMATI SAROJ DUBEY (Allahabad) : At least now you stop talking.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : I will not keep quiet(Interruptions) What is the need to refer it to JPC.....(Interruptions)

[English]

We are here for the people. We should raise here the people's voice.....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI (Saidpur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Please start the question hour. These people have made a mockery of the Parliament.

SHRIMATI SAROJ DUBEY: (Interruptions) J.P.C. should definitely be constituted and an inquiry may be made into this matter.....(Interruptions)

[English]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : You are interested only in propaganda(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRIMATI SAROJ DUBEY : Shouting does not end corruption.(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, House should not be adjourned again and again. Parliament should be allowed to run.....(Interruptions)

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV (Jhanjharpur) JPC should be constituted.....(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI : If anyone has any objection, he should speak in the House only. The matter should be discussed in the House. They speak anything without considering its consequences. They neither regard Supreme Court nor the Parliament.....(Interruptions)

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV : JPC should be formed.....(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI : However, Parliament should carry on its' business.

SHRI DATTA MEGHE (Nagpur) : Parliament should carry on its' business.....(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI : Crores of rupees are spent everyday for running this Parliament. A lot of money of the country is going waste and they are saying that they will not allow to run the House(Interruptions) What for this Parliament has been made? Parliament should be allowed to run. All the points should be discussed in the Parliament only. No one will object to it..(Interruptions)

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer) : Inquiry should be made by J.P.C.(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJNATH SONKAR SHASTRI : Every point should be discussed in the Parliament only(Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, you take decision at your discretion. Parliament should run and it will definitely run...(Interruptions) They are not concerned about the country. They want to make it an election issue but it is not possible...(Interruptions) They have violated all the rules. Sometimes, they stage a Dharna outside the Parliament and sometimes they create a scene here...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : We shall make towards setting up of a Joint Parliamentary Committee(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : I request you that the Parliament is the highest institution of our country and

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : And whatever happens in this House it affects the other institutions of the country and people of this country. Members of both sides have same feelings but this House has been made with the object that people having different opinions should have an opportunity to express their views here and take a decision unanimously. I can understand that you have demanded time for discussing any issue here but I am not able to understand whether that discussion should be held in the Supreme Court, in the newspapers, outside and also in this House.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I do not want to give decision on that who is right and who is wrong.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Roseria) : You constitute the Joint Parliamentary Committee..... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Therefore, it is better to discuss first this issue in toto and after that you can decide about that in this House or by sitting in the Speaker's Chamber or Party leaders can decide it after making mutual discussions. But if you create such a situation, discussion cannot be held in this House and besides this, other points also cannot be discussed. I am making a request. You can yourselves think as to what extent such situation is proper for this House and for our democracy. This should not happen but unfortunately, it is happening. We all who are sitting here are wise persons but are not able to find a way out. For God's sake, this situation should not leave an impression that we are not able to decide over this matter. You should think together in this House whatever you want to do. I will allow the things according to your will. Such a situation is against the dignity of this House. I am not blaming anyone but I do not think that anybody will be able to reply it. I am requesting you all to think how dignity of this House can be maintained how to keep it's

suitability. We can find out some solution here to the most intricated issues. Only this picture of this House should reach the common man. Otherwise, people will gather an impression that we are not able to find solution to any issue. If such issue is considered in other institutions then it is not good. You can understand it well. I request all the members sitting in the House to listen carefully and then give your opinions on it. If you do not do so then what will be the impression about this House on the people outside and what history will be created thereby. In this regard I do not want to say anymore.

(Interruptions)

SHRI PRABHU DAYAL KATHERIA (Firozabad) : This is a very big scam*(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, a simple step of asserting the authority of the Parliament is being denied to the Parliament. The very simple step of the formation of a Joint Parliamentary Committee which will assert the authority of the Parliament is being denied by the Executive. It is the Executive which is scuttling the supremacy of the Parliament. That is why, unfortunately, other things are not being discussed. We, therefore, implore upon you to see that the authority of the Parliament is asserted over the Executive and that will solve the impasse...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (Mayiladutakai) : Let the House come to a decision in this regard. How can Mr. Chatterjee insist that a decision take place without a discussion in this House? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, they are denying the authority of Parliament. They are afraid of Parliament...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I want to remind Mr. Chatterjee that this is not Soviet Union; this is not CPSU and this is not a communist country. This is democratic India...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : A Joint Parliamentary Committee could not be formed and for the last ten days, we are in this unfortunate situation.*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I cannot accept him to get up in this House and indulge in this kind of a fascist talk. He belongs to a party which has got no democratic traditions at all...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : We implore upon you, Sir, to assert the authority of the Parliament. Why should the authority of the Parliament be scuttled by the Executive in this manner?...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : These people - the party to which Mr. Chatterjee belongs - once welcomed the Chinese to invade India. He belongs to a party which is communist in origin...*(Interruptions)*... They do

not understand anything about democracy and democratic procedure... *(Interruptions)* I insist Sir, that we have the right to continue to talk in this House and my privilege as a Member of Parliament cannot be abrogated by Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee ... *(Interruptions)* These Communists and communalistic forces have joined hands together in order to stop functioning of democracy in this country...*(Interruptions)* You just cannot allow this kind of a thing...*(Interruptions)* Therefore, I stand up to say that I have the right, as a Member of this House, to express my views. ...*(Interruptions)* Sir, I insist on you to protect my right to be heard in this House and in this country as a whole...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, we agree with you that the House should carry on its business but how this situation has been created?...*(Interruptions)*

If you do not allow me to complete my point, you will be exposed...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I tell you politely but leaders of all Parties speak here with a great responsibility. They have a point of view. They also have to speak. Please you listen to them attentively. If need arises, I will give you also an opportunity to speak.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I react to what you have just said. It is beyond my capacity to make the ruling Party members understand.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want that this House should carry on its business. There should be a discussion but you will have to accept that the discussion should be result-oriented...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : If you do not pay attention to good speakers then you will not be able to understand anything.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the issue under discussion has become an apple of discord and there is deadlock in the House on it. It has been continuously discussed in your chamber. I am not going to refer to it here. You had said that it can be decided in the House. Now the discussion is going on. The Supreme Court can examine the issue of licences. The media too can reach at a conclusion and level charges. But the irony is that this Parliament, the biggest institution of the country cannot probe into this issue. Mr. Speaker, Sir, can it not investigate the matter just because they have the majority? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : You are responsible for the demolition of the mosque.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was decided in the House that*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh) : Mr. Speaker Sir, it has happened earlier also...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : You have, in fact, asked....

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : Sir, I want to submit that this happened earlier also. Shri Vajpayee rose to speak, Shri Advani rose to speak and we had let them speak and thereafter they started shouting.

[Translation]

He wants to give his clarifications but this clarification is wrong...(Interruptions)

SHRI PHOOL CHAND VERMA (Shajapur) : Sir, please stop Mani Shankar Aiyar ji....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum) : Sir, there should be a proper debate first. (Interruptions) They should agree to a debate first. A Committee can be constituted only after the debate...(Interruptions) One minute, Sir..

MR. SPEAKER : You cannot intervene; you can reply. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. CHARLES : Are we not allowed to reply, Sir?

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : I cannot run the House in this way

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI A. CHARLES : Sir, are we not allowed to reply?

MR. SPEAKER : No, that is different. Where you are not allowed, you are at fault. Here, when Shri Vajpayee is standing and you are intervening, you should have to be careful. Yes, Shri Vajpayee.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was submitting that the discussion was going on in the House. It was decided that all the files pertaining to this scam should be scanned. We had even gathered to go through the files. However, we had said at that time that if we reached the conclusion that a Parliamentary Committee should be set up, was the Government open in its mind then? The Government had made it clear that there was no question of setting up of a Joint Parliamentary Committee and they ruled out this proposal...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA) : We have not said so. It is totally baseless...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Now let me clinch the issue and you please do not interrupt me.

Now, there is a statement made by Shri Vajpayee. Let Mr. Parliamentary Affairs Minister reply. You are not entitled to reply.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Sir allow me to complete.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, please. You will complete.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : The hon. Minister have to reply to many more issues, so let him give all the replies together...(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, we all want that a discussion should held and the Government should come out with an open mind. But it is useless to hold the discussion unless the Government agree to an inquiry. Therefore, it is being opposed....(Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not concluded yet.

My submission is that till the discussion is complete no more licences should be given. They are bound to abide by the decision of the Supreme Court but are not ready to implement the unanimous decision likely to be arrived at after the discussion over this issue in the House...(Interruptions) Other suggestions to end this deadlock were also given. Keeping in view the national interest and the deadlock, we had requested you as well as the Government that there should be no deadlock on Kashmir issue, or the issue regarding Uttar Pradesh. We even found a way out...(Interruptions) We are ready to find a way out today also but the treasury benches have not displayed its bonafides...(Interruptions)

I would like to add that my colleagues of Congress party should not feel annoyed...(Interruptions) The deadlock has been persisting for many days. The whole opposition, which generally differ on other issues is united. This issue is being taken seriously by the opposition, but the Leader of the House has not played any role to solve this tangle...(Interruptions) Cannot the hon. Prime Minister call a meeting of the leaders of Opposition parties? It is being feared that if a case is investigated, the other issues will also come up. So far, only Vidyacharan Shuklaji spoke in support of Shri Sukhram. The things have changed today...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER, Sir, my submission is that Shri Vidyacharan Shukla should be asked to reply to the questions raised by the Members. If you want to find a way out, the Opposition is not going to oppose. The way out should take us to a conclusion. A discussion cannot be held merely for discussing an issue. Now there is no time to hold discussion. That stage has passed.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Mr. Speaker, Sir...

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it would have been better if he had spoken after us.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : No, all of you cannot speak...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Once the things are clear and even then the need be, he will be called so that repetition could be avoided.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : That is why, I am saying that it would be better if he speak at the end ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : All of them will be allowed to speak later on.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, we also want the investigation, to be conducted but only after a discussion in the House. The leaders of Opposition parties hold secret discussion in your chamber but they shy away from discussing the issue publically. All the discussions should be held here in the House. They level false charges, when they meet you in your chamber.

The Government has never said that it did not want the investigation. We have been emphasising from the very beginning that the matter should be enquired into... *(Interruptions)* We even deviated from the precedent and agreed to show them official files including secret ones so that they are seized of the issue and its could help them in the discussion.

Those who have no issues to raise in the House, try to escape from the discussion and also do not let others to speak. We are ready for a discussion and we have been continuously urging them to take part in the discussion. Many rounds of discussion have taken place in your chamber as well as the chamber of the Chairperson of Rajya Sabha. We have not said that we do not favour investigation. After discussion, if it is concluded that the investigation should be done and the J.P.C. should enquire into it, it will be done but at least, let the discussion take place.

They want that, at first,.....*(Interruptions)* This is what they had stated before you. Now, I am compelled to reveal it. They had said that you should informally decide that the J.P.C. would be set up and then they would agree to a discussion. They want a decision before the discussion and that is not possible. First, they should take part in the discussion and if it is decided to set-up the J.P.C., then we are ready for the same.

In context of the question of our leader in this House, I would like to say as to what role can be played by the leader of the House when you have not allowed the proceedings of the House. What will the leader of House will do here when Parliamentary proceeding are not going on. He will certainly come and fully participate in it if Business of the House starts. But at present, you

are trying to stop the debate but in vain. Apart from it several other issues are to be debated here which were decided in Business Advisory Committee, The hon. Members would like to speak on the shocking Hack Brown issue in which several charges have been levelled on India's nuclear Policy and programmes. The House intends to express its unanimous opinion on it for which permission is not being accorded. In the same way several other important issues are there and hon. Members intend to express their opinion on it but they are being not given permission. Why it is so? Hon. Members like to raise several other questions here and we are also ready to reply to them but permission is not being accorded for it. It should not happen in this House.

Today I, with my full strength refute the statement that we have ever said that we have decided not to conduct, any inquiry in this matter. We always said that inquiry would be conducted, if required after the debate. You can see the documents in this regard. But till the hon. Members would not from a collective opinion....*(Interruptions)* We may get consensus on it. There may be some differences but atleast let them come forth in this House. But they discuss and try to reconcile on it surreptitiously and to reconcile here they beat about the bushes by raising different issues, go in delegation to Rastrapati Bhavan, sit on dharna in front of the House and try to avoid debate on it. The person whose case is weak that avoids debate. I challenge you for conducting this debate. Let you justify your point and we will justify ours. The public of this country and this House would decide as to whether it would be inquired into or not.

[English]

SHRI A. CHARLES : We will not allow them. If they agree for the debate, then only we will allow them. First, let us decide whether to have a debate or not.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, today you were on legs while expressing your views in this House. We, fully agree with you. Just now Shri Atalji expressed his view here. I would like to say that we were present in every meeting held in your chamber during the last seven days. I would also like to present the statement of hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs before you, this House and the public of the country. Truth can withstand any acid test. JPC is not going to hang any one if arises any doubt or any question during the enquiry. The committee constituted by the House is to advise and not to award punishment...*(Interruptions)* No member from my party has interrupted the speech of Shri Viday Charanji.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : If you want, I will allow you. But no interruptions.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I regret to say that we came here for this session well prepared and in high spirits but....(Interruptions) Mani Shankarji, you can rise to abuse me if you wish so. I will speak later.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I will call you bad names later on.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : I agree with you. You can speak first and there after I would speak.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Sharadji, please sit down. Let Shri Mani Shankar speak first whatever wants to speak. You should speak later on. Mr. Speaker, Sir, excuse me, is there any limit to it or not? Whether all the Member of Congress party have the same rights as the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has. Whether the leaders of other political parties have no say or status in this House.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Not any special.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : If they have no say in this House, well you may keep along with you such other Members as have status here and run this House in the same manner in which it is being run so far.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : I would like to say to the Member of Treasury Benches that many of you were not present there. Mr. Speaker, Sir, not a single suggestion came from their side during the meetings held in your chamber during the last seven days. Hon. Chaturananji, Shri Somnathji and our several other leaders have also given suggestions. Shri Indrajit Guptaji has said so many things to us. We all, Shri Atalji and other leaders made our best efforts. Our suggestions are also important. They are in power and can take action but we do not have other place except the Parliament, to raise and debate this issue. We can not act against the dictates of our conscience. We have made so many efforts beside JPC. But today the opposition is adamant on the issue of JPC because ruling party does not accept any suggestion. After two or three hours debate on the issue, the Government gave a negative reply. Hon. Chandra Shekhar came twice in your chamber, talked to us and asked me as to what I was doing and why the proceedings of the House not going on. The decision was taken on this issue when Chandra Shekharji came there for second time. Shri Somnathji articulated this decision and also gave in writing. Earlier Chandra Shekharaji was speaking in favour of this decision but later on....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please listen to me for one minute. Why are you discussing here what transpired in the chamber.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Sir, I would like to make a statement in this House about the correct version of the debate that took place in this House.

MR. SPEAKER : It would be as if different opinions are made from two sides and then I am asked to tell which is right.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to mention their names but some of them have spent half of their lives in this House. After giving these twenty suggestions we wanted to raise some issues in this House. There are so many issues not only regarding Telephone Services but also regarding duplicate shares, Chandra Swami and prices of sugarcane. Earlier the prices of sugarcane were quite high whereas today it is getting rotten in fields. It is really unfortunate that we made preparation for months together to raise these issues of public interests but have to sit here idle. Mr. Speaker, sir you have expressed your feelings here but I am compelled to say that the Government is quite adamant on this issue. You may be knowing that before the commencement of this session, a news item was published in newspapers that the Government is reluctant about this session. I do not say that this news was correct or incorrect but now it seems to be correct. There were several such questions. I know that Members of your party would interrupt me if I raise any question here. You do not want debate to be conducted in this House. Therefore you....(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : We demand that it should be debated in the House whereas you are trying to skip the debate.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Shuklaji, do not take any decision in haste. I am expressing my apprehensions. They may not be completely true. Government is almighty. I am presenting here the information I have with me. You can raise to say that it is incorrect. Mr. Speaker, sir, I would like to say that there were several issues before this House like the issues of Kashmir and Arms supply to Pakistan which are related to unity and integrity of this country. I wanted to discuss it comprehensively with a view to strengthen the nation. I would like to submit humbly that here I differ with Shri Atalji that the way in which this issue was presented by the Government reveals that Shri Shuklaji, was not speaking alone. I humbly disagree with Atalji. The whole Government and Narsimha Raoji is supporting his action. Otherwise they would not have refused discussion on this issue so adamantly. The demand for JPC has not been raised here for the first time. It seems and I have said it that this House has a detestation for the word Joint Parliamentary Committee. Then constitute a Committee, but they are not ready even to do so....(Interruptions) They are not willing to form a Committee (Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, we agree that such thing is happening for the first time that allegations have been made on a person and he say

he is innocent. If he is not guilty then why should he be afraid or have apprehensions. If anyone makes charges on me, I will immediately ask to probe the charge. If we are honest and fair in practice there is nothing to get scared of any inquiry. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was also said that we keep the worth of constituting a JPC in abeyance. We had made our position clear. Shri Somnathiji had made such suggestion and we keep it in abeyance....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : I asked him.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : You were only asked to postpone the process for a few days. We honour the verdict of the Supreme Court. The members sitting here in the House represent 90 crore citizens of the country....(Interruptions) Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, I am at a loss to understand as to why you behave like an epileptic (Interruptions) Why do not you understand the reality..(Interruptions) Are you a patient of epilepsy ... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : It is very wrong. He cannot say. ... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Why have you stood up. Let him stand and I will reply to his question. My submission is that ... (Interruptions) we want discussion. You have rightly said that this country as well as this world cannot be run by bullets. We do not like to discuss things outside or to express our views through newspapers. We are more secure here. It is better to express our views here only because the whole country can learn about each and every thing that we are discussing here. But through you, I would like to state that you were very much concerned about this and you tried your best to find a way out but the Government is not ready to accept any solution in this regard. Shuklaji, several suggestions have been received for constituting a JPC. The seasoned senior members of this House tried to patch up the differences but you did not yield on any of the points suggested by them whereas we agreed on them. On several points we agreed with you but you did not accept our suggestion. We said that we agree on keeping the JPC in abeyance and asked you to keep your decision in abeyance but you did not agree on that point also. We said that matter should be referred to both the hon. presiding officers--Speaker of the Lok Sabha, and the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, and let them constitute a committee but you did not accept this suggestion. We said that the committee should be constituted with an object to conduct an inquiry but you did not accept that. We want to see

proceedings of the House going on. So that we could raise two-three important points here. In the matter, we can put this Government in the dock and lead it to more severe crisis. We want to put you in the dock. We will not spare you, instead we will prefer to walk out because we can discuss only but you have the power and you are wielding the sceptre. We can only discuss the issue but you want to snatch away ever this right from us. You successfully persuaded all the leaders of the opposition to agree on stalling of the proceedings of the House, so that no discussion could be held on the issue of Chandraswamy, Reliance and other issues of corruption...(Interruptions) You wanted to do so with a view to avoid placing of A.T.R....(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Whatever Sharadji has said just now and whatever was discussed in your chamber, you must be remembering all that. While consultation was going on in your chamber between the Chairman and you, I had promptly told you that we were ready for that...(Interruptions) I later amended my opinion and said that we are ready to refer it to the Speaker but prior to that there should be an informal understanding between us that the Speaker will decide the modalities. Therefore, first we should be committed to that. I have repeated it again and again that we are ready to accept all the things. We never rule out any such possibility but whatever we have to discuss, we discuss in the House only. Whatever we want to say ... (Interruptions) Discussion should be held. Everything can be done. Nothing is out of rule. We are ready to discuss on the demands of the opposition, and prepared to ventilate our views and aspirations(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I think we should avoid referring to what we discussed in the meeting.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, at last I would like to speak on the issue of A.T.R. on scrutiny scam on which J.P.C. had met. Please listen carefully. No business could be transacted for 7-8 days in this House on A.T.R. issue .. (Interruptions) In that matter, you had said that you would take action on Action taken Report issue. It was decided in consultation with you. We wanted you to make a report on A.T.R. also. Sir, through you, I would like to say to Shuklaji that a person in the power should be generous and kind-hearted. In a democracy, a person in power should be considerate towards the opposition. But from the very first day you have compelled us to stage a walk out and shown favours for one side only. You have put us in such a situation during these 7 days that we are compelled to think whether we should be sit in this House or remain outside the House to save our honour. The House cannot be transaction in this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit that still there is time to get ready. Please let this House transact

its business. We have not made any undue demand. We have made a demand for making inquiry only and not to punish anybody. There will be a discussion in this House... (Interruptions) Whenever a committee will be formed, your members will be in majority. I am not able to understand as to why you have made this matter so serious? Why you have stretched it to this extent? I want to say that we have suffered a lot in the matter of A.T.R. The Government has not taken any action on A.T.R. so far. The whole country stands witness to it. We had advised to constitute an inquiry committee. The decision on this should have been taken in the House itself. But you did not accept that. Please name out any such person who does not want that this House should transact its' business? Therefore, I want to say that we are ready but your should also make up your mind... (Interruptions) We want to discuss the issue but first, you get ready. Shri Shuklaji, in a democracy, if a person who is in power, makes such matter a prestige issue then definitely this matter will become more serious. We are unarmed people. We have no prestige issue. We have made only a petty demand. Please accept it. This is only what I want to say through you. We are in agreement with you... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar, I am allowing you to speak. But please do not say certain things on which I would be required to give some judgement. Please avoid them.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to you and particularly, to my friends in the opposition for giving me an opportunity to express my views here.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard carefully what Vajpayeeji and my friend Sharadji have said and we are very happy that we have got an opportunity to discuss here after 9-10 days because earlier, we were in dark about your opinion and the discussion which was held in your chamber.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, begging your pardon, I would like to state, that you have been appointed as Speaker of this House for, at first, your being a member of this House. Our hon. Prime Minister has been appointed as the leader of this House and the Prime Minister for, first of all his being elected to this House within six months. Vajpayeeji has been appointed as the leader of the Opposition for, first of all, his being elected as an M.P. from Lucknow constituency. We all come here in the same manner. It is right that the people of this country have neither appointed me as a Minister or Prime Minister, nor have sent me in the Opposition but of course have elected me as a member of this House and

being the member of this House, I have the same rights as Narasimha Rao ji, Atalji or my friend Sharad Yadavji have. If I am not given an opportunity to express my opinion, then I will think that my interests are not being safeguarded and I am not being given a chance to exercise my rights.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I agree to what Shri Vidyacharan Shuklaji and particularly, former Prime Minister Chandra Shekharji says. We ought to listen that with rapt attention and we are ready to seriously listen that but we are not aware of the surreptitiously conducted parleys in your chambers about which we are not allowed to make any suggestion. To my mind, this is a grave injustice to an ordinary Member of Parliament as well as to this House. Hence, I am grateful to you and to Sharad Yadavji in particular, for giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mr Speaker, Sir, my point is that anybody can level allegations and the opposition is there for this purpose. This is vital for the health of a democracy and I assure you that in case the destiny prefers us to be in the Opposition and bestows Yadavji with the charge of a Ministry, I will definitely level allegations on him because the opposition is obliged to do so. Yet, it becomes our duty to give reply to any allegation levelled against us.

12.00 hrs.

The hon. Prime Minister, Shukla Sahib and the entire cabinet alongwith their supporters like me are ready to listen to the allegations, weigh and judge them on merit basis and accept any lapse on the part of Pandit Sukh Ram. On the other hand the House should decide the significance and credence of the views we may put forth in favour of Pandit Sukh Ram. Under the circumstances, I cannot explain as to how Pandit Sukh Ram is innocent in my opinion because this issue has not so far cropped up in the House. I would like them to raise this issue. Under Rule 193 or through a Calling Attention Motion or any other Parliamentary device at their disposal and I would not divest them of this right. Jaswant Singhji became my Guru conducted a class and taught back-benchers like me as to how the House should be run but he left the House the moment I went to give him *Guru Dakshina*. I would like my Guru to recall the lesson he taught us in July, 1991 and bring forth a No-Confidence or an Adjournment Motion under Rule 193 or 184 or through a Calling Attention Motion and test the calibre of his taught. We shall accept their demand, if any, for constitution of a JPC if that has any basis. I remember, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussion held for months together to unearth the 'Bofors' scandal and lastly, the same Government against whom they levelled charges set up the J.P.C. I was a Member of this House in 1992 when the issue of Securities Scam involving predatory economic adventures of thousands of crores of rupees was raised. We constituted a J.P.C. and

worked on that for one and a half years to ascertain. If any of our Ministers were to be blamed for that. We are not scared of J.P.C. They claim that it was because of them and during the regime of our Government that all the Standing Committees were constituted. We are ready to debate every issue but meetings cannot be held at the stairs of the House. A curious photograph taken yesterday of my friend, Sharad Yadavji has today appeared in the Press. I cannot edure it. I wish Sharadji to take a seat here so that the cameras focus on his facial expressions and reflect his mind to the people at large who after listening to his thoughts will think twice before casting vote in his favour. He raised the issue of sugar scandal and got Kalp Nathji ousted from ministership. The prices of sugar are before him. I want him to level charges on us so that we can resort to self-introspection with regard to our failures and improve ourselves. In case we do not approve of your charges, the plebs of the country will get an opportunity within 5-6 months to vote to power the party responsible for demolition of Babri Masjid or vote you people who have a history of inner strife. You had a strength of 60-70 Members. God alone knows why Nitish ji does not talk to you now, why Rajnath Sonkarji crossed the floor to join our side? They demolished a structure in a single attempt whereas you are disintegrating on your own and wrecking others as well. Let you and us go to the court of the people and ask whether we had been wrong in awarding this contract to the Himachal Futuristic Co. If the people's verdict goes against us, then, we are ready to sit on that side of the House. For God's sake take recourse to democratic method, as per the direction given by the hon. Speaker at the commencement of every session. You send us a notice saying that as per the rules nobody can go into the well of the House..... (Interruptions) Again, nobody can rise on his legs to speak unless asked by the hon. Speaker to do so. You raise abusive slogans here. A person of volatile disposition like me criticises you, when it is not on the record, if provoked by pinpointing mistakes. This House should run as per the Rules of Procedure. We are ready to debate issues here with all the civility and etiquette represented by the speeches of Atalji and Sharadji here.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I lastly demand that a method of debating this and other issues in the House should be evolved either by you or the Opposition benches or even this side. I am a back bencher and besides, am not a Minister. Therefore, I would like them to advance such facts and pleas as can convince me to vote with them but it should atleast be preceded by a discussion wherein you should explain the reason of anguish, erupting the volcano within you on the indignation suffered by you so that the hon. Speaker can catch a glimpse of it. You have harassed them a lot. For God sake come here and harass us.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, if Shri Mani Shankar Aiyer comes back again here to this House, I wish him well. If he remains a Member of the Ruling Party, then I wish him well to become a Minister—whatever may be the portfolio or probably, he would be better as Minister without portfolio because then he can put his finger in every pie.

Sir, everybody here is fully aware of the importance of this House and you also reminded us today that this is the highest elected body where the entire country is represented through us. This is a place where we should discuss all important issues.

Sir, to run an institution like this, there has to be some understanding, some attitude of cooperation. One cannot run it by mere arrogance or flippancy or confrontation.

Now, Sir, one of the basic fundamental tenets of our Constitution is the accountability of the Government to the House of People, to the Parliament. Unless we are able to enforce that accountability of the Government, one of the basic important functions of the House will not be discharged.

Sir, this is a contract which has been entered into, admittedly, in an area which is being opened for the first time to private sector. Admittedly, the Minister himself has said here that this is the largest contract ever sought to be or attempted to be entered into by the Government of India. Mind-boggling figures are there; that a small company worth Rs. 62 crore is making an offer Rs. 85,000 crore. If somebody becomes worried about it, and particularly when we find that the company has chosen associates which are of very questionable credibility, at least, then shall we not ask ourselves? Are we here to be the mute spectators? The hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs wants to make it a number game. Is this the way we shall deal with the national issues? He has always been saying one thing. Once, I had used an expression 'like a broken record'—the same thing is being said. Of course, Sir, I am not saying what some of the hon. Ministers in this Government and so many Members of Parliament are saying in private. I am not also referring to what has happened in your Chamber. I do not want to bring you into any controversy — Sharadji might not have done that. In what context, what was said and what was in somebody's mind, I do not want to go into it. But one should have thought about accountability and of constitutional provisions when such huge contracts are entered into. So many Members of Parliament have serious reservations about it, and the whole question of security of this country is involved.

Sir, I found that one thing is very clear here that no other Minister has come forward to support Pandit Sukh Ram. We have been saying it openly, and I also have been saying that where is the Prime Minister of this

country on an issue like this. The Minister says that if there is no discussion, the Leader of the House has no function. Is this the concept of the Leader of the House and the Prime Minister that his function is only to sit in seat No. 1, and if at all to open his mouth? Does he think it proper? Does he not have got to give a leadership here? The Parliament of India is unable to function. Nobody can say that there is no issue. Even Mani Shankar Aiyarji had to admit that there is an important issue. On this important issue, the Prime Minister has nothing to say! The Parliamentary Affairs Minister is only saying one thing and his insistence on prior debate here is to put it on numbers. The Rajya Sabha may take a different decision because of its present composition. Then it will be said that as there is no agreement, there will be no JPC and their purpose is served. Therefore, the posture that there should be a debate on the floor of the House is only to avoid an inquiry. We have been saying that there should be an inquiry because we want to know the facts. What has happened in the so-called gesture of inspection of the records? I was not there, but we have heard from our hon. Members of Parliament who were there, who are very responsible persons, that there was not even an attempt to cooperate with the Opposition leaders who gone there. Therefore, the attitude is very clear. In a context like this when the whole country's telecommunication system is being opened up, anybody is coming. Thailand is coming. Israel is coming. Capping is being done. Why was this done at a particular stage? Did anybody think of security consideration? At what time you thought about it? When did you think of capping? So, these are very important matters. It would have been decided by this time if the Government wanted to cooperate. Some hon. Members would have said something and would have decided the issue. The House would have gone on. Every issue would have been discussed. If the Government takes this disgusting attitude, displays this arrogance, if there is no consideration of any proposal, how will it help? How is the Government helping discussion on the nuclear question? How are you helping us to discuss the Brown Amendment? How are you helping the process of discussing important issues of Vohra Commission, *hawala* report and so many things?

You are now taunting us about sitting on a dharana. This is one of the democratic methods of protest. Therefore, if we take recourse to one democratic method of protest, if some friends felt that approaching the President of India is another democratic method of protest, then you are abusing us and taunting us. We do not have to learn parliamentary etiquettes from my friends there. We have also been here for a long time. We have seen and we have seen the giants there also. Without the spirit of cooperation, spirit of accommodation, how can you function in the Parliament like this? Today you must not forget that in spite of our

very serious differences between the BJP and ourselves - everybody knows in this country about this on this issue, our demand has been one... (*Interruptions*) What is the sensitivity of the Government towards a united opposition demand? Has there been any real approach? It is very easy to blame. Nobody knows about it. We are also prepared to go to the people. We are inviting you to go to the people earlier than you are thinking. Do not tell us that we are avoiding the people. Of course, whatever be their verdict, we will have to accept. There is no question about it. But on the basis that you know people better, you are passing judgement sitting here today. We have to listen to all sorts of gratuitous advice from him.

Sir, these are important matters. The very fact that we do not want any constitutional impasse here shows our commitment. Important issues have been discussed here and allowed to be passed. The issues regarding Uttar Pradesh and Kashmir have been solved by agreeing to adopt the Motions. We have said here also. If we were irresponsible, we would have created a constitutional crisis. That has not been done. Therefore, my appeal to the Government is this that even now three days are left. Let us utilise the three days. Openly, you should invite, you should welcome an opportunity to clear yourself. Let the people be told fully, let the Parliament be told fully that this is the position and there is nothing wrong in it. Therefore, Sir, I respectfully suggest - even now I request - to the hon. Prime Minister that you have some duties to perform. I do not accept anything from the hon. friends sitting here because they have been keeping complete silence. You are following your Prime Minister by being *mounis*. Let there be an action now. If you have any faith in parliamentary democracy, if you have any respect for Parliament, if you have any respect for the basis of functioning of different party systems of Government here, the Opposition will be there. Therefore, kindly accept this. Let the House function even for three days. It would be a good gesture on the part of the Government if it does something. The very fact that we have always been attending, Sir, whenever you had desired our presence shows our commitment. We have never shied away from the attempt to have a settlement or understanding. We have always cooperated with you. We are prepared to sit with you, Sir, any time you desire our presence in your room. Whatever method of discussion you desire, we are prepared for it. But we have never run away from that. Therefore, even now I am requesting the Government to see reason.

So do not take a confrontation attitude for the good of this country. You should accept this request for the JPC for the good of this country.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are very grateful to you specially because today you appealed to all of us saying that you were very much shocked as the House is not running properly. You tried

your best. We have got only two working days now. The House started working from 27th of November. And now it is a matter of shock that we have got only two working days left. Yes, I agree that opposition Members have their democratic rights. They can raise the issue; they can raise the grievances; they can enquire into the matter; they can ask a question to the Government. This is their democratic right and fundamental right, according to our Constitution. But, Sir, we have also the same right to raise the issue and the peoples' voice. The poor people, people belonging to weaker sections cannot come to the House, they cannot go to the leaders, they cannot go to the press, they cannot come to the VVIPs. And they came to the Less Important Persons (LIPs) because they belong to the weaker sections. Today I am happy and I am grateful to all the leaders of this House and to all the Members of this House and I think, we should specially express our congratulations, not congratulations but convey our regards to you, Sir, that it is because of your intentions, because of your kindness at least we have started some talking. Earlier I asked some opposition friends - I do not want to mention their names because of the courtesy, the system, the decorum - why they did not allow the House to run. They told me that was their election agenda. I told them, "if you have this as your election agenda, then why are you creating all these problems now? The elections will be held in March or April. And you have started your election agenda three months before that. It is because of your election agenda, people suffer the most." If the corruption is proved here, the House can discuss the matter. We agree with all the leaders including Vajpayeeji, Sharadji, Somnathji and V.C. Shuklaji, our Parliamentary Affairs Minister. He categorically stated that the House could discuss it and if anyone is found guilty, the House can decide whether the JPC should take place or not. Even I am in favour of the JPC though I am a ruling party Member. They have not allowed the Members of this House to speak. We also have the right to raise the voice because the Congress Party is the mass-based party. We always depend on masses...(Interruptions) Please do not interrupt me. Had they allowed me earlier to speak on this issue, I would have placed this issue and appealed to my Minister on that. After the discussion, whatever the Members will decide, the Government will accept that. What else can they do?...(Interruption)

[Translation]

It can be decided later as to who defeats whose arguments.

[English]

I am a junior Member here. There are so many senior leaders in this House. Sometimes we have to learn the method from the seniors. But the seniors should listen to the juniors. Earlier a section of the industrialists used to be busy in running their business.

What has happened now? Now I am sorry to say that because of the deterioration of the value-based politics, a section of the industrialists are running this House. If it is not checked, I am sorry to say that the democratic rights, the democracy, the democratic institutions, the supreme institution of democracy will be spoiled. The Vohra Commission has indicated in their report about it. That is why, my submission is to all of them. If I want to bring in any controversial matter, you know I can say so many things. They have referred to the Prime Minister as 'Mauni Baba'. Somebody has accused our Government to be the *Brahstacher* Government.

[Translation]

Even while discussing corruption courtesy should be observed. They cannot talk of corruption if they are unable to uphold the dignity of the House. I listened to them, so now they should listen to me.

"Ham aah bhi bharte hain to ho jate hain badnaam,
Yeh qatla bhi Karate hain to Charcha nahin hoti".

Corruption prevails everywhere, in every State today. There should be no difference with regard to corruption. There is corruption in West Bengal.

[English]

Sir, they are saying that our Government is corrupt. One senior *de facto* Chief Minister of West Bengal - I have great regard for him because he believes in value-based politics - Shri Vinay Choudhury has said that the Government is of the contractors, for the contractors and by the contractors...(Interruptions)... When they have said that our Prime Minister in *Mauni Baba*, I thought I should not say anything. I do not want to condemn anybody or I do not want to bring any controversial issue...(Interruptions)..

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He is not here
...(Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, the problem is because of this. There are so many issues and specially for them I am giving notices every day. Every day you must have received the notice. Even I think this will go to the Guinness Book of World Record on how many notices are given to you regarding the issues of lock-up deaths and the police custody deaths, further employment and further compensation of their families, their rehabilitation, relief, etc. But we are not able to raise these issues. After the death of the parents of the mentally retarded children what is the situation? Nobody is there to look after them.

Sir, this is a very good Bill about the mentally retarded Children. This Bill is supposed to be introduced here but nothing has happened so far. That is why I say 'better late than never'.

When you have started something very friendly, Sir, I will appeal to all of them, through you, that let this

House run. It should raise the voice of the people, by the people, for the people and not for the election agenda.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Rabi Rayji.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (Hooghly) : Sir, what she had said about the West Bengal Minister is absolutely wrong. Today it has come out in the press. He has given a statement that it was wrongly reported by the regional press.... (Interruptions)... Shri Vinay Choudhury has given a statement, which has come out in the press.

[Translation]

SHRI RABI RAY (Kendrapada) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not want to speak on this topic but I speak the truth. When Atalji and other Members spoke after you that showed that some way out could be found out.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, no business is being transacted for the last 9 days. I know that you have been pained most in the House. But I would like to say that corruption is a question which, I suppose, all the Members of Parliament of Congress Party would not like to overlook. While saying so, I am very much in distress. The message has gone all over the country that the hon. Prime Minister and other Ministers who are responsible for it, want to escape debate in the manner it should be conducted in the House. I do not know whether it is right or wrong but a message has gone to the people.

I would like to suggest the leaders and Members of the Congress Party to go through the History of the last 20-30 years of the House. I would like to mention the name of Shri Krishna Menon ji who was a renowned leader. Today, the Congress Party lacks such type of leaders. At the time of Chinese aggression, persons like Shri Mahavir Tyagi had asked for his resignation. Jawaharlal ji refused to accept his resignation though ultimately hon. Jawaharlal ji had to accept his resignation on the request for Mahavir Tyagiji.

I would also like to cite two more incidents that took place during hon. Jawaharlal Nehru's period. Why was Das Commission constituted? Shri K.D. Malviya was an efficient Minister but on a complaint involving merely Rs. 1500, an enquiry was made against him. Do you know the reason as to why Das Commission was constituted? He was an up right person despite that he had to resign. The history reckons Shri T.T.Krishnamachari as a very efficient Finance Minister of the country but 'Moondara Commission' was set up and he had to quit.

I know that Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru himself participated in the proceedings of the House but what is happening today? The biggest Parliament of the world and Parliament of the country is not functioning. The Lok Sabha has come to a standstill for the last nine days and our hon. Prime Minister is not willing to open his mouth.

What had hon. Prime Minister said before six month? I would like to ask Shri Shuklaji as to had he not

committed in the House that he would keep the House well informed of every day of each and every new information regarding Bofors scandal. Do you know as to how many times did hon. Prime Minister came to the House and spoke on the issue? Mr. Speaker, Sir, he had made a commitment in the House but nothing happened. Nothing happened about ATR.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of hon. Shuklaji and hon. Chavan to contain the corruption prevalent at Ministerial level, as was done during the period of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru. That this message should not go throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, while writing history, it must be written and neither I, nor you would like it to be mentioned in the history that -

[English]

When Rome was burning, Nero was fiddling.

[Translation]

It should not go into the history. Therefore, with a heavy heart, I shall take my seat after giving one suggestion. After today's discussion, I would like that leaders of the parties, and Shri Chandra Shekharji - I am specially mentioning his name with a belief that he will not refuse because he has been recipient of 'The Best Parliamentarian of the Year' award - should be invited and I hope that all the leaders of the parties will rise above the party politics like Shri Mani Shankarji, and think for the country. If we do not control the corruption prevalent at higher levels, what will happen in the States. Therefore, we should set ideal and eradicate corruption prevalent all around. The Parliament should set an ideal by disclosing the nature of complaints received about Ministers.

[English]

• We have come to grips with that situation. Therefore, I want that we have to burn the midnight oil today and we must come to a conclusion.

[Translation]

The Government should only invite leaders and Shri Chandra Shekharji.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the way in which constructive suggestions were made and all the speakers delivered good speech, leaves no doubt in my mind with regard to continuance of the discussion in the House and setting up of a Parliamentary Committee to look into the matter and take a decision in the light of these facts and the deadlock persisting for the last nine days will be removed.

[English]

SHRI A. CHARLES : I plead with you Sir, for just two minutes for me. It is with a sense of agony and

anguish I am expressing my concern. I have been very attentively and with rapt attention listening to the intervention of the leaders of that side. I am going to be very brief and specific.

I think the country is facing the greatest crisis. Wild allegations have been raised in this House about a particular contract in the Telecom. All the Members and the Leaders spoke on that issue. We were patiently listening to them. The Minister was here and he was also listening to them. At the close of the discussion, the Hon. Minister stood up to answer the allegations. But it is really sad; we have long laid down parliamentary traditions; when an allegation is made, when somebody is accused, when somebody is answering to some allegations, at least he should be given the time to reply to the allegations.

Our presumption is, anybody who is accused of an allegation is innocent till the highest forum or the Court—let it be anybody who decides—decides beyond reasonable doubt that the allegations have been established. But unfortunately, in this august House, after all the allegations have been raised, it is really sad that the person against whom the allegations have been made is not even allowed to speak one word and finally this august House decides that he should make a statement. He came with a statement. All the Opposition Members, they say, are divided, but we know what happened in the Ninth Lok Sabha. The National Front Government was ruling with two crutches on two sides, one was the BJP and the other was the Marxist Party. They are together. We have no complaints against that because we are in the Treasury Benches now. In a Parliamentary democracy, we have to answer to the people. We are responsible to the people. We have the responsibility to rule the country.....(Interruptions) Do not laugh, my dear friend! I also represent the people. Please do not laugh. This laughter has some different meaning. I know that....(Interruptions) When he was about to read it, the hon. Minister was not even allowed to read the statement. He was compelled to place the statement on the Table of the House. The next day, there was a consensus when the representatives of the parties went to the Chamber of the Deputy-Chairman. I was there. I was called. Many Leaders and many Members were also called. The understanding was that the files will be brought there. The files will be looked into. They should be given all facilities to go through the files. All the confidential documents and the whole file were there. But, unfortunately without going into this particular allegation, some Members raised a point that before we consider the allegation on the basic telecom services, we should go into the cellular telecom services files....(Interruptions) They had taken a time of three-and-a-half hours. Most of the Ministers, including the Home Minister and Shuklaji were there.....(Interruptions) You hear me.....(Interruptions).

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane) ; What was our demand? Our demand was that the licences should not be issued. That was our demand... (Interruptions)

SHRI A. CHARLES : After three-and-a half hours, the only point mooted was that the cellular telecom services issue should be taken up. That is another issue. In all fairness I plead that whatever allegations have been raised, we are prepared to answer the allegations. We should be given time and I plead with the entire Opposition to allow for a proper debate. If, at the end of the debate, they are not satisfied, we, here, are for a J.P.C. or a House Committee or any sort of inquiry because we also stand for accountability. I am very sorry that a very senior Member, the Former Speaker of the House - I have great respect for him - was accusing the Congress Members. I take serious objection to that. We are not corrupt. We are not here for any corrupt practises. We are not going to shield any corruption. We are equally accountable.... (Interruptions).

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : But some of your Ministers are corrupt....(Interruptions)

SHRI A. CHARLES : We have a great tradition. I can also point out fingers on most of your Members. Do not try to...(Interruptions)

This is my only humble request. We want a proper discussion. We want a proper debate. We want time to reply. At the end of the debate, if they are not satisfied, we are willing to have any sort of inquiry so that the whole country may know what exactly has happened. I feel, a very wrong message has gone to the country. This august House is for the people and I plead that this may be done.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, discussion is going on in the House for the last 9 days but no business is being transacted. As you have said, everything is going outside the House. It is a matter of pleasure that due to your interference, we are atleast talking to each other but it is a matter of displeasure that conversations taken place in your chamber are discussed here. You had once complained and expressed your displeasure, on my not visiting your chamber. It was my helplessness that I feel hesitation in revealing here the conversations taken place in your Chamber. Due to these conversations, I feel myself caught in a dilemma. One side puts forth something and the other side puts forth something contradictory to that, on the same issue and I remain a mute spectator who has no option but to listen to both the sides which is not fair. I visited your chamber twice and both the time I had to accompany two persons whose proposals. I could not reject. First time, I visited your chamber under the compulsion of hon. Indrajit Gupta and second time under the compulsion of Atal ji and I made proposal there.

I would like to make one submission to hon. Vidyacharan Shukla ji that he, being on a responsible post, should not refer to the conversation taken in your chamber. Even if he wants to mention them, he should do so in a manner as may not put persons like me in a dilemma. That is all, that I wanted to say.

I would like to tell you that these debates and discussions are not going to yield anything because we have gone too far to reconciliation. The Leader of opposition, Shri Atal ji told a thing which invited reactions of Shri Somnath ji as well as some other Members. This situation cannot be thought of in a Parliamentary Democracy that no transaction takes place in the House for the last 9 days and the leader of the House remains a mute spectator. The Prime Minister is not only the leader of Congress Party but the leader of the House as well. If no business is transacted in the House then what for we are here and what for hon. Prime Minister is the leader of the House? My only request to you is that it should not be made a prestige issue.

I wonder when I am asked as to what I wanted to discuss with hon. Prime Minister. I am in this House for a long time and I also have talked with many Prime Ministers. For me, it was for the first time that I was told that hon. Prime Minister would meet me only when I told them as to what I wanted to discuss with him. I never faced such a situation before. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was the first such bad experience of my life. You will invite leaders again but I do not want that the dignity of your high post may become a matter of discussion in the House. Therefore, through you, I would like to request hon. leader of the House Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao that he should invite other leaders also, such as Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Shri Sharad Yadav, Shri Somnath Chatterjee, Shri Indrajit Gupta to his residence or to his office before you invite the leaders. It will enhance the dignity of Prime Ministership and only after discussion with him, any decision can be taken. If my request has any significance then I would like to request you publically to convey it to the hon. Prime Minister. If any decision has to be taken in this regard, then hon. Prime Minister should invite these four people for discussion.

Whosoever may be the Prime Minister, it hardly matters. These members may also one day become Prime Minister. At time one who is not the Prime Minister, enjoys the higher status than Prime Minister. On having become the Prime Minister for a couple of days one should not relish a misunderstanding that he is the greatest man ever born. If hon. Prime Minister invites the leader, it will enhance his dignity and we shall be able to get out off this situation.

I do not want that every leader should be invited. After inviting these four leaders to your chamber if hon. Prime Minister and my friend hon. Vidyacharan Shuklaji talks to other leaders, some way out can be found out.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, only thing that pricks me, is that when I had told you not only in meeting but separately, that I do not know as to why some of our Members of Parliament moved the Supreme Court. The only thing that I would like to say and the treasury bench also holds the same opinion—that if Supreme Court give verdict in favour of the Government, then they will win the case and the opposition will be stigmatised. It is a most abhorable tendency in democracy and the most serious threaten to the Parliamentary system. If the works which can be executed by the Parliament, are not executed and referred to the Supreme Court, then let the Supreme Court decide it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to state humbly that if the dignity of the Parliament is not maintained, the dignity of these courts too cannot be maintained. All other pillars of democracy will crumble down. Better if the Members of Parliament had not moved the Supreme Court and the Government had not made efforts to gain popularity on the basis of the verdict of the Court. Many a time the public has given its decision against the verdict of the Supreme Court. If the Government does not remember the history, then it should go through it afresh and leave this idea. It is my last request that if hon. Prime Minister pays any attention to my request, then he should take a initiate by inviting these leaders.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH (Satna) : Sir, I am grateful to you for this opportunity. I would fully endorse what my esteemed elder Member of this House Shri Chandra Shekharji has just said.

This is not a question merely of the rights and wrongs of an issue. Accusations are flying thick and fast; and in a Parliamentary democracy, that is not an unusual thing. But Parliament has always devised methods whereby you get at the truth or as much near to the truth as possible by means of which, they do not give offence to any one. I think that the Inquiry by a House Committee of whatever denomination it may be, does not give an offence to anybody. It is one of the methods that the Parliament devices to get to a certain conclusion in a matter where difference of opinion are very manifested. I think, the Government should accept this request. What shall be the shape and nomenclature, it should be decided by the Presiding Officer, but let a House Committee of Members of this House constituted under the authority of this House or at the discretion of the Chair, can look into the whole thing. After all, what is the difference, if you call ten people and show them the file and why not give those ten people the opportunity and the authority to go through it and inform the House? What else is meant by a Committee? There is no difference in it. I think that will not redound to the discredit of this Government. On the contrary, by allowing the House to be adjourned day after day, the entire country is under the belief that there is something seriously wrong. I do not think, that is very good. We are Members of this House, Members of the Tenth Lok Sabha of this nation. Sometimes I feel, as I have said in one previous

occasion, whether we are adding credit to this House or acquiescing in gradually to the total disappearance of accountability which lies at the root of Parliamentary system. We are trying to evade our responsibility to this Parliament, to this nation.

I was witness in this House as a spectator to one of the debates that was held here many many years ago and our first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was sitting here as the Leader of this House. It was a very acrimonious debate. He sat impassively throughout the debate and at the end of it, he stood up to say this. I am quoting whatever I remember from my memory. He said, 'I have heard everyone; now, I speak of my duty.'

The Leader of this House is a leader not of a party or of a Government, but a leader who has to rise above everything else and only concentrate ultimately of what is his duty to Parliament and the nation. I know all of us are not in a position to emulate that. But this occasion will arise only if the Leader of the House is present. If he is not present, he cannot rise to say anything. Rising above Parliamentary parties and all, that is a different thing.

That is why, I endorse what my elder friend and colleague Shri Chandra Shekhar has said. It is absolutely necessary that the oracle should not now remain silent. The oracle should speak and speak the voice which the country wants to hear and not a partisan voice, not a protective voice, but a voice which will ring out, throughout the nation, coming from a person who has been given the responsibility and the opportunity to lead this country.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : Sir, the scheduled duration of this Session is only for another three days. I think all of us - I do not wish to impute any motives to anybody - should be concerned and even pained at what has been going on. I am not blaming anybody. Whether we like it or not, Sir, the objective and the reality is that the credibility of this House is being destroyed. You hear what people outside are saying. You will understand what I mean by this. Now, in these few days time, if we can find some solution to this deadlock or impasse, it will be well and good. I think we are on test; the whole House is on test. If we cannot find a solution and if you have to adjourn the House *sine die* on the 22nd, with this deadlock continuing like this, with what sort of a message will we go to the people from this House? Well, all of us are on test. I know that this is not a very propitious time because unfortunately, it happens to be the election season. I am sorry that some kind of an imputation has been made by a Member here also that some industrialists are running this House. Industrialists may be running some party. I do not know about it but I, as a Member of this House, resent this kind of a charge that industrialists are running this House. If that is so, I prefer to resign and go away. Why should I remain in a House which is run by industrialists?

Sir, during the last ten days, we have had many kinds of dialogues not on the floor of the House perhaps but in other places including your Chamber. Now, I wish to make one suggestion; I have not consulted my friends from this side. We have come to a point where we are all united on our demand from this side that there should be a parliamentary committee. I also do not insist and I do not feel that it must be a Joint Parliamentary Committee in the old sense. It can be some other form of a committee but a parliamentary committee, a committee of only this House. We are united on this issue that there must be an inquiry by a parliamentary committee. The hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, day after day, is telling us that first the files can be looked at, if we want. We had agreed and we had even nominated our Members from each party as to who would be given the job of looking through the files. Then he says that there should be a debate and at the end of the debate, the House will decide... (*Interruptions*) He says that at the end of that debate, we will decide whether a case has been made out or not for having a committee. Sir, we have asked him repeatedly as to what does he mean by saying that the House will decide and how will it decide. Obviously, the reply can be spelt out very clearly in terms of what he is thinking, that is, the House will decide by voting or a division.

I do not know - I am not a big student of Parliamentary affairs who can read big volumes and tomes on it - whether always in every Parliament on every issue whenever a crisis arises, matters have to be settled only by a question of majority and minority or not. Is that the conception of Parliamentary democracy? There have been occasions in many Parliaments in other countries when the margin between the Ruling Party and the Opposition has been very big in terms of numbers. Nevertheless, they have not followed rigidly such a practice that everything must be settled only by voting, by majority and minority. That is not the spirit of parliamentary democracy. Of course, a majority is a majority. I am not suggesting that a majority should be converted into a minority or the minority should become the majority. Majority and minority are there but the point is, what is the relationship in the framework of a parliamentary democracy? So, I want to ask the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs when he says that at the end of a debate - if a debate takes place, practically half a debate has taken place today—the House will decide, but is he prepared to say clearly that it will not necessarily be decided by the question of majority and minority? We will again, at the end of the debate, have to come together; put our heads together and find a way by which some consensus or some agreement could be reached. If we cannot do it, well, we cannot do it. That is all. The system itself will be in further crisis. He has been giving us clearly, very

clearly, an indication that finally the matter has to be settled by a division or by votes. We cannot agree to it because this matter has gone too far now. It is a very serious matter.

I am very sorry for Shri Sukh Ram - I do know, he may have been misguided, he may have been misled or anything else - when he complains that he is not heard; he is not allowed to speak; I have every sympathy for him. I do not agree with this at all that somebody who wants to speak in this House, who is entitled to speak should not be allowed to speak. We never had any such intention or decision that we will not allow him to speak. So, that is not the point. The point is that if we want a way out now, when two to three days are left - we do not want to go from here back to the country without being able to tell the people anything and without being able to take the credit for any kind of an agreement or solution, it will not be a very good thing.

Sir, I do not wish to add much to what my friends here have said about the Leader of the House. I am a part of this House. When you say he is the Leader of the House then to that extent of being a Leader of the House, he becomes my leader also. I am a part of this House. All of us here are part of the House. Or, we should expunge this idea of a leadership - not to a Leader of the House in that case. What does it mean? Has it got any significance, any importance? I also came to this House at a time when Pandit Nehru was the Prime Minister of India. I have many memories also - how he used to conduct himself here. I do not want to go into all that now - how much time he used to spend in the House every day; how he used to be present here during the Question Hour every day and how he used to intervene whenever necessary. But I cannot understand the role and responsibility of a Leader of the House who during the last ten days has not given any indication of being interested in what is going on. He must be interested, obviously. He must know what is going on. I give that much credit to Shri Shukla that he must be faithfully reporting - faithfully or unfaithfully—he must be reporting to him. So, the Leader of the House obviously knows and I am sure he is interested. After all, he is the head of the Government.

13.00 hrs.

One of his Ministers is being charged with the very serious offences of favouritism, corruption and so on. The whole matter requires to be cleared up. But the Leader of the House has, at least, up to now not given any indication of being interested enough either to come here himself or to know at first hand what exactly the Opposition is feeling, what they want, or of having consulted the Opposition leaders. He has not done anything. This question was also raised and Shri Shukla said, "If you want to meet him, he will be very happy to meet." I said, "What do you mean by, 'if you want to meet him'?" I am not the Leader of the House: he is the Leader of the House. Is he interested or not? Does he

not think that the matter is sufficiently serious and critical that he should have some direct interaction with the Opposition? Apparently, he does not. I cannot commend this kind of attitude, Sir. It is not only the Parliament's credibility is being destroyed but this Leader of the House also which is a status which has been given a particular place in the whole structure of Parliament will lose all its meaning; it becomes senseless. It happened on some previous occasion also which I do not want to refer to.

Anyway, some specific suggestions have been made by Shri Chandra Shekharji and Shri Arjun Singhji. I think, some action should be taken along those lines. It may or may not lead to a solution, I do not know. But we have tried everything else and failed. So, there is no harm in trying this. Obviously, nobody is giving any commitment from beforehand that anything the Prime Minister says, we may accept. We may not accept. But I want one commitment from the hon. Minister here. When he says, 'after a debate the matter will be decided in the House', if he means that it will be decided by numbers, by figures, by voting, by division, that we cannot agree for obvious reasons. This has become an issue now, it has been made into an issue, of confrontation and it is a very vital issue affecting the whole polity of the country. Let him say, at least, that after the debate, the discussion, everybody is free to speak, to make out their case and then what we shall do after that will also have to be decided by this whole House, both sides sitting together with you, Sir. Then we will be on test again. If we pass that test, well and good. If we fail, well, we fail and we have to tell the people that we have failed. This relying at the back of their mind of the fact, "we are the majority, so what does it matter, ultimately we can pass anything we want," would not do. This is not the spirit of Parliamentary democracy.

So, I am humbly repeating a very small suggestion that I have made. If he agrees to that or if the Leader of the House can be wise enough to agree to that, we may consider the whole matter again. There is no time left now and that is the trouble. There is hardly any time left. But we are as eager as anybody else for a solution on this. Some fair, objective, impartial solution should be found, that is the crux of the matter. An impartial, objective and fair solution which is not detrimental to anybody's rights and not detrimental to anybody's sense of prestige has to be found. That is what we want. Therefore, I hope, Sir, that you also will use all your influence and your authority to try to see that even now some way can be found out. Thank you.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Sir, may I say what I have been saying again and again during our ... (Interruptions)

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Gobichettipalayam) : Sir, I want to say something.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Just one moment please.

Sir, on this matter of having a JPC or not having a JPC, I have said again and again and I will repeat it clearly here.

This question of having a JPC or not having a JPC will not be decided necessarily by number game or voting...*(Interruptions)* It is as clear as day light ...*(Interruptions)* May I answer briefly...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : I am again saying that it is not going to be a question of number game. After the debate takes place, both sides could put their viewpoints before the House. It is not necessary that this kind of serious matters are decided by numbers. It is not necessary.

Secondly, I will recall the formation of two JPCs recently when we had the majority. Even then, we decided to have the JPC because there was a consensus, a decision or agreement or whatever you may like to call it and that also there was no question of number, no question of voting. I am not saying that this has to be decided by number game, it has to be decided by voting. I am clearly saying again that after a full scale debate is held, it is not necessary to decide such a question by voting alone. There are many methods of deciding it. We have tried those methods successfully earlier. We can still try them. I have been saying this right from the beginning. We have been saying this. But for some reason or the other, the whole thing has been converted into a controversy which in my opinion is absolutely unnecessary and it wasted very valuable time of this House.

About the level of Opposition and the level of leadership in this House, I also had the opportunity and the luck and fortune of coming to this House in 1957 when giants were present on both sides of the House. If Pandit Nehru used to be here every day, he used to attend to debates very carefully, pay his respect to the House and House proceedings, there were many reasons behind it apart from the overriding reason of his being a great lover of parliamentary democracy. They were stalwarts. *(Interruptions)* I am not casting any aspersions on the present leadership of the Opposition. *(Interruptions)* As there was Pandit Nehru here and Shri Hiren Mukherjee and Acharya Kriplani were there on that side. And I can name several big leaders who were there and we were as youngsters and backbenchers sitting and admiring the kind of parliamentary skills from both sides. So, I am not suggesting that the level has gone down on one side only and it has not gone on the other side. But it depends how the House has to conduct itself. We know the discipline. Therefore, Sir, we will have to content with ourselves. It is no good blaming this leader or that leader or blaming this party or that party. This House is meant for discussion and debate. If a commitment is asked for as has been asked for the last seven days - that you must commit before discussion that a JPC will be formed, I said that this is not the proper way. It is not

going to be decided by numbers. It is going to be decided by a debate - debate in both the Houses of Parliament. All kinds of various other things have been mentioned and said. I do not want to go into it because I want this debate should turn into a purposeful decision. I would reiterate that - Somnath Babu must listen to it carefully - I am not saying that it is a number game. It has to be a debate, a purposeful, objective debate in which both the sides should be able to participate fully, give their viewpoints and then a decision has to be taken, not necessarily on majority. There are many other ways on which we have been able to take decision and we can take decision in that manner again. That is my fond hope, Sir...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN : I agree that this august House must be run peacefully. We have many matters to be discussed on the floor of this House. We are also ready to discuss the issue of telecommunication but before discussion, an assurance must come from the Government to form a Parliamentary Committee to inquire into the issue of telecommunication.

Sir, this telecommunication scandal is not an ordinary one. There is a loss to the tune of Rs. 25,000 crore to the Exchequer. The entire Opposition is united on this issue. The Government is not respecting the sentiments of the Opposition. What happened to the JPC on Security Scam? It had submitted a unanimous Report. The recommendations of the JPC ought to have been accepted in its entirety. But, the Government failed to accept most of the recommendations.

Sir, here the stalemate is continuing for the past ten days. But, it is very strange that the Prime Minister is not taking any interest or making any effort to solve this problem.

So, I demand that efforts should be made to solve this problem and a Joint Parliamentary Committee should be set up to inquire into this scam.

[Translation]

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR (Gopalganj) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, today you have given a patient ear to the leader of the Opposition and the leaders of other parties and groups. The astonishing part of it is that nobody said that this House was not allowed to run. Instead, all said that the House could not, unfortunately, run. Everybody put forth his point of view here. A couplet of Iqbal say, "Saare jahan se achha, Hindostan hamara." I would like to say that one should not consider oneself above others—be it Shri Chandra Shekhar, Shri Somnath Chatterjee, Indrajit Guptaji, Shuklaji or Vajpayeeji. I inadvertently think of Atalji when I go to sleep as to how great he is. He rise above petty differences. He is a man who owns the responsibility of all sins and that is no ordinary attribute. Chandra Shekharji made a well contemplated comment on the hon. Prime Minister. I commend the patience of the hon. Speaker who could have sent us out of the House if he so wished. A ray of hope beamed today which soon disappeared. We

did not allow the House to run. It is the responsibility of others to ensure running of the House. On this occasion I would like to recite a *complet*. I wish the leaders, particularly of this side understand the underlying meaning of it.

"Iqbal barha upadeshak hai, man baaton mein moh leta hai, Guftar ka gazi ban to gaya, kirdar ka gazi na ban saka."

'Guftar' denotes words and 'Kirdar' denotes deeds.

The speeches of some senior leaders raised apprehensions in the minds of some Members. It should be noted that in the event of a confrontation between the mind and heart one is faced with a dilemma. Great men listen to their mind whereas ordinary people listen to the voice of their heart. I will not complain about anybody. Many hon. Members asked the hon. Speaker to constitute a JPC. Mr. Speaker, Sir, without going into the discussion and prior to taking my seat, I would like to give a practical suggestion that the senior leaders of our side, Chandra Shekharji, Arjun Singhji etc. spoke of the Leaders of the Opposition, Leader of the House and also referred to Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru. I laud Shuklaji who gave it a beautiful turn and the prudent among us would have understood the underlying connotation. We have watched the leaders of the Congress suggesting the Prime Minister the names of people purported to be made Ministers. This issue can be solved within no time if they come to our side for a moment or if Shuklaji arranges the meeting of 3-4 leaders with the hon. Prime Minister. I am pleased to hear Shri Somnath Chatterjee saying that the whole Opposition is united on this issue. But, yesterday, some differences were discernable. I will take my seat after reciting the following couplet of Iqbal :

"Masjid to banadi shab bhar mein,
iman ki hararat walon ne,
Man apna purana papi hai, barson
mein namazi ban na saka."

I think it is not pertinent to say how elections can be won. We all have lost elections. The whole country is looking in dismay the condition of the House where great personalities like Vajpayeeji, Chandra Shekharji, Indrajit Gupta ji, Shri Somnath Chatterjee and Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao are present.

Lastly, to speak of the hon. Speaker, Shivraj Patil ji, we should not pave way for the people to say that the House could not run during the tenure of Shivraj Patil ji or Narasimha Rao ji. In order to save your face, there is the need to call these people and find a way out of this impasse so that nobody dares to hold the House to ransom. With these words, I conclude.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I think the hon. senior leaders of this House have expressed their views in a manner which can be really useful to all of us, useful to solve

this impasse and useful to protect and preserve the dignity of this House also. I would very sincerely like to thank them.

I am not disclosing any secret when I say that the discussion in the Chamber also was really very good, pointed and it gave the opportunity to both the sides to explain their points of view. But it is not possible for us to disclose what we discussed in the chamber. In the chamber only a few persons could be there.

Before saying anything as to what can be done I would like to thank the Members of the Opposition parties and the Government also for deciding that important issues that are faced by the country should be first solved. This is really being very, very responsible and the people would appreciate it. The Parliament could appreciate it. Let us, first of all, transact this important business. Today I am not going to say what can be done or what should be done because each and every word spoken by the leaders was calculated and spoken in a very responsible manner and has given an impression that there is a ray of hope that we would be able to solve this problem. Very good suggestions, suggestions which are of practical nature, have been made. It is difficult to analyse them here. So I would not like to analyse them here or I would not like to say what can be done. But we would all keep those suggestions in mind and try to see as to what can be done to see that this House works and functions. I have full sympathy with those Members who want to speak. I have full sympathy with those Members who feel agitated because certain things have happened and it is not for us to sit in judgement and we would not like to sit in judgement unless, finally, impartially in an unjustified manner what is the fact is discussed, known and the verdict is given. So may I request you to please transact the business relating to Jammu and Kashmir Resolution today immediately and Supplementary Budget (Railways), if you feel?

...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Is it without discussion?

MR. SPEAKER : Well, Jammu and Kashmir can be discussed. Even the Railways, you know, have Supplementary Budget because there are certain things the Railways are trying to do. I was told; I have not gone through it. Otherwise we will see what can be done but today let us take up Jammu and Kashmir Resolution first. Let us transact the business on Jammu and Kashmir Resolution and then we will decide.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : You decide just now and get it passed without any discussion.

[English]

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN : It is without discussion?

MR. SPEAKER : Please understand the spirit in which the views were expressed by the Members before saying this thing and that thing. If the House wants that this matter should be taken up and it should be passed, it may be taken up because there appears to be an agreement on that. I am not insisting that there should be a discussion. But then understand the spirit in which the speeches have been made.

Now, the matter is at serial No. 50 and if the entire House agrees that it should be taken up first, I shall take it up first.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : If the hon. Members want to say something on this all important matter regarding Kashmir...(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : If they are not willing, I am going along with them that we can do it without discussion. There is no question of forming a follow up action or anything like that. If a simple discussion showing the solidarity is allowed, it is all right, otherwise you can put it out...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI UMRAO SINGH (Jalandhar) : The matter is so important and you are not ready to discuss it.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I appreciate the suggestion given by the Parliamentary Affairs Minister. But let us appreciate the situation in which we find ourselves and let us take a decision on this. If it is necessary to discuss this matter and if all Members want, we shall find a solution. We shall find a method to facilitate the discussion on this point, but as has been suggested by the Members, let us first transact this business.

Shri S.B. Chavan - item No. 50.

13.26 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: APPROVAL
OF CONTINUANCE IN FORCE OF
PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION IN
RESPECT OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S.B. CHAVAN) : Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation dated the 18th July, 1990 in respect of Jammu and Kashmir, issued under article 356 of the Constitution by the President, for a further period of six months with effect from the 18th January, 1996."

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the Statutory Resolution moved by the hon. Home Minister to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation dated the 18th July, 1990 in respect of Jammu and Kashmir, issued under article 356 of the Constitution by the President, for a further period of six months with effect from the 18th January, 1996."

The motion was adopted.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA) : Sir, if the House agrees, we can take up the Supplementary Demand for Grant in respect of Railways...(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER : We have agreed only for Jammu and Kashmir.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : No other matter today...(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Sir, it is only a formal matter...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Don't take up any other item, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : The House stands adjourned to meet again at 2.30 P.M.

13.28 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till thirty minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

14.30 hrs.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

(Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair)

[English]

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura) : Sir, what happened to the constitution of JPC?...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, what happened to the constitution of JPC? In such a situation the House can not be run...(Interruptions)