

(b) if so, the annual average of agricultural land becoming barren, State-wise;

(c) whether the Government have formulated any strategy to check it;

(d) if so, the details thereof; and

(e) whether the Government are considering any Scheme for production and use of bio-fertilizers of other natural fertilizers?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ARVIND NETAM): (a) There is no evidence to suggest that any land has become barren due to use of chemical Fertiliser is fertilizer use is advocated based on soil test reports & crop requirement.

(b) to (d) In view of (a) above, question does not arise. However, since the organic manures and bio-fertilisers have additional favourable effects in improving soil productivity, their use is propagated by organising training of extension staff & farmers through Centrally Sponsored and State schemes.

(e) To produce, distribute and promote the use of bio-fertilisers in the country, a National Project on Development and Use of Bio-fertilisers is being implemented as a Central Sector Scheme. A Technology Mission on Bio-Fertiliser is also under consideration.

12. 00 hrs.

RE: ACTION TAKEN REPORT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON IRREGULARITIES IN SECURITIES AND BANKING TRANSACTIONS—*CONTD.*

[English]

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: I hold the Report in the highest esteem. I do not doubt the integrity, the capability and the expertise of the hon. Members of that Committee. I take it for granted that that is the Report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee. But that cannot be and that can never be the final word in law for taking action. While initiating action against any individual, we have to keep in mind its many many consequences. Leave alone the Ministers, leave alone the Officers and leave alone the banks, on the basis of the report itself, without going further into the matter, without further investigation, any action initiated against anybody in the country is liable to be struck down. If that is the situation, who would hold himself responsible subsequently for a decision taken by the court? That is what we have to be conscious of. Today I would borrow the words of Shri Chandra Shekhar who said the other day that it is a political issue.

My problem is that the hon. friends on the other side are taking it only as a political issue. I know that they have been saying that there can be no question of consensus, no question of agreement on the Action Taken Report. They have been saying this. They know that as each day passed by, all the issues which they tried to rake up during the past few years have slowly and slowly

slipped out of their hands. They know about this. Even this issue of scam is not prevailing with the people today. It is not a secret information that the Government is giving us. All the Members know it. We all know it. The members of the public knew it. Ever since the surfacing of the scam, the Government was conscious of it; the Government had taken every possible measure to curtail its effect and to ensure that such things do not happen. This Action Taken Report is only a formality. It is an important step in the process of the working of Parliamentary institutions. The Government summarises all that is done and places it before the Parliament. That is all that has been done. All that I would say finally to and is that if the hon. friends on the other side were really serious — we have been hearing invocations in the name of democracy during the last few days— to ensure that Parliament works, that we get an opportunity to bring forth everything to public, they would have given us an opportunity to discuss that. That opportunity has been denied to Parliament. I may have my personal differences with that also. They are talking of withdrawal of the Report. When the hon. Finance Minister wanted to get up in the House to speak, he was not permitted to speak. That is the sort of democracy we are talking of. We do not know what he wanted to say. I share the sentiment of everybody that certain words in the Report could have been avoided. Certain words in legal matters would have a different meaning. I think such words could have been avoided as far as the question of the presentation of the Report is concerned. But that does not really give us the right to do things that have been going on, with all humility at my command, I would say.

I would, therefore, request and I appeal

to them that we have to ensure that Parliament really works, that the working of Parliament is not stalled. But if ever their endeavour is to stall the proceedings, I can only tell them that the people of the country are not going to be taken in by such things. They know what is what. They know what is going on, what are the motivations behind this. So, the friends on the other side must not be under any illusion on that score. It would not be appropriate today to simulate a situation as they have done. The Government is taking major steps in improving the economic situation, in improving the economic environment of the country. The people acknowledge this and this stand of the opposition will not impress them.

[*Translation*]

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when this Monsoon Session was about to commence, you had invited we people in your chamber on the day before the session was to start and asked us as to what topics we would like to discuss in this session. On that day, I, on behalf of my party, had mentioned the most important issues before the country which were proposed to be taken up by us for discussion. Those issues included the economic condition of the country. The way inflation has been increasing, the unchecked inflation has become a big problem the unemployment problem has reached a point of explosion and the way the sugar scam created a havoc in the country and millions and billions of rupees have been wasted in several such scams now, the poor people of the our country will have to face several difficulties. The price of sugar has gone up to Rs.20 per kilo from Rs.9 per kilo. The people of our country are constrained to buy

sugar at the rate of Rs.20 per kg.

The flood situation is also very bad. We would like to discuss it but on that day we had said that we wanted to discuss the forthcoming report of JPC and it had been suggested by the leader of opposition that they gave it priority. All of us were of a unanimous opinion that this should have been discussed and that they were ready to discuss it. But today it is being rumoured by the ruling party that the Government wants to discuss it but we do not want to do it. This is absolutely baseless and wrong. We wanted to hold a detailed discussion on it but then what went wrong? Sir, after that, this report was presented before the House without consulting or taking anybody into confidence.

Shrimati Pratibha Patilji has just said that this committee is not like other general committees. But even the other general parliamentary committees also have a rule that whenever they make recommendations, these recommendations are normally accepted by the Government. If the Government does not accept the recommendations then they send the report back to the committee and when the committee does not agree then, it is kept before the House, this is an enquiry committee.

The whole House had felt that it was a very big scam which involved the hard-earned money of the people of our country. It was the money of not only the Government or the budget but in fact this money belonged to the poor people of the country who would forego their meals in order to deposit some money in banks and this scam involved those billions of rupees deposited by poor people. That is why, the House had been of

unanimous opinion that no judicial inquiry would be held or no investigation would be got conducted by any commission in this regard. The House themselves had taken the responsibility of conducting an investigation into this serious scam.

I would like to say that the members of this committee deserve to be praised who gave such a report and it was repeatedly mentioned that we wanted that some action should be taken and the guilty persons should be caught to make the public believe that no corrupt person would go scotfree. That is why, this report was prepared unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you had convened a meeting. As the representatives of the Government Ministers were present in that meeting. These Ministers could have come to you and said that this committee had ceased to function as other normal committees and that it did not exist any longer and that the Government was proposing to come out with their report and as to whether a way to hold a discussion on it could be found. It was repeatedly said as to why this Government did not initiate any talks in this regard. Did the Government ever convene a meeting of opposition and other leaders to inform that this committee did not exist any more and that they had taken a decision in the form of an Action Taken Report? Please tell us, this is a matter to be decided by the House. We do not want to bring any party politics in it. This is a serious matter. Why did the Prime Minister not do it? Why did the Government not do it?

Sir, this House has not been taking up its business for a week now. The eyes of all the people in the country are on the House

as what is happening here and what is its background. Once the Opposition Members had even decided to resign en masse from the Membership of this House on the question of corruption. This report has been presented at the time when the sugar scam involving billions of rupees has come to light, which has affected the public. Now the public is wondering whether a way out will be found or corruption will become a part of life. It seems corruption will remain unabated and the guilty will not be brought to book.

A colleague of our's has just mentioned that if do not hold a discussion on it it will weaken the Parliamentary system. But they did not bother about the Parliamentary system. I would like to repeat it that I do not blame the hon. Minister of Finance since he never got an opportunity in the House. He went to Madras and said that he was ready to apologise because some objectionable words had inadvertently been used. I would like to charge an allegation against the Government that they never seriously considered such an important report. We...[*Interruptions*]* They had used some objectionable words for which they had to apologise. Is this the way to consider a report of such a big incident of corruption? Are the people of our country not aware of this?

On behalf of our party I would like to say that we are resigning from the membership of Parliamentary Committees because we feel that this Government has destroyed the dignity of Parliamentary Committees. The Government should have given attention to the dignity of these Committees but they remained nonchalant. I demand again that it is the moral duty of all three Ministers to resign whose names have

appeared in the report of the Committee and who have been held responsible by this Committee. They should tender their resignations, only then will a good impression be formed. I demand their resignation. Will the parliamentary dignity remain intact or not? One recommendation is that the action should be taken against the top management of the Government for the misappropriation of the money which belonged to the public sector. The Government had replied that the necessary action is being taken against them. They did not specifically mentioned as to against whom the action would be taken and who is responsible for it? Nothing more had been said. This Government is not seriously considering the idea of doing away with corruption. It does not behove the Government that the people of the country may get an impression that even after such a big scam and looting of crores of rupees not a single person will be punished.

I would like to tell the ruling party that you have had great traditions. Did you not hear the voice of your conscience? I do not want to say that you should rebel, I am merely reminding you of your traditions. By acting on your conscience you have taken action which have gone against your decisions. Are you not going to shake your conscience out of its slumber for taking such a step?

I would be honest in saying that...[*Interruptions*].... your conscience has not bogged down, it is resting in its slumber. Is it not correct that an action should have been taken thereon, corrupt people should have been caught and the Ministers should have accepted its moral responsibility? If they have heeded the voice of their conscience it is our request to Shri Shukla to

convey our submission to the hon. Prime Minister as the Prime Minister hardly remains present here. He does not have time. He should ask his conscience as to whether he is satisfied with this report? I have an information that the Government have realized their mistake. Sir, while abiding by the Parliamentary tradition I would not disclose the contents of the discussion which took place in the Speaker's Chamber but it is my information that the Government have realized their mistake and we should have a statement in the House by such a Minister whose department was not involved in this scam. The Government has not given any statement on it so far. You should not make it a prestige issue. We had given suggestions in connection with finding a way out. This Action Taken Report will fail to satisfy the people of the country. This Report will be instrumental in increasing corruption and you will not be able to check it. If no action is taken again misappropriation of billions of rupees, corruption will not be rooted out. Please consider it and withdraw this report. They denied making it a prestige issue and maintained that they were ready for a discussion. We attended all the meetings convened by the hon. Speaker. Shri Somnath ji and Shri Vajpayee ji have just said that all the meetings were convened by the hon. Speaker and he is worried most of all. Sir, you even said that though it was not your duty yet if everybody wanted it then you were ready to undertake the work which was proposed to be undertaken by the Government and a way out could be found. We requested you and you took an initiative. You are still pursuing it but the hon. Prime Minister did not consider it even once to hold a discussion by inviting us and trying to find a solution. He did not pay any attention to see whether there can be a solution.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: My point of order is whether a regular discussion on this report has started or not....*[Interruptions]* You do not listen and only say whatever you have to. I am asking you whether a discussion has started in the House or not? If the discussion has started, then we should discuss the merits and issues....*[Interruptions]*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are cooperating but they are observing a point of order which will create problems....*[Interruptions]*

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: What is the question of coordination. Let a discussion on the report be held. It should be made clear that the discussion has started on the report.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: I do not want to take more time of the House. We have been feeling that it is a big issue and it is not a question of parties. It is necessary to take effective steps to free the administration of our country of corruption and to ensure that people found to be involved in corruption get punished. Otherwise the people of the country will not be satisfied. For that certain parliamentary traditions are to be observed. That is why, the members of our parties are forced resign from all the Parliamentary Committees because the Government has adopted a lackadaisical approach towards it....*[Interruptions]*

[English]

DR. DEBI PROSAD PAL (Calcutta North West): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very much pained and distressed to learn that the leaders of the opposition parties have announced their decision not to associate

themselves with the different parliamentary committees which have been set up by you.

Sir, it is through your efforts that these standing committees have been introduced; and you have made significant contribution in the functioning of these committees and thus, strengthening the democratic institutions. These different standing committees are functioning properly if I may say so. If the parliamentary democracy in our country is to be strengthened, your contribution will always be remembered with gratitude for the new system that you have introduced. But, I am rather pained to learn that the opposition Members are now taking a decision not to associate themselves with the parliamentary committees.

You have allowed the discussion on the floor of the House on this particular aspect. If I may say so with utmost respect, the situation might not have been as it is today if the Members of the Opposition had allowed the discussion on the Action Taken Report on the floor of the House. The Parliamentary Affairs Minister announced before this House that the Government had an open mind. The Government has an open mind to take further decision as a result of the deliberations and the discussions which are to take place on the Action Taken Report. But unfortunately, the attitude which the hon. Members of the Opposition have shown during these several days, shows clearly that parliamentary democracy is not to function by coercion. It is a cardinal principle of our democratic institutions that democracy can function effectively only by discussion and not by coercion. That is what is happening today. If the Members of the Opposition had allowed the discussion to take place on the floor of the House, the House would have been benefited. The

discussion would have brought to light if there are any deficiencies in the Action Taken Report.

The Government has announced — the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has announced— more than once that the Government has a free and open mind. It will react to the discussion which will take place in the House. But that is not allowed to take place.

On the other hand, what has happened? Today, the decision is taken that they are dissociating themselves from the different Committees. Why? The Action Taken Report is not to be discussed in the House. That is to be withdrawn. It is rather surprising how a Report on Action Taken can be withdrawn. The Report only describes what action has been taken on the Report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee. The action has already been taken by the Government. And the Report only describes what are the actions that have been taken by the Government. I wonder how this sort of demand that the Action Taken Report should be withdrawn can stand at all to reason.

On the other hand, the discussion will show how far the Government has implemented the recommendations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee. The hon. Finance Minister was ready— it appeared from the Press—to make a further statement before this hon. House. The Members of the Opposition did not allow even the hon. Finance Minister to make a statement before this House for a further clarification on the Action Taken Report. It appeared from the Press that the hon. Finance Minister was ready and is still ready to withdraw if there are any unfortunate expressions or

observations appearing in the Action Taken Report. But the Members of the Opposition did not even have that amount of patience and forbearance to allow the hon. Finance Minister to make his statement on the Report. On the other hand, without discussion on what action has been taken by the Government, the Members of the Opposition have now been taking an extreme course that they will dissociate themselves from the Parliamentary Committees. I wonder how this decision is in consonance with the true principles of constitutional democracy.

You do not allow the House to discuss because the JPC has now ceased to function. Therefore, the only way to discuss the attitude of the Government is by discussion on the floor of the House. You did not allow that to be done. The hon. Finance Minister has pointed out the measures taken in the Action Report—if anybody had taken the pains to read the Action Taken Report, he would have found that 93 recommendations of the JPC have been accepted in full and action has been taken.

Six recommendations have been partially accepted. It is now a well settled principle of constitutional democracy that the Government should undoubtedly view the reports of the Parliamentary Committees with utmost respect. But that does not mean that the Government cannot differ with some of the recommendations or observations of the Parliamentary Committees. Therefore, the Government has come out to explain its position. But the opposition in the House is not allowing the Government to present this sort of report before the House. This is something, which if I may say so, runs counter to the proper functioning of constitutional democracy.

Now, the Members of the Opposition say that action has not been taken. I am not here to discuss the Action Taken Report. Mr. Sneaker, Sir, if you allow this discussion to take place on the floor of the House, then certainly, the Members would have an occasion to discuss it in detail.

I just want to give one or two illustrations. The Opposition is saying that no action has been taken with regard to foreign banks. The recommendation of the Committee is that the repatriation of the profits for the years 1991 and 1992 should be withheld. The Government has accepted that recommendation and the profits of the foreign banks have not been allowed to be taken to their own country. The Committee has recommended that the report should be given to the respective foreign governments to which these Banks belong, so that action may be taken according to their laws. That too has been accepted by the Government.

I am not discussing the Action Taken Report. I am only highlighting certain issues to prove my point. Take for example, the recommendation regarding the audit and supervision of the nationalised banks. Government has accepted all these recommendations in full. Government has also accepted in full the recommendation pertaining to the appointment of Directors of Banks.

The Committee itself has conceded at the very beginning that system failure is the major reason for this sort of securities scam. When there is a system failure, it is for the House to discuss how best this system failure can be remedied. Government has taken measures to remedy this sort of defects and now, it has come out with many more suggestions.

The Committee has recommended that prosecution should be launched against the delinquents of this scandal. Forty-three FIRs are lodged, then the matter is within the jurisdiction of the appropriate court and it is the court which has to take cognizance of the FIRs. Thereafter the proceedings have to continue. Now, in any event, the Government cannot be blamed for that. I would like to give yet another example. Government has conducted investigations in respect of the income tax details of different delinquent persons and officers. As a result of that, the CBI has already started action and even prosecution.

These are matters which should be discussed in the House. This discussion could not take place because the Members of the Opposition are not allowing the House to function. At least now, I am grateful, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that on this occasion when the hon. Members of the Opposition are taking the decision to dissociate themselves from the Parliamentary Committees, you have allowed some discussion. I would appeal to the hon. Members of the Opposition also, even on this occasion, that the decision to dissociate themselves from the Committees would not have been necessary at all, if the House was allowed to have a detailed discussion on this issue. I am of the view that many more things would have come to light by this discussion and the Government would have responded to the points raised by the Opposition Members.

Mr. Vajpayee has pointed out that the Government has a closed mind. The Government is repeatedly saying that it has an open mind. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has made it very clear on the floor of the House and the hon. Prime Minister has also made it clear. If the Members of the

Opposition were to stall the proceedings of the House in this manner, insisting all the time that the Action Taken Report should first be withdrawn and if they were to make a political issue out of it — some of them have even conceded that it has become a political issue— then the result will naturally be what is happening today. But I would appeal that even now it is not too late and there is enough time and opportunity for the Members of the House to think over the matter quietly and take this opportunity to discuss the Action Taken Report which has been submitted before this House.

The JPC has now ceased to exist. Therefore, House is the only forum where this can be discussed.

Sir, I am grateful to you for the contribution that you have given and history will remember you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that to strengthen the functioning of the Parliamentary democracy you had set up these Committees and they are functioning well. Now, the decision that the Opposition Members are dissociating themselves from these Committees, I would say with great respect and humility, will amount to setting the clock back. I appeal to the Members of the Opposition, who are taking this decision, not to take the decision in this way. Let the House start discussion on the Action Taken Report. The Action Taken Report only mentions about the actions that has been taken. It does not mean that the Government will not consider it further.

With these few words I would again appeal to the Members of the Opposition not to take this decision which will block the progress of the Parliamentary democracy instead of strengthening it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore):
Sir, I wonder whether we are now discussing the contents or merits of this Report. That was not the objective or the purpose with which we have assembled here this morning. While expressing my high appreciation of the repeated efforts and initiatives which you have taken in the last one week to try to solve this impasse, I feel that we have now come to a stage where these are actually obituary references to the Action Taken Report which are going on in the House.

My colleagues have referred to the fact that during the last one week the Government has never taken initiative or made effort even to call the Leaders of the Opposition Parties for a discussion. Even a meeting which was called some 2-3 days ago, in which the Prime Minister was also present, was convened by you and not by the Government.

Sir, the Government does not seem to be interested at all in breaking this deadlock. I am not going to discuss the merits of this Report. All I wish to say is, you may like it or not, that it is not a technical or procedural matter. Thanks to the attitude of the Government, it has now become a political matter and why should we be on the defensive about that? This House is there to discuss political issues also and we think there is no political issue which deserves higher priority than the question of corruption in high places. This is the latest and the most blatant example of it.

It is true that corruption is eating into our whole society like a cancer. There is no aspect of our public life which is uncontaminated by corruption whether it be politicians or anybody else. When I say that, of course, I do not mean that everybody is

contaminated but today outside in the streets people talk like that — politicians are contaminated, the Press is contaminated, parts of the judiciary are contaminated, the business world is contaminated the media is contaminated by corruption which is being practised and which is intensifying every day because of the growth of black money in this country. Those who are the owners of this black money are using it to good purposes.

Now, Sir, we have come to this case of banking scam, the Bombay Share Market scam where nobody is even able to quantify the total amount of money which has been looted or siphoned off. That is why I said the other day that this is the grandfather of all the scams. Bofors on which we had resigned and left the House is nothing compared to this. In Bofors about Rs.60-70 crore were involved and here the estimates which are there show that Rs.3000-12000 crore have been involved.

Sir, in such a case what are you expecting the House to do; what are we supposed to do? Therefore, we had been pleading that this Report which they had prepared and placed cannot be accepted by us. It cannot be discussed. We will have a polite discussion here, with both the sides expressing their views and then the whole matter will be given a quiet burial. This we cannot allow. We cannot allow because we have to go out and face the people. Therefore, I am once again pleading with the Government that as far as we are concerned, the Government whose face we see every day is that of Mr.V.C.Shukla and no other part of the Government confronts us on this issue. The Prime Minister was there one day. Thanks to your efforts, Mr. Speaker. He listened, of course, and in the

end, he said that: "We have an open mind and whatever you say, Mr. Speaker, we will be receptive to that. But is that to be said only? For one week we have been saying it in the House, outside, round the table but the Government from its side does not respond at all. Therefore, Sir, we cannot associate ourselves any more with this kind of thing because the whole Committee system is being sabotaged. The very concept of Parliamentary Committees is being scuttled and sabotaged by the attitude towards this Committee. This is not an ordinary committee. We have said it many times here. A committee of both the Houses, comprising Members from all the Parties, had presented a unanimous Report. The attitude of the Government is now on trial, towards such a Committee and towards that Committee Report and findings. They may not be able to implement all the recommendations and they may say— they have not said that also—that. They have to explain why they could not or what is the difficulty in implementing some of the recommendations. But they have challenged the very findings. The observations or findings of such a committee have been challenged by saying that this is "unwarranted", that is "unjustified", that is "unfair". Having realised their blunder, they now say that these words can be removed, if they have given offence to anybody. But I said that these words are not just words, these words have come from somebody's thinking. It is the attitude of somebody which has produced these words. That means apart from the recommendations, the very observations and findings of this Committee can be challenged by the Government. They can sit in judgement on it. I humbly suggest that they have no right to sit in judgement. That is not the function of the Government to sit in judgement on the observations and

findings. About the recommendations, they can sit in judgement by saying that some they can implement, some they cannot accept and some they are partially accepting. They should explain to us why they cannot accept. We do not find any light thrown on this point by the Spokesman of the Government so far.

Therefore, I do not wish to take up more time. We, all the Members of the Opposition, have been consulting together and we came to an agreed conclusion yesterday and we have already announced it to the Press that in order to express our protest and our disagreement with the whole attitude of the Government, our condemnation of the Government, we have now reluctantly I must say very reluctantly—decided to take this step of disassociating from the Parliamentary Committees. That will be put into operation from today unless the Government changes its attitude, stand and come forward with some means of redress. Even now there is time. I agree with those Members who have said Mr. Shukla is here, he can take back this Report and in order to make it acceptable, let him change it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has no authority to do so.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: If he has no authority, then he should say so.

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR (Gopalganj): Only man who can do is Mr. Ram Lakhar. Singh !

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: During the course of the day all the members of our Parties will submit their individual resignations from whichever Committees

they are Members of. I would like you to believe us when we say this does not in any way signify our lack of faith in the Committee system. But the Committee system is being cut at the very roots by this attitude towards the JPC.

Therefore, we have no more effective way of registering our protest than to disassociate ourselves from these Committees for the time being; we are not doing it for all times to come, for ever; now we are doing it. If still the Government is not prepared to make any response, well, it is for all parties to sit together again and decide some further steps, which we have not yet announced, which we have not yet decided. Therefore, this kind of confrontation is no good. I am not happy about it at all.

We have been forced to this position. As my friend from the BJP with whom we have got so many ideological and political differences has said, it is the Government which has brought us together today. The press and public are always eager about this. Why can all the Opposition parties not come together? What prevents them from coming together? now, they can see for themselves that a situation has been created by the Government's folly which has brought all parties of the Opposition together. The logical consequence of that should follow. What is that? They should resign or at least they should accept what we are all saying unanimously that this Report cannot be accepted. Please take it back, revise it, amend it, expand it, augment it, do whatever is required to be done. You know by now what are our main objections to it. Three points have already been enumerated, but there are many more.

If you like, I am prepared to submit a

paper even on the question of systemic failure. The system has failed. There are recommendations of the JPC as to how this systemic failure should be plugged; how this should be rectified. Even those recommendations have not been accepted and implemented.

Regarding auditing, parliamentary supervision over the banking system and functioning of the brokers, there are so many recommendations made in order to rectify the systemic failure. Have those been accepted? Have those been implemented let alone other things?

We cannot make people believe that such a huge scandal took place without any Ministerial responsibility. I cannot swallow it. Such a huge thing has happened and no Minister is responsible, nobody is accountable, nobody is to be hauled up.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): There is no Government at all.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: If there is no Government, then what is the use of this Government claiming that it has a majority in this House and therefore we must listen to it and all that. So, apart from those three points about Ministerial responsibility, culpability of certain high officials and top executives and the role of the foreign banks, even systemic failure, as they have recommended, for rectification, has not been accepted. Therefore, this Report will not do in its present form. There is no point in debating it also. What are we going to debate? I do not understand what we should discuss about it.

Therefore, I request the Government not to stand on prestige and please take it

back in the light of what we have already told you. If you want to know more, we can give more points. You rectify it, change it, amend it, augment it, revise it and then bring a proper Report here, which will be worthy of discussion.

Pending that, we have no alternative but to join with all our colleagues. I am speaking on behalf of my party. All our Members will submit their resignations from all the Committees in which they have been functioning.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North Central): It is very unfortunate that the Opposition parties have come to the decision that they should disassociate themselves from all the Parliamentary Committees.

At the outset, I will appeal to them with all sincerity that they should re-consider their decision. Some points which have been raised by a very senior Opposition leader, Shri Indrajit Gupta, are very important. Now he has candidly conceded that this is a political issue and not a parliamentary and procedural issue.

No doubt, fight against corruption is a political issue and not only the Opposition but the Ruling Party should also fight to root out the corruption. But I would say that if it is a political issue, why not discuss that in this House and put your points of view as far as corruption and measures to be taken against them are concerned.

Now, the hon. Member Shri Indrajit Gupta himself said that Government must explain that they had not done all these things. Exactly, that is for what the discussion should take place, so that you put your points of view and Government will be bound

to explain their views or concede to some of the points raised by you.

Then, the hon. Opposition Leader Shri Indrajit Gupta also said that there are these two-three points on which you amend or withdraw the report. But he had also to say that there are many other points, particularly regarding system failure also on which he was prepared to give a written note. Then why not discuss this and let us know his points of view?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You read the Report !

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: Therefore, it is really necessary for the purpose of attacking corruption, to fight against corruption that there should be discussion first on the Action Taken Report which was submitted by the Government. The demand for merely withdrawal of the Report is not logical, according to my humble submission.

We have always been working in all these committees. Now the point is raised that this is a deviation from the parliamentary committees and as the hon. Member Shri Indrajit Gupta put it that the whole committee system is being sabotaged. Most of us are working in different Committees and I am sure the senior Members have all the experience of working in Committees like the Public Accounts Committee, the Estimates Committee, the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the Public Undertakings Committee, etc. what is always the procedure followed there.

Here we are making much noise about the unanimity of the Report. All these reports are unanimous and rarely there is a note of dissent. All the Committee reports are

unanimous but even then many times the Government has to come forward and say that they do not accept those recommendations; that there were these difficulties and that this was impracticable. Therefore, they could not implement it. That report always comes to the Committee and I need not tell you, you all know, that the procedure is that we consider their explanation, again send them back and ask for reconsideration.

Now, the other day, in the Public Accounts Committee, we had recommended certain amendments to the Legislation of Excise Tax. The Government said that it was not necessary to amend the Excise Tax Act because it would not serve any purpose. We again said, No, it will plug the loopholes, so do it. Then the Secretary of the Ministry said that they would again consider it. This is the normal procedure followed in all these committees that Government comes, accepts many recommendations or does not accept some of them and explains its position. Then again the Committee asks them to go back and do it.

Here, as I said the other day that this is not a permanent committee. Now the JPC is this House itself. Therefore, this House can say in discussion that this action taken is not good and we insist that this action must be taken. The Government is bound to come back again with another report. It is not necessary to say that this is an interim report and nothing is final as far as the recommendations and our views are concerned. We can go on pursuing our views and make the Government report again and again to our satisfaction or till, ultimately, the hon. Speaker decides that this is all.

We need not go further. No useful purpose will be served by doing all these things. Therefore, the logical way is to discuss this Report. Now it is being said that the Government has made it as a matter of prestige. The Government has always said, as I understand, that they would delete the objectionable words and the offending words and they would keep it open so that it can be amended. The Government has suggested to treat this Report as an interim Report and said that it would again come back with another Report. And even the Finance Minister has gone to the extent of apologising also. But, the stand of the Opposition is to withdraw the Report and nothing else. Then, who is standing on prestige? I submit that the Opposition is standing on prestige and the Government has an open mind to discuss, to accept some of the points, to amend the Report and to submit again another Report.

Now it is made out that this Report is not treated with that respect at all. I submit that if we read the Report carefully, many of the recommendations have been accepted. Some of them are under process. Some of them are not accepted at all. I understand that. I also concede that the wording is not proper. The Government can amend all those things....[Interruptions]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Which wording?

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: I concede that the language, such as _ it is not warranted-, used in the Report may not be correct. For that purpose, we can criticise the Government and the Government would react accordingly as far as this is concerned.

Finally, I would put a point for your consideration. Now, today some Party is in power; tomorrow another Party may come to power and again a different Party may come to power. Are we going to establish this convention that at the demand of the Opposition, the Minister should be dropped or kept in the Cabinet? Is it not the prerogative of the Prime Minister and should it not be the prerogative of the Prime Minister, in a parliamentary democracy, to decide which Minister should be dropped, which Minister should be retained and which Member should be taken in the Cabinet?....[Interruptions]

SHRI ANNA JOSHI (Pune): Those who are responsible for corruption should be dropped....[Interruptions]

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: Should there be an insistence from the Opposition? It is a joint responsibility of the Government. You can attack the Government. You can attack the Government's policy. I submit, with all humility, that in a parliamentary democracy it will be a bad precedent if we follow the practice of including or dropping somebody or some other person from the Cabinet at the insistence of the Opposition benches. I urge upon you to consider all those points...[Interruptions]. From the point of view of parliamentary procedure, it is necessary first to discuss this Report and thereafter insist upon the Government to make another Report in the light of the discussion, which would take place in this House.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): Mr. Speaker, Sir, with deep anguish, I inform your goodness our Party's decision to resign from several Committees, to which our Party Members have been appointed or nominated in

connection with the functioning of our responsibilities. We are doing this with a heavy heart in protest against the Government's stonewalling of this very serious matter.

Sir, you are very good enough in trying to break the impasse for the last several days. Sir, you have taken so much pains and you have convened the meetings. But we are very sorry to state that the Government is not responding to your efforts.

Sir, without repeating what our learned leaders, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Shri Sharad Yadav, Shri Somnath Chatterjee and Shri Indrajit Gupta have already stated, I would like to say two words in this respect.

Sir, apart from the wording, which Shri Sharad Dighe has just now accepted, about words like 'unwarranted' or 'unfair', here, the question is that it is not only an affront to the respect of the Committees and of the House, but also because a wrong signal is being sent to the entire country that this Government is not really serious about the securities scam. People feel that if a matter in which Rs.5,000 crore to Rs.6,000 crore of public money is lost and nearly Rs.50,000 crore of investors' money is lost, is not a serious matter to draw the attention of Government and to invite comments from the JPC, does the Government feel that only when lakhs of crores of rupees are lost, that alone would warrant a comment from the Committees? People are feeling that way and it is sending wrong signals even to foreign countries also about the sincerity of the Government in taking action against the culprits.

I would like to humbly submit that this Government has been saying—in the Report

also it has been consistently saying—that it is a system failure. But when the Committee has given a concrete suggestion to plug the deficiencies in the system failure, for example, that the bouncing of SGL should be made punishable, the Government has not accepted it. They are referring it to some Committee again to suggest some amendments.

Sir, on the other day when the hon. Prime Minister was going abroad to USA, to satisfy those multi-national corporations like the IMF and the World Bank, a National Telecom Policy was announced just before his getting into the plane without deciding the crucial issues, such as how the foreign equity percentage should be allowed, what steps are coming in the way of the nation's security and defence point of view. Still, the Government announced the National Telecom Policy. They have not come forward with an amendment about the bouncing of SGL.

Also, with deep anguish I would like to say that the whole security scam had taken place because of the role of the brokers in these inter-bank transactions on securities and the JPC had recommended that this issue should be seriously considered. But the Government has expressed its opinion that there is nothing to worry and still it has to be allowed in future also. When the Nationalised Banks themselves are in need of some security, from one bank to the other, why should a broker come in the way and go away with a lot of money as commission? We have seen all these nonsensical things. All these things coincide with our views. (*Interruptions*)

I am not going into the merits. I only just wanted to pinpoint a few issues that

show very clearly the Government's intention not to act on the JPC Report. That is why we have been insisting that this Report should be withdrawn. In spite of the fact that the Government has not agreed that there is nothing wrong in the Report in the beginning, and at a later stage, the Finance Minister has agreed that certain words are detrimental to the dignity of the Committee, to the respect of the Committee and through that Parliament, why does the Government stand on prestige to withdraw this Report?

I request the Government to withdraw this Action Taken Report and come forward with a real Action Taken Report taking action on the recommendations made by the JPC and then only can any fruitful purpose be served in discussing it. Till such time, the Members of our Party have decided to dissociate themselves with the Parliamentary Committees. If the Government does not amend its behaviour, we have also decided to boycott the further proceedings of this Session.

13. 00 hrs.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to be very brief. I do not want to speak, at this moment, on the merits of this JPC Report. What I say is that the attitude the Government has adopted on the JPC Report has destroyed the democracy in this country. The Report was a unanimous Report and rejecting a unanimous Report is an insult to the entire Parliament and we cannot be a party to such a behaviour on the part of the Government.

I would have always liked the Government to have the grace to come forward and have withdrawn the Report. I

say that the Government does not have an open mind but a close mind. Therefore, it cannot take a proper decision.

In these circumstances, I associate myself with the Opposition Parties and dissociate myself with all the parliamentary committees as a Member of this House representing the Indian National League, which is a secular and national democratic party.

Therefore, I associate myself with the Opposition Parties and dissociate with all the Parliamentary committees reluctantly for the time being.

SHRI P.C.CHACKO (Trichur): Sir, in the last few days, unfortunately, a one-sided impression was allowed to spread in the country. We, the Members of the ruling party, were very sad and we were keeping quiet only because we wished that after the deliberations, the Opposition Members will take a reasonable position. I am very sad that the Opposition Members—some parties in the Opposition—are announcing their decision of dissociating themselves with the parliamentary committees. Here, I want to point out one thing to put the record straight. Sir, at least, one party in the Opposition today—I have read this statement—is saying that they are not agreeing to this action of most of the Opposition parties and are not resigning from the parliamentary committees. This at least shows that this action taken by some of the Opposition Parties is an over-reaction or it is not a consensus even among the Opposition Parties. At least one party in the Opposition has announced their decision that they are not resigning from the Parliamentary Committees but they have reservations on certain things. This itself shows that the

argument which is being advanced from the Opposition side is not fully correct.

The Members served in the JPC for eighteen months and have laboured very hard. They spent so much time in the JPC. When the JPC was concluded, with all my anguish and anxiety I told some of my friends that the JPC, in spite of its best efforts, could not come to a conclusion about the end-use of money which is involved in this scam. The parliamentary committee has got its own limitations. So, the JPC also could not come to a final conclusion. But I fully endorse their decision. I fully associate with Shri Indrajit Gupta's analysis about the corruption in public life. Sir, the Opposition Members, in their anxiety, to establish their points are saying that if the JPC Report is fully implemented, then corruption in the public life will go. Sir, they are sadly mistaken. For argument's sake I say that even if the JPC Report is fully implemented, also it is not a panacea for all the ills of the society.

I wish to point out one or two points here because they are wrongly mentioned in this House. Sir, when we referred to Shri Shankaranand, we deliberately and consciously referred to him as the OIBD Chairman. Sir, there is only one Minister in the Government who is a Chairman of the Board. It happened and this decision was taken not by Shri Shankaranand but by his predecessor, Shri S.P.Malviya. When he was a Minister that the Minister himself will be the Chairman of OIBD. The Minister has got certain responsibilities. OIBD Chairman as a Chairman has to deal with the public sector banks. I am sure, the hon. Members, Shri Jaswant Singh and Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee will definitely remember that we deliberately used the words 'the then Chairman of the OIBD' while referring to.

Shri Shankaranand. Today, Shri Vajpayee has said that they will be happy only if the action is taken against the Ministers. But what action are they contemplating against another former Chairman of OIDB who is still in the Opposition. I am referring to the previous Chairman here.

I fully endorse the JPC Report. The definite conclusion of the JPC was that wherever an irregularity occurred, we have said: *over the years*. What does it mean? Definite proofs came before the JPC that irregularities occurred from early 1980s. So, who are responsible for that? If they are asking for action, it should start right from early 1980s... [Interruptions]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: We fully support that. You take action right from 1986.

SHRI P.C.CHACKO: Paswanji, you have not read the Report fully. It goes back to 1980. You can very well ask your friend, Mr. George Fernandes as to what had been happening. So, wherever the word *irregularity* is found in the Report, all of us have come to a consensus that this has been happening since early 1980s. So, if you are satisfied only with the action taken against the Ministers, will you agree for going back? Will you show an example?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Yes, we are ready.

SHRI P.C.CHACKO: Then you ask those who were Ministers at that time to resign from Parliament.

Sir, if they are sincere, they should ask their members, their leaders who are still in the Parliament, who are still in the

Rajya Sabha, to first set an example by resigning themselves. If any Minister comes forward, takes the responsibility and says that he is resigning, I shall be the happiest person. But will they agree? Will they tell their friends who are still adorning positions in this House and also in the other House, to resign and show an example? Let them do that if they are sincere.

Sir, unnecessarily an impression is being created and it is being allowed to go down. As many hon. Members have pointed out, this is a forum for discussion. You have given your wise counsel to all of us but unfortunately this is not being accepted by the Opposition parties. We did not stand on prestige. This Government has changed its position. They may call it folly or they may call it mistake, but we take that mistake as an honour. We came first with the Report and then we said that if any unparliamentary reference is there, we are prepared to change that. In the meeting also that you had called in your Chamber, the Finance Minister came out quite unexpectedly for all, openly offered that he was prepared to tender an unconditional apology. Where is the question of prestige then? Can they still say that we are standing on prestige?

This Government was prepared to amend the Report. Many Members were saying: *Throw away the Report, scrap the Report*. As a senior wise person, Shri Indrajit Gupta said: You amend the Report, you change the Report. The Government is prepared to amend the Report. The Government is prepared to change the Report. Time and again, the Parliamentary Affairs Minister was not even allowed to make a statement in this House. Is this the parliamentary procedure we want to follow? They did not allow the Finance Minister to

make a statement. They have been raising the accusing finger against him. Time and again, all of them stood up together and did not allow him to make a simple statement in this House. Is this the democracy we want in this country? The people who elected all of us are watching from all corners of the country, what we have been doing for the last four days. They say that they are fighting against corruption. I support my hon. colleague who said let us fight against corruption together. It is not a party issue. As rightly said by Shri Indrajit Gupta they have made it a political issue. This is a political reaction. If they want to take this matter to the streets, we are also equally prepared to do that. Let us fight this issue there. We have seen this political fight in U.P., we have seen this political fight in Madhya Pradesh, we have seen this political fight in many other places also, but there they did not succeed.

JPC has put in the best of its efforts but many lacunae were there. Now they want the Action Taken Report to be taken back. But that does not mean that the action will be withdrawn. Government has taken action and action will continue. For argument sake, let us think that the Report is taken back. What will be the qualitative effect of that? The action will continue. The action has been initiated. A number of cases have been registered. My friend Mr. V.S.Rao was saying that this is *no* Action Taken Report!. The Securities and Exchange Board of India was strengthened on a recommendation. When we were in the JPC, itself, a number of actions were taken. We wanted to make an Appendix on this. We wanted to add one chapter about the action taken in the JPC Report itself. Unfortunately, we did not have the time, otherwise we had discussion in the JPC that we would append one chapter

about the action taken itself. That shows the sincerity of this Government. The Government could have produced a two-page cyclostyled Report and they would have been satisfied with that. But now we think that we are being punished for the sincerity of this Government. We are being victimised because this Government is frank. [Interruptions] On each and every issue, we said that this is our reaction. What is it for which you are blaming us? Instead of that two-page cyclostyled version, we could have said that in pursuance of J.P.C.'s recommendations we have taken the following actions. What would have been the reaction from your side? Some of the colleagues are saying about conscience. Shri Somnath Chatterjee was saying about conscience. You ask your conscience as to what should have been your reaction. On each and every issue this Government has taken action. Never in the parliamentary history, a report was completely accepted or implemented by any Government.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE
(Bolpur): It is all bogus.

SHRI P.C.CHACKO: The Government may have reservation. The Government will have to come to a conclusion. I am happy about what Shri Indrajit Gupta has said, you can be satisfied with the phrase of *an* obituary reference to the ATR!. But, at least, a discussion took place in this House today. This party, this Government will be remembered in the history as a Government sincerely tried to implement the recommendations of the J.P.C. [Interruptions] I want to say one more thing. If, at any place, deliberately or not, there is a derogatory reference to J.P.C., everyone from this side will feel apologetic. Our Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and also our Finance

601. *Re: Action Taken Report SRAVANA 11, 1916 (SAKA) Parliamentary Committee 602 on the recommendations of the Joint on irregularities & Banking Transactions*

Minister have made it categorically clear that they are prepared to amend it and are prepared to take back any derogatory remark. They are not going into the argument whether they are derogatory or not. You spell the words and we are prepared to amend them.

Sir, this Government did not stand on prestige. Some of them did not understand the J.P.C report properly. Even the J.P.C Chairman, the J.P.C Members and the Committee as a whole were not fully happy and satisfied with the report because even after 18 months we could not find out the end-use of the money. We wanted the Government to conduct investigations. The C.B.I, the Directorate of Enforcement and other Governmental arms and agencies are going into the investigations. Cases are being registered. S.E.B.I. is being strengthened. The internal controlling mechanism of the Reserve Bank of India is being strengthened. A number of steps are being taken. Do you want to throw out all these things? Do you want to reject all these things?

All the actions taken by the Government will not be accepted by you but they will be accepted by the people of this country. If you are acting with political motives, these political slogans will be fought in the streets of India.

This is my submission to you
.....[*Interruptions*]

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I demand of the Central Government to take action now and if any case of corruptions in 1986 comes to light

then it should also be investigated into and action should be taken thereon.....[*Interruptions*]

[*English*]

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum): In 1986 Shri V.P.Singh was the Finance Minister. He should first resign. You ask him to resign first and then you talk here.....[*Interruptions*]

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAMVILAS PASWAN: We want that you should take an action and if any Minister is found to be involved in it, action should be taken against him.

[*English*]

We are not interested in the Action Taken Report. We want action. [Interruptions] But you must take action.....[*Interruptions*]

SHRI P.G.NARAYANAN (Gobichettipalayam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think we have reached a point at which the Government has to come forward with a proposal to defuse the situation. I feel this is not a matter in which the Government must stand on prestige. When the prestige and privilege of the parliamentary committees, especially the J.P.C. are involved, there is nothing wrong for the Government to come forward to rectify the defects and deficiencies in the Action Taken Report. Our demand is action must be taken on those who are indicted in the J.P.C. report. The insulting comments of the Government on J.P.C must be removed.

I appeal to the Government, in the

interest of the healthy parliamentary system, to come forward with a concrete proposal either with a fresh report or with any other proposal to the satisfaction of all the parties to end this crisis.

So far as our party is concerned, we feel that it is not necessary to resign from the parliamentary committees.

We will fight the injustice by remaining in the Parliamentary Committees.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I join our friends here in the House to inform you that our party will resign from all the Parliamentary Committees and Standing Committees as a protest against the attitude of the Government towards the functioning of these Committees and also the Parliament. I do not want to discuss the merits and demerits of the Action Taken Report. But it has been crystal clear to any observer that this Action Taken Report is an insult to the intelligence of the people. It is a fraud on the Parliament. It is also a contempt of the House and finally, it is a blow to the tradition that this House has built up over the years in matters regarding the functioning of the Parliamentary Committees.

Sir, you were the architect, as a matter of fact, for introducing the new system of functioning through the Standing Committees related with different departments of the Government. It has been our experience that these Committees are also not being allowed to produce the desired result. Therefore, the attitude which has been displayed towards the recommendations of the JPC is an example for us to note. This was a unanimous report and this unanimous report, as a matter of fact, if you allow me to say, has been

rejected unceremoniously. They have given up the basic principle of parliamentary accountability. They have given up the fundamental principle of ministerial responsibility, the collective responsibility of the Government.

These are the pillars of parliamentary democracy. If the Government is able to destroy the pillar, the edifice cannot exist. Therefore, in the interest of the parliamentary democracy and to defend the basic principles of parliamentary practices, we have got no other alternative than to, with all humility, say that we cannot associate ourselves with the functioning of these Committees which you were so pleased to set up. I also want to say that we have taken this decision with utmost reluctance.

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a matter of concern for the country that this Parliament has come to such an impasse and it is the duty of all of us to find a way out to avert such a situation. As a matter of fact, the decision of the Opposition parties to withdraw from the Parliamentary Committees is very much unfortunate and it will be the saddest day in the history of Parliament if the Members of the Opposition withdraw from the Committees. It is also the duty of the Government to take all steps to avert such a situation. This House is to transact its normal business, especially to discuss some other very sensitive and important issues facing the country like flood, sugar scandal and such other things which the hon. Leaders of the Opposition have already mentioned here. Therefore, this is not the time for a confrontation, but a conciliation.

Sir, it is an undisputed fact that the Action Taken Report submitted by the

Government is containing a number of deficiencies.

These deficiencies are there whether one would like it or not. One of the undisputed facts is that there are several and numerous deficiencies in the Action Taken Report. So, this is not the time for the Government to stand on the issue of prestige. I would also request the Opposition that they also should not stand on the issue of prestige. The very important issue before the House is how to solve this problem.

Sir, with great respect to the Chair and also to the feelings expressed by the Members from both the sides, I would say that the Government should come before the House and admit in the House that there are deficiencies in the Report already submitted before the House. Government should also assure the House that there will be another report. It can be an additional report or a supplementary report or an exhaustive report covering all those deficiencies. When deficiencies are there it is the duty of the Government to cover those deficiencies and come before the House to express its sincerity of purpose. [Interruptions] May I just make my submission. You may or may not agree with it.

What I mean to say, Sir, is that the Government should change its approach. There has to be a shift from the stand that it has so far taken. Government should change its approach. How can the Government change its approach? Firstly, it has to admit that there are deficiencies in the Report submitted before the House and secondly, the Government has to assure the House that those deficiencies will be covered in an additional report or supplementary report.

Pending the submission of that supplementary report before the House, we shall just postpone the present discussion and only after that supplementary report is presented, we can very well discuss the matter in detail. Anyway, Sir, there was already a discussion here. We now have partly discussed the matter in the House. I do admit that it was not a full-fledged discussion. Therefore, we can have a full-fledged discussion on the Report only after the Government comes out with another report which you may call as a supplementary report or an additional report or an exhaustive report with sufficient amendments, with sufficient augmentation as suggested by the hon. Leader of the CPI, the senior-most Member of this House, hon. Shri Indrajit Gupta. Let us try to resolve this issue for the time being and we can discuss other matters in the House.

I do not know, Sir, whether one would associate with the Opposition's decision to withdraw from the Committees or not. I have a humble submission that, Sir, there was a very very serious and highly sensitive issue that this country had faced. For example, take the demolition of Babri Masjid. According to me, there was no issue much more serious than that. But even then, myself and whoever were in my party, at that time, have not disassociated with the Government or disassociated with the Committees. Therefore, as far as I am concerned, this is not the time for me to withdraw from the Committees. Anyway, I would just submit before this House that this is the time for all of us to take conciliatory attitude rather than confrontationist attitude.

I hope and would also request the hon. Minister, in-charge of Parliamentary affairs or whoever is the concerned to come

before the House and admit that there are deficiencies and also to assure the House that a new report will be submitted before the House. Until then, if necessary, we can even treat this as an interim report and let us come to such a conclusion. Thank you very much.

[*Translation*]

SHRI PIUS TIRKEY (Alipurduars): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not a party issue. This is a national issue and in such a case nobody be it congress people or opposition people wants that such a loot should continue in our country. So far as the members of the ruling party are concerned, they also do not want that it should be restricted to a few people. We have had these problems since the evolution of human beings. But whenever there have been incidents of theft, loot etc., the guilty people have not been let loose after catching them. The JPC has pointed out the guilty people. Several incidents of murders, rape etc. take place and the arrested people cannot be let loose on the pretext that this has been the practice. The Government are enacting new laws of order to acquit certain congressmen and criticising the JPC report. I feel that the Government should expose the guilty people involved before the public no matter, they are Ministers or officers. They should not suppress incidents of corruption and speak in its favour. That is why, on behalf of my party I say that the members of our party are resigning from all the Parliamentary committees and I would like to tell the Government that this is not their party issue. This is a national issue and it would be in their interest to accept the steps taken by the JPC for doing away with it.

SHRI SHIBU SOREN (Dumka): Mr.

Speaker, Sir, we have approached this House for the last judgement. It is not a small issue. A Committee was set up to enquire the security scam and even on the basis of the report of the Committee, no scamster has been traced out or we are unable to apprehend the culprit, the main reason of it, is the interference of the hon. Members. Not only from the membership of the Committees, but we should also tender our resignation from the Membership of the Parliament also. Last time the Bofors case involved 65 crore rupees but this scam involves 5000 crore rupees. If only a little thing is not known then what is the use of setting up of committees, presenting reports and there is no use in holding discussions even? There is no use of speaking anything here. What will the people of this country think when none is found guilty when we say that such and such person is involved in this 5000 crore rupees scam. None has been apprehended. Therefore, it is very disgracing. What will we say to the people. The whole of the country is burning. Therefore, my submission is that if the guilty persons are found out, as the hon. Members of the committees claim that the guilty should be pointed out, only then our dignity can be saved. Otherwise, my submission is that there will be no use in coming of us to the Parliament and in setting up of this system.

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA): I am very happy that a short but purposeful debate has taken place on this issue. I must make it clear as I have done it earlier in your Chamber and in the sittings that we are not standing on any issue of prestige. We are open to

suggestions. We have an open mind and I must say that some very useful suggestions have been made by hon. Members during this short discussion and we will fully take into account all those suggestions and take purposeful action on those matters.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: What are those points?

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Many points have been made. I do not want either to refer or to argue on those points. These points can certainly be discussed. We have taken careful note of those points. We stand second to none in establishing the supremacy of Parliament and parliamentary committees.

[Translation]

Hon. Vajpayee ji has talked about the dignity of the House. Vajpayee ji has always tried to safeguard the dignity of the House and we have also made efforts in this direction. I think that the whole of the opposition have been trying to keep the dignity of the House intact since without doing so our efforts to run the House on the Parliamentary system can be of no use. Therefore we have never tried and we will never try to bring down the dignity and reduce the powers of the Parliamentary system and the Parliamentary Committees. I would like to assure you that we will make every effort in the direction of maintaining the dignity of the House, the Parliamentary traditions and the Parliamentary Committees. If there is any lacunae in it, we are ready to remove it.

We make it clear firmly that if it appears from this report that no action has been taken then we will take the further step.

There is no question of patching up the issue since neither we nor the hon. Members of the opposition have ever made it a party issue but we have discussed it as a national issue and this is the result that this report has come unanimously and whatever we could do, we have done. We never claim that whatever we have said is right or there is no lacunae in it. If there is any lacunae, we are ready to remove it. If some additional action is to be taken, we are also ready for the same.

As far as the question of fighting out corruption is concerned, both the Houses had decided to set up a joint committee and everyone contributed in the completion of the proceedings in a cordial atmosphere. After the proceeding was completed we are trying to fight out corruption [Interruptions] Please listen to me. Therefore, I would like to say that.....[Interruptions]

[English]

Sir, there are many more points that could be given. But I would like to make it a short submission to you that after consultations with the Leaders of various Political Parties about the Action Taken Report laid on the Table of the House on 26th July, 1994, pertaining to the Report of the JPC, since the need was felt to augment the report in some respect, the Government is willing to bring a Supplementary Report covering the deficiencies before the House at an appropriate stage....[Interruptions]

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): What is that appropriate stage?.....[Interruptions]

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: In the meanwhile, the present Action Taken

Report will remain with the House as an interim report and the consideration of the final report after receipt of the Supplement may be decided upon by the House at an appropriate time.....[Interruptions] Sir, I hope that this will be acceptable to the House. I would submit that we do take action that the whole House wanted to take.....[Interruptions]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, you have given us the opportunity to express our views not on the merits of the Report but as to our response generally to the attitude of the Government. I do not wish to repeat that. But in view of the stand taken by the Government, we are not satisfied with mere placatory words. The Government seems to be adamant in not withdrawing the Report. It is very difficult for us to participate in the deliberations of this House until the end of this Session. So, we decide to walk out of this House till the end of this Session.

[Interruptions]

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has read out the resolution put forth by the Government in the meeting summoned by you. I would like to say that this resolution had come as a reply to Shri Indrajeet Gupta's resolution, which should also be presented before the House. Shri Indrajeet Gupta had tried to find a way out but the Government did not let it be successful.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the record should be complete.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, please carry on.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I would like to read it out. The resolution presented by Shri Indrajeet Gupta in the meeting of the leaders of the parties is:

[English]

After consultation with the various opposition parties about the Action Taken Report laid on the Table of the House on such and such date pertaining to the Report of the JPC, since the decisions in some respect are not comprehensive enough to satisfy the expectations of the Members of Parliament, the Government is now willing to have the Action Taken Report amended, augmented and to bring the Report so revised before the House at an appropriate stage. In the meanwhile, the present Action Taken Report may be treated as an interim report and the approval or disapproval of the final report may be decided by the House at an appropriate time.

[Translation]

This resolution was moved by Shri Indrajeet Gupta and we were asked to discuss it, discuss it immediately today. We had decided to present it in the meeting of our party but we could not do so due to the urgent nature of it. If both the resolutions are compared, the allegation, levelled by the ruling party that the opposition is not having a reasonable attitude, will be proved wrong. Shri Indrajeet Gupta had tried to find out a way but the Government did not accept even that limited resolution since the Government is not in a mood to settle this issue. The Government has adopted a rigid attitude.....[Interruptions]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: This is not the resolution. [Interruptions]

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you also. Now please let Shukla ji speak.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is right. [Interruptions]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are ready to accept the resolution of Shri Indrajit Gupta into read out by Shri Vajpayee ji is to be. We are ready to accept, what you have read out. We accept it in toto. [Interruptions]

MR. SPEAKER: I will give you a chance also to speak. Now, please let Advaniji speak.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gandhinagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you might be remembering that at the time of the setting up of the Standing Committees, the hon. Members of the opposition parties.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): He has read out what Shri Indrajit Gupta has said. The Government has accepted it. Is he not accepting it? It is closed now.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not closed please.

[Translation]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Parliamentary democracy works more effectively wherever the standing committees and Parliamentary Committees have been set up. Today, it is a great setback to the Parliamentary committees set up. Not only the J.P.C have

been disgraced and insulted but the whole set up of the Parliamentary Committees and that institution have got a set back due to this attitude of the Government.

I remember that once the whole opposition had withdrawn and disassociated itself from the consultative committees. May be you remember or not but the old Members of this House like Shri Somnath Ji might be remembering that the issue was settled when the Government accepted that a unanimous decisions of the consultative committee should be accepted. Unfortunately, today the obstacle is due to the disapproval of the unanimous decision. Earlier the obstacle was removed when the Government had accepted that a unanimous decision would be accepted. I think that the Government does not give any importance to it and these problems are the results of it. The opposition is not resigning from the Parliamentary Committees willingly but the Government is responsible for it. Corruption is the main issue and the Opposition is not ready to compromise on it.

Today it has appeared in the newspaper and many people have made an appeal to us to change our decision and to give it a second thought but I do not know whether it is right or wrong today it has appeared in the newspaper on behalf of the hon. Prime Minister that the opposition wanted to criticise the Government on the issue of G.A.T.T. agreement, they could not do so, therefore, they have raised this issue.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: It is wrong. Do not go on it.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Good, that it is wrong but it has appeared in the newspapers. I had made a reference of it as the attitude

of the Government was so. Although the hon. Speaker had tried a lot to put an end to this controversy but the Government was not ready for it and it was firm on its point. We had opposed due to that.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, just now a letter of Indrajit ji was read. We do not know anything about it. All the hon. Members from all the parties had held a meeting at 1.00 p.m. We are clear in our views. Indrajit Babu had been with us. I do not know why this misunderstanding has cropped up but one thing is clear that this action taken report is useless. To make it useful, Indrajit Babuji had given four suggestions time and again in the Committees. If these four things are added the report becomes useful. I do not want to go into verbosity. We have always demanded that this report should be withdrawn. I would like to make it clear that as long as this report is not withdrawn, it will be difficult for us to continue this discussion and the matter will become more worse. Therefore, the National Front and the Left Front boycott this House....*[Interruptions]*....

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Your decision is there, but at least please listen to others also.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: In response to your desire we have come.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Whatever I could understand from the hon. Minister is that right at the end he said he is willing to accept that proposal. I want to make it clear. I want to remind you though you do not need to be reminded.

MR. SPEAKER: I was going to say that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I made it clear that it was subject to the approval of the other Left parties and the JD friends. It was my personal proposal; it was not on behalf of all these Parties or Members. Now if any of them is not prepared to accept that in toto or they have any reservation on that or any objections to it, it is too late. I withdraw my proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: I must make the record very clear that that was a proposal given by Shri Indrajit Gupta. He had said that it was coming from him and that he had to consult others also. Probably we all were under the impression that that would be something on which there would be consensus. I think Shri Saifuddin Choudhury and Nirmal Kantiji were also there. I must make it very clear that the Government also had said at that time that if it was acceptable, then they would consider it.

Indrajit ji also had said that he would discuss it with others. Let that record be very clear.

Now, the second point is this. Well, today I am really happy and unhappy. I am happy because at least we could exchange our views and we could speak; and thus, some points could be made very clear to us. I am also happy because all the leaders—Shri Shuklaji and his colleagues also—had met in the committees and outside also; they tried their best to see that some solution is found to this problem so that the problem is overcome. I think, they tried their best very sincerely in spite of the fact that they had their own views and they stuck on to those views also. That is why, I feel happy.

But, I am sad because the leaders have declared on the floor of the House that they want to dissociate from the legislative

617 *Re: Action Taken Report SRAVANA 11, 1916 (SAKA) Parliamentary Committee 618 on the recommendations of the Joint on irregularities & Banking Transactions*

committees and it cannot give pleasure or happiness to any Member in the House. Those who have done also, might have done with a very sad heart and reluctantly. I am very unhappy about it.

As far as the third point is concerned, you have made a declaration on the floor of the House. But, I think, we all should persist in having a dialogue even after this and try to solve this.

[Interruptions]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, we shall not respond to any responsible or reasonable suggestion. We have always cooperated with you in finding a solution. Whenever you have desired, we have attended the meeting. But, in view of the Government's attitude, we are not able to take part in the deliberations at least till the end of the Session. [Interruptions]

13. 47 hrs.

At this stage, Shri Sharad Yadav and some other hon. Members left the House.

13. 47 hrs.

At this stage, Shri Somnath Chatterjee and some other hon. Members left the House.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: As I had said that Indrajit Gupta.....[Interruptions]

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday, Vajpayee ji was not present, so please let him speak.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It is concerned with what I had said earlier so I would like to make it clear. I had said that the proposal of Indrajit Gupta Ji came to us today morning and we were to discuss it on party level but I would like to draw the attention of the House towards the sudden change in the attitude of Shukla ji. We decided to give resignation from the Committees and thereafter he accepted the proposal of Indrajit Gupta ji. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you might be remembering that and now you will have to be a witness that in your chamber...

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe that is right or wrong but I admit that if you put a pressure, they will accept and if they request, you will accept.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Therefore, we are putting some more pressure to withdraw this report. If they do not withdraw then we will also have to stage a walk out with the other friends....[Interruptions]

13. 48 hrs.

At this stage, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and some other Members left the House.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: It was decided before your announcement today in the morning. It was not accepted on anyone's pressure. [Interruptions]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we were not a party to the different opinions of different parties.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no you were present there. You have been called, ask

Indrajit Gupta ji.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We are happy that we were not aware of these things. What has come up right now before the House is not going to solve the issue. What has been going on since morning enrages us and there is nothing in it to solve the tangle. Since beginning we have demanded that the Government should withdraw this report but what was decided along with you, the Government has tried to violate it. It has been said that if the report is withdrawn, the Government will have to resign...[Interruptions] and later on it was said that that some of the Ministers should be sacked, overall it meant that if the report is withdrawn the Government will have to tender the resignation and the elections will have to be conducted again. I doubt at the courage of the Government to tender its resignation and to go for the polls. We would like to urge upon the Government that either this report should be withdrawn and if the hon. Prime Minister does not have courage enough to withdraw or take any action on this report then this House should be dismissed and polls should be conducted and then let the people decide the fate of both this Government and the future of the country.

With these words our party also will not take part in the proceedings of the House and we leave the House.

1. 51 hrs.

[English]

At this stage, Shri George Fernandes and some other hon. Members left the House.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (Mayiladuturai): Sir, I am on a point of order. Is it appropriate for a Member of this House, who has been indicted by the Joint Parliamentary Committee, to speak? Mr. George Fernandes has been indicted by the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order.

[Translation]

SHRI BUTA SINGH (Jalore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish, Vajpayee ji would have been present in the House and I had said so before him. The dignity of the House does not allow me. While we were discussing in your chamber on the business advisory report, I along with Shri Shivcharan Mathur Ji had requested you on the proposal of Indrajit Gupta. You might be remembering that Shri Jaswant Singh ji was representing B.J.P. in business advisory committee. He had said before you that they would support on behalf of the BJP the proposal brought by Indrajit ji. He had said so. We had presumed that Indrajit ji is playing the role of a middleman on behalf of all the parties.

I take it as a well thought resolution supported by BJP. If Jaswant Singh ji had not given this assurance, we might have consulted the hon. Members of BJP. I would like that it should go on record....

MR. SPEAKER: Discussions were held with BJP in the morning.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Jaswant Singh ji had said earlier that they would accept it. It appears from the way he has gone that he is busy with his political tricks. He has no

concern with it.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry to say that even after agreeing with the Opposition, taking it as an interim report and later on a detailed report can come, we are ready to abide by, what has been said by you, the opposition is not ready to sit here. It is sad for the House and I hope that they would give a second thought to what has been said by them.

You know that we had moved a resolution and Vajpayee ji had said on it that the resolution moved by Shri Indrajeet ji should be accepted as such. There was no any specific difference between these two except a few words. I had no objection in accepting it on behalf of the Government and we have accepted it. After that Gupta ji raised to withdraw it while Vajpayee ji had moved it for acceptance. God knows, why they have decided to walk out. I could not understand properly the proceedings of the last ten minutes. It is quiet astonishing that even after accepting to what they wanted, they rejected their suggestions and walked out. Mr. Speaker, Sir, therefore, I would like to submit to you that they should think over it coolly. We all have the aim that as far as possible, corruptions should reduced / exadicated from the administration of the country and we should make every effort in this direction. It should be made a political issue. I am of the view that we are fully bound to safeguard the dignity of the House and the Committees. The opposition should also co-operate with us. My submission is that you should make an appeal to them and once again the discussion should be held with them. If they accept it, I think that it will magnify the dignity of the House. It will also help us in our desired endeavours to fight out corruption.

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with you and we will sit together to discuss, as earlier.

13. 54 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Annual Report and Review on the working of Indira Gandhi Rashtriya Uran Akademi, Raebareli for 1991-92 and statement for delay in laying these papers.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS) AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MUKUL WASNIK): On behalf of Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad, I beg to lay on the Table.

- (1) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Indira Gandhi Rashtriya Uran Akademi, Raebareli, for the year 1991-92, alongwith Audited Accounts.
 - (ii) Statement (Hindi and English versions) regarding Review by the Government on the working of the Indira Gandhi Rashtriya Uran Akademi, Raebareli, for the year 1991-92.
- (2) Statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers