

Statement Correcting Answer to SQ No. 15
dt. 25.7.1983 *Regarding Loss Due to Cyclone*
and Rain in Saurashtra

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI
ARIF MOHAMMED KHAN) : Sir, In reply
to Starred Question No. 15, due for answer
on 25 July 1983, regarding 'Loss due to cy-
clone and rain in Saurashtra', part (d) of the
question was answered as follows :

"A ways and means advance of Rs. 10
crores has been sanctioned to the State
pending receipt of detailed memoran-
dum and visit of a Central Team.
Rupees 97.75 lakhs have also been sanc-
tioned as agricultural in put subsidy
and for carrying out tillage operations."

The Government of Gujarat have been
sanctioned a ways and means advance of Rs.
20 crores for flood relief in two instalments
of Rs. 10 crores each, pending the receipt of
detailed memorandum from the State. In-
advertently the figure of Rs. 10 crore as ways
and means advance was mentioned as accord-
ing to the information available at the time
of preparing the reply to the Question, the
State had been sanctioned only Rs. crores
but on 22 July 1983, the State was sanctioned
an additional Rs. 10 crores by which
time the reply to the Starred Question had
already been approved and the subsequent
sanction of Rs. 10 crores could not be cor-
rected in time.

2. It is only with the intention to give
the Hon'ble Members a correct and up-to-
date information, that I have come before
this House to rectify the error at this stage.
The error would have been corrected, had I
got an opportunity to reply to this Question
on 25 July 1983. Since the House adjour-
ned, this error could not be corrected at that
time.

3. This inadvertent error, however is
regretted.

14.30 hrs.

Statement Re : Extenslon of time for Comp-
letion of Inquiry and Submission of Report

by Kudal Commission of Inquiry on Gandhi
Peace Foundation and other Orgauisatlons

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Before I
call upon Mr. Laskar, some of the hon.
Members have told me that they want to
oppose this statement being made by the
Minister. I am sorry under the Rules any
statement made by any Minister cannot be
opposed. But the Members are entitled to
give notices of any motion they want.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE
(New Delhi) : We are opposing the extension
which is being given to the Kudal Commis-
sion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : There is
no motion before the House.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
He is extending the time by making a state-
ment.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Haji-
pur) : They have already circulated. You
just read it, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That is
what I am saying.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mor-
mugao) : It was on my amendment that this
Commission was appointed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has
also given notice. What I was saying is :
let the statement be made. You give notice
in the form of a motion. At this stage I
would like to tell the hon. Member that the
Minister is making a statement.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
Statement on what ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I am not
interested in what statement he makes. He
makes a statement in public interest. There-
fore, you cannot oppose it.....(Interruptions)
I am sorry you cannot oppose.....You can
give notice.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
We are opposed to giving extension to the
Kudal Commission.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You cannot oppose.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : I am not opposing. I am entitled to ask a clarificatory question.....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Vajpayee, you have said what all you wanted to say. Don't oppose it. The point is whether you can oppose the statement being made by the Government. Is there any precedent ?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I am not opposing the statement. We are opposing the extension.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The point is : when the Minister is to make a statement can any hon. Member oppose it ? You are entitled to give any motion for a discussion on it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) . Why don't you listen to us on the procedural issue ?

Just now you said, probably inadvertently, whether there is any precedent. I may tell you the precedent in this very session-in the last week when the notification regarding President's rule in Pondicherry was actually laid on the Table of the House. I had given a notice. Though the rule says that as far as the papers to be laid on the Table are concerned, there is no positive provision for members being allowed to make a submission, I had given a notice.....(Interruptions) I am not going into the object of the problem. What I am saying is that in this very House when the notification regarding President's rule in Pondicherry was laid on the Table of the House.....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Was it in the form of a statement ? Now the question is that a statement is going to be made by the Government.

Can any hon. Member oppose that statement ? This is what I say.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Why do you interrupt me ? If I interrupted you when you were making observations, you would have been angry.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I am not angry.

PROR. MADHU DANDAVATE : What I want to tell you is this. I say there are certain precedents in both houses of Parliament. Rules in both houses are identical. If you go through the proceedings, you will find that on a number of occasions, when certain papers are laid on the table of the House, the Members get up and seek clarifications and express their views and, later on, they come up with a notice and discuss the matter in depth and they go into the merits of the case. We are opposed to the very undemocratic procedure followed. The Kudal Commission met once. Even the organisation which was to be enquired into did not appear. Now, after 30th July 1983, the term is over. They want extension by one more year. It is highly objectionable.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Don't go into the subject-matter. Can you oppose the statement to be made by Government ? I am only hearing the views on this. He is only on this issue namely whether you can oppose the statement to be made by Government.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Sir, the clarification asked for on the Pondicherry issue was entirely on a different footing. It was a paper laid on the table of the House specifically. The rule here is regarding the statement to be made by the Minister. The statement concerns with the action already taken and completed. What he is doing now is merely taking the House into confidence, because the House is sitting, on what he had already done. There is no question of his opposing that statement. There is no meaning at all. The precedents are there. Look at the book. You will find that they are not in the rules. Only precedents are there. On these, the Members are entitled to seek any clarification. Let them put questions only at the end of the statement.

Sir, this Commission was appointed on my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, you are going into the subject-matter. I say that the Minister is going to make the statement.

Some hon. Members wanted to oppose it. That is not being permitted by the Chair. The Minister will now make the statement. You are entitled to give a motion and then it is for the Chair to consider it. Now, the Minister. You may make the statement.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR) : Sir, consequent on the adoption of a Resolution by this House on 28th August, 1981, a Commission of Inquiry consisting of Shri Justice P.D. Kudal was set up by Notification dated 17th February, 1982. Copies of the Notification were laid on the Table of the House on 3rd March, 1982. The Commission was required to complete its inquiry and submit report to the Central Government on or before 31st July, 1982.

On the request of the Commission, the time for the submission of the report was extended by one year, i.e., upto 31st July, 1983.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (New Delhi) : The Commission was asked to submit the report on or before 31st July, 1983. Now the time is extended by one more year. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Minister, you do not reply to that. You go ahead with your statement.

SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR : The Chairman of the Commission of Inquiry has requested the Government for ending the time for the submission of the report by one more year. The Government has considered this request and the term of the Kudal Commission of Inquiry on Gandhi Peace Foundation and other organisations is accordingly being extended upto 31st July, 1984.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, Matters under Rule 377. Shri Pratab Bhanu Sharma. (*Interruptions*)**

Don't record anything, Now, matters under Rule 377. Shri Sharma.

SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR : One thing I would like to say.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have permitted him. Please listen to him.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : Why do you come in the way ? He is replying.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have allowed him. No more clarification. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Can you tell me.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No clarification please.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Because the Gandhi Peace Foundation, and other organisations sided with Shri Jayaprakash Narain who resolutely fought the Emergency.....This extension is undemocratic and vindictive.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, the Minister is replying.

SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR : It is entirely a wrong thing on the part of Prof. Dandavate to put this allegation against the Government of India. It is on the resolution of this very House that this Commission was set-up. The House wanted us to have this inquiry. (*Interruptions*) Now, once this Commission is set-up the House definitely wants to know the truth about the whole matter. It is because the organisations against whom the allegations are there are not cooperating with the Commission that there is delay.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, the House will take up matters under Rule 377.