

12.03 hrs.

RE: LAYING ON THE TABLE OF GYAN PRAKASH
COMMITTEE'S REPORT ON IMPORT OF SUGAR

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I am going to allow each one of you one after the other.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Sir, we would like to discuss the serious situation which has arisen due to the resignation of Shri Antony, the Minister of Civil Supplies. I had asked you in the beginning of the question hour whether Shri Antony wanted to make a statement in the House after his resignation and whether he had taken your permission for making the statement? You had replied that till now you had not received any notice from him about his intention to give a statement. But there is no doubt that resignation has been given. He has given this information while addressing a Press Conference. The resignation was the result of the reply given to a written question which was asked yesterday and which was replied by the Government. First of all I would like to congratulate Shri Antony. He has fulfilled his moral responsibility by giving resignation and has heard the voice of his conscience. We hope that other such Ministers will also hear the voice of their conscience and will take inspiration from Shri Antony. Shri Antony is representing Kerala. The election results of Andhra and Karnataka and the issue of corruption is already creating a problem for the ruling party. This will go as an important event in the annals of history of democracy. In Southern State of Kerala in the name of cleanliness in public life Shri Antony has accepted his moral responsibility by giving the resignation. But whatever has been said by him and whatever has been said in the House in reply to a yesterday's question, it has totally been proved that the allegations levelled by the opposition in regard to the sugar scam were correct. Out allegation was that the decision of importing the sugar was taken very late and was leaked out. If you will see our earlier speeches you will find that we have continuously stressed on this point and it has been admitted very factually in the yesterday's reply that

[English]

"The absence of Confidentiality regarding the decision to import sugar."

[Translation]

The confidentiality which should have been maintained while importing the sugar...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI P. C. THOMAS (Muvattupuzha): Mr. Antony has not said that he has taken moral responsibility of the fact. (Interruptions)...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: He has said so...(Interruptions)

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal): He has said so...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No, No, please...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES AND
MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: No, he has not said that. The interview at the press conference, if you read it,

[Translation]

In the statement which he has given in the Press Conference, he has not said any such thing which our hon'ble Member or you are saying. The has not said that he had given the resignation on the basis of moral responsibility.. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Rosera): He has said that the fact is just the reverse. He is innocent and the Prime Minsiter is guilty. (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if this is the attitude of ruling party even after the resignation of Shri Antony, then I think there is no hope for the ruling party.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: It is not a question of attitude You have said the wrong thing.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Whether he has said it or not—"but whatever the reply has been given after that my conscience does not allow me that I should remain in the Cabinet."

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: He said that a false charge has been levelled against him. That means charge has been levelled against the Prime Minister.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: He has not said that.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: He has siad this. You please read it. He has levelled charges directly against the Prime Minister.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: You are saying wrong.. (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not a time to play with the words. Shuklaji you are not understanding that your Government is facing crisis at present and you please do not try to defend it...(Interruptions).. Mr. Speaker, Sir, all the Members are demanding that the report of the Gyan Prakash Committee should be laid on the Table of the House. The Government is not ready to do so. Due to some technical reason Government is not willing to lay the report on the Table of the House. But the reply which was given yesterday was based on that report and it is a sort of condemnation of the entire Gvoermment and in real meaning it is a chargesheet against the Government. It is not a reply, it is a chargesheet against the Government. I would like to cite an example in this regard.

[English]

"Unreliable and inflated estimates of sugar production."

[Translation]

You are misleading the House as well as the country. You are not ready to give the factual figures in regard to the total production of sugar in the country and if it is so, in the case of sugar, then does your credibility not come under question in regard to the figures of production of other commodities? Why the reliable figures were not given? Inflated estimates were given in whose interest?

And then there was mismanagement in distributing the stock available in the country. The decision of importing sugar was taken very late and then it was also implemented very late. What is this inertness? You had taken a decision that you will import sugar, but the Gyan Prakash Committee says that in this decision also [English]

"Delay in implementation of this decision to import sugar-A poor co-ordination." [Translation] Your Government is famous for this.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Is this Government functioning on the principle of collective responsibility or not? Can in Parliamentary democracy and Government function without accepting the principle of accountability? But a part of Gyan Prakash Committee's report which has been given to us and the incorrect reply given yesterday show that there is no co-ordination among the Ministries.

Every department is adopting narrow minded approach. That means cabinet has no policy and everyone is doing what he feels like doing. Is this the way to run the Government?

It has been said—[English]—"lack of clarity in the decisions of the Cabinet Committee on prices regarding import of sugar"—[Translation]—that means a Cabinet Committee has been set up in regard to the prices. I do not know who are the Members of this Committee. We would like to know who are the Members of this Committee because this committee has been condemned for the decision it had taken, as there was no clarity in the decision—whether it was done deliberately or this Government is in the habit of working like this? The Government is working in this manner. It is a sort of stricture against the entire Cabinet committee.

I have already mentioned—

[English]

"the adoption of a narrow departmental approach on the part of the various concerned Ministries." [Translation] where is the collective responsibility in the Cabinet? [English].."failure on the part of the various concerned Ministries including the Cabinet Committee on Prices, Food Minister.." [Translation] Food Minister is sitting here. Civil Supplies Minister has not liked it. [English] and the Cabinet Secretary did not bring the matter to the notice of Cabinet/P.M..." [Translation] that means Cabinet did not know what was happening. These committees must have been composed of important Ministers. They had also not informed. Prime Minister's office itself does not monitor as to what was happening in the various Ministries, and shortage of which essential items is likely to be there? Is there no system to monitor it?

Today, it is being said that Cabinet was not informed—who is responsible for it? Who has not given the information? Then it was said that Mr. Antony was included in it and this was the reason of his resignation. [English]

"The poor relations between the Food Minister and the Food Secretary.." [Translation] Since when they were having poor relation, I am unable to find exact equivalent of the word "poor". Since when the Minister and Secretary were having poor relations and why this type of thing was allowed to go on? Could you not replace the secretary or remove the Minister? This is also

one reason.

It has been mentioned further..[English].. which adversely affected the functioning of the Ministry.

[Translation]

Later on, the decision to import sugar was leaked out.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, now this charge stands substantiated that it was done deliberately to benefit the industrialists and traders...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): And some politicians also...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There must be some political leaders who are doing all this. We should not ignore the fact that they are also getting the benefits. Under-assessing of production, improper utilization of stock, improper distribution, lack of coordination, delay in imports of sugar, delay in implementation of the already delayed decision, leaking out the decision abroad resulted in sugar price like in the international market and a muddle involving rupees two thousand and five hundred crores have confirmed the above charge.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, one more thing has come to my notice, the people who had been distributed the sugar—imported from Brazil, have complained that dead or living insects were found in the sugar. A sample was got tested in a laboratory and it has been indicated in the test report that the insects were there in it.

Now, This muddle is taking a new turn. In this regard, our hon'ble Chief Minister has written a letter to the Hon'ble Prime Minister. I would like to quote an extract of that letter. Sir, if you kindly allow me, I can lay it on the table of the House. I have no objection. If I quote it, you would ask for laying it on the table. I am prepared for it. I cannot place the insects on the table but I would like to make the things clear:—

[English]

"Three living insects and 25 dead insects found in 340 grams of sample. Nine living and 73 dead insects found per kilogram of sample".

[Translation]

All these facts give a new dimension to the whole sugar muddle.

MR. SPEAKER, Sir, I demand a discussion in the House on this issue. Now, Shri Vidyacharan Shukla should not stick to the point that the Report will not be laid on the Table of the House and can only be shown to the members in the chamber. In the wake of reply of Shri Shukla, Shri Antony had to resign. Now, the other guilty Ministers must also go. Further is the Hon'ble Prime Minister runs the Government in this manner, he has no right to hold this position any more.

Now the question is, whether the Government would lay the Report on the Table of the House or not? Many serious issues have come up before this House and the democracy. If the Government will be run in this manner and the common man will be made the victim of such

muddles, the Government has no other way but to go. I, therefore, demand that the Government should resign.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House could not transact its business during last two days due to pandemonium during discussion on sugar muddle. Suddenly, there was the news of resignation of Shri Antony. It shook the whole nation; It was clear from the clarification given by the Government in regard to Gyan Prakash Committee that there was lack of coordination between the Ministry of Food and the Ministry of Civil supplies, Consumer Affairs and Public Distribution. Sir, Shri Antony is one of those sincere and honest persons in the political field and government, who have a good image and who reassure us of some way out for this nation. It is clear from his press statement that he had repeatedly informed of about the shortage of sugar. Moreover, he had also warned the Government in all the Cabinet Committee meetings, including those of Cabinet Committee on prices, about this impending loss and shortage of sugar. Despite this, it was stated that the Government had no information in this regard.

Sir, it is evident from the Gyan Prakash Committee's report on which the whole House is full of stir and movement for the last two days that... This report does not go deep into the roots of the muddle. Rather, it reflects shallowness of the probe. This committee has deliberately raised such issues which could protect the real culprit. I mean to say that they are like Bali, Marich, Kaikeyi and manthra who were bent upon harming Rama to serve their vested interests. In the Gyan Prakash Committee Report.... It is clear from this Report that the people like Shri Antony become the culprit, whereas other people like Shri Saifullah go unscathed. It was telecast on Doordarshan that Rs. 2500 crore were involved in this scandal. The Cabinet Secretary says that he has sent written report of every committee to the Hon'ble Prime Minister. The Hon'ble Food Minister, Shri Kalpnath Rai is sitting here. He has been claiming that there would be no shortage of sugar. However, he suspended those persons who were responsible for importing sugar. It is still to be provided whether he took the right or wrong step. He has been sitting here quietly for the last two or three days. He is entangled in a crisis. The Government is trying to escape from this situation by taking the plea of earlier convention, secrecy and administrative nature of the report. However, the resignation of Shri Antony clearly indicated that though everybody talks of voice of conscience yet nobody hears to it. There is no conscience but the voice behind it is the real one. Why did Shri Antony resign? He resigned because no notice was taken of his warning. Those who were responsible for the scam could not even be detected by the Gyan Prakash Committee. They simply chime on a point that there was lack of coordination. whose fault was it? the whole fault lies with the Government and particularly with the Hon'ble Prime Minister. That is why we have been insisting on laying of the Report on the Table of the House. we already know that there is nothing to get from this report. Through this Report we want to detect the real culprit. We are well aware that these Cabinet Committees have been constituted by the Prime Minister and headed by him. The Secretary, who deals with the pricing or

determines the scarcity of items has clearly stated that all the dates can be seen by the Members. He had also informed the Hon'ble Prime Minister of impending scarcity and it was the overall responsibility of the Chairman of STC to import sugar. The Cabinet Secretary as well as Shri Antony had also been informing the Hon'ble Prime Minister of this crisis. Then why this delay? The sugar was imported on higher rates.

It appears to me that the Government by delaying its decision and leaking out the news from here has helped the prices increase in international market. Therefore, functions of all the committees create suspicion in our minds. This has been done in connivance with higher ups and as a result, loss of Rs. 2500/- crore has to be borne by the Government. So far as the question of coordination is concerned, Shri Antony warned the Government time and again, I know Shri Antony as a good person. I did not even talk to him. What he has said is true. Shri Gyan Prakash has not given the correct report. He has rather diverted the report. The Government has given a statement based on this report. However, later on they were shocked to see that the report has not gone into the truth. It is because of this fact that Shri Antony resigned. I would like to know whether he want to give a statement here or not. The nation is being kept in the dark. We have been demanding that the Report should be laid on the table of the House but it has not been done so far. The things could have become more clear during these two days. Perhaps, Shri Antony had not been constrained to resign, rather the real culprit had resigned by now. Will the Government give a statement on the resignation of Shri Antony alongwith the reasons therefore?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the opposition has said one thing last evening that Gyan Prakash Report will help apprehending the guilty persons.

We would be able to unearth the scam involving Rs. 25 crore....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I Will make them read to understand that.

[English]

Speaker is not entitled to pressurise.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura) : I am not saying it to you. Through you, I am saying it to the Government that in front of you we have stepped down. We had asked them to lay it on the Table of the House and then Shuklaji had said that there were 2-3 ways and one way out was to keep it in the Library. The entire opposition was agreed to that it should be kept in the Library....(Interruptions) The report should be made public ...(Interruptions) He was asked to sit here and do something to divert the attention of the people in such a way so as to make them think that the report has been made public and the guilty have been identified and 1-2 people would be made scapegoats.

Kalpnathji is sitting here and nodding at anything said by us or others. Credibility plays an important role in

politics. The loss of credibility pushes everything else out. We have been having *in camera* discussion for several days, the report of the Gyan Prakash Committee is not being tabled and the debate is not coming to an end. Allegations have been levelled against not Antony along but against you also that you did not coordinate. But you are staying put and keeping mum and still ensconced on this post...(Interruptions)

SHRI VIRENDRA SINGH (Mirzapur) : Kalpnath Rai has already said in this House that he is innocent...(Interruptions)... Sharadji is saying that his guilt is being established but he has already said that he is innocent in that case, please tell us who is innocent and who is guilty.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : I have not said it. Kalpnathji is our old colleague and I want that he should be absolved of all allegations. Whether he remains on the post of Minister or not, he must save his reputation as did Antonyji as having a good reputation is an important matter.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Balai) : He is definitely a Minister. The resignation tendered by him is yet to be accepted and he is still in the House.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : But he is not that kind of man, he is determined...(Interruptions)... You mean to say that if he can come then it is alright...(Interruptions)... But Kalpnathji, you are a permanent Member of this House. I am finding it difficult to understand that you have reached that place after taking pains, you were speaking from this side only. If there no cultural ethic of this side left in you?... (Interruptions) Why have you become silent all of a sudden? I have not seen you like that before that you are not willing to say anything...(Interruptions).

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : If nobody is willing to say that it is not correct, everytime I should not say that it is correct or not... (Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA : Sir, I have a point of order. We should be relevant on these matters. We are not discussing Shri Kalpnath Rai. We are discussing the reply given to an Unstarred Question and in that reply certain points have been made by hon. Shri Vajpayee. Shri Sharad Yadav is completely entitled to make those points. But, to debate like that and try to provoke people in this manner, I do not think, is in keeping with the dignity of this House.

MR. SPEAKER : I uphold your point. This kind of argument should not be advanced in the House.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to tell Shuklaji that he is not a child so as to get provoked by something I say. He is a wise person but when you have also agreed with Shuklaji then I would put an end to it. I wanted to talk to Kalpnath Rai ji, but, O.K. I will do it later outside the House.

MR. SPEAKER : I can only see that if you also start speaking then even you will not be spared. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : It is good that you have

understood my wish. I only want to submit that the report of the Gian Prakash Committee is very important and has become the talk of the town in our country. This topic has generated more interest because a cabinet Minister has resigned in this context...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : One more point. We are criticising the gentleman who has enquired into it and he is not able to defend himself. I do not know whether it is correct.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I strongly feel that our demand regarding the report of the Gian Prakash Committee has been justified. In order to ensure that the whole House and the country get to the root of this matter. I would again like to ask Shuklaji and the Government to keep the report in the Library which he was willing to keep in the Chamber. We also want that this discussion which has only touched the tip of the iceberg should touch its root and bring out all facts.

The Cabinet Secretary is saying one thing and Antonyji is saying another. We believe what they say, that is why, we want that this report should be kept in the Library. Now the Government should not come in the way of unearthing such a big scam that has taken place in our country.

With these words I repeat that the Government should keep this report in the Library. This is the demand of the entire opposition to ensure that the whole country becomes aware of the facts.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Rawaleji, I am going to allow your issue. I am not going to adjourn the House before it is completed. Let this be continued and completed. Shri Indrajit Gupta may speak now. I will let others speak and then allow you to speak.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the last two days the Opposition has been trying—unsuccessfully so far—to persuade the Government and the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to lay, or to make available to the House, the Gian Prakash Committee's Report. I am obliged, or grateful I should say, to Shri Antony for the step which he has taken, not only because it shows that he is an honourable man, a man of honesty and a man of principle but because his act of resignation, in these circumstances, has helped us and will help you and held the whole country to get at the real truth of the matter.

Now we are in a difficulty. We have two conflicting versions before us.

We have a report which has been summarised in the reply to Unstarred Question which says clearly or imputes quite clearly that the hon. Minister of Civil Supplies was guilty of dereliction of duty in so far as he was not keeping the Prime Minister or the Prime Minister's Office regularly informed about the question of sugar import, prices of sugar and so on and we have, on the other hand, a statement categorically made by Mr. Antony—who, till yesterday, was a member of the Cabinet—that this is a false imputation and it is a false allegation and that he was very

much surprised to read what had been put there in that reply to the question. He has stated quite categorically that he was regularly keeping the Prime Minister's Office informed about these matters which, it was his duty to do. Now, both of them cannot be speaking the truth; either what Mr. Gian Prakash has stated in his report, if it has been correctly summarised in the reply to the Question, is correct or what Mr. Antony is saying and on the basis of which he has gone so far as to resign, that is correct.

Sir, what are we to do now? you may say that it is no business of yours. This is what Mr. Shukla meant by saying that this is an administrative matter. Administrative report means that what is going on inside the Government, the dealings within the Government by the Ministers, by the Departments, by the Officers, by the Secretaries, all these matters are lumped together under the omnibus title of "administrative matters" and this Committee deals with that and therefore, the report cannot be laid.

We were also told that there is some difficulty in giving the report because certain officers and the people who had given evidence would not like to be named and not like their identity to be divulged. But now, after what has happened yesterday, when we look again and read carefully the reply given by Mr. Bhuvanesh Chaturvedi to this question, it appears that something quite different has been happening and Mr. Shukla was, no doubt, aware of the contents of the reply which was going to be made to that question. I cannot take it that he was ignorant of that. He knew that this was going to be said in that reply and obviously, a Minister who has been misrepresented, wrongly charged, falsely accused, if he is a man of principle and of honour he is not going to keep quiet. Therefore, as Mr. Antony has said, on grounds of his own conscience and because of revealing the truth he has resigned.

Now, what do we do? What is the credibility left of this Gian Prakash Committee's Report? I would like to know that. If he can make an allegation like that which, I think you will agree, Sir, can be taken now to be false allegation, it has led to the exit from the Cabinet of a prominent Minister. If such a thing can be there in the Report, then what can we believe about the other things which may be there in the Report? If such a falsehood can be indulged in, then so many other things may be there in the Report. We have not seen the Report; we do not know what is in it. But about the other people, other Ministers' other Secretaries and Officers there may be so many things there which are also not correct, which are not true. I do not understand what is Mr. Shukla's anxiety now to keep this Report secret that it should not be revealed.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has never been my case that I want to keep this report secret. I have been misrepresented in the open House. I never said that we want to keep this Report secret.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Then, why is this fuss which is going on for two days?

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: The only thing is, we would like this Report to be discussed. After the hon. leaders, who represent their Party Members, see this Report and have a statement from the Government we can

discuss it. There is no Question of secrecy and there is no question of suppression. It is a matter of procedure. I am suggesting a certain procedure and the hon. leaders are suggesting certain other procedure. That is the only difference and no fuss is being made.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, I do not want to take up more time of the House.

As to the other matters which the report may have brought to light, some of which Mr. Vajpayee has referred to about the way that the Government was functioning or not functioning and which I agree with him-by itself constitutes a complete indictment of the Government, really, it will shake the confidence of the people in this country, if they come to know that the Government which is dealing in this manner with such sensitive and essential commodities which are vital to the day-to-day life of the people. If this is the way the Government functions with total lack of coordination, total lack of any procedures which are to be followed by different Departments responsible, each having its own outlook and its own narrow departmental outlook, giving wrong figures, inflated figures and false figures to lull the public into some false feeling of confidence and complacency, I think this is criminal. Those things are enough. That is a charge-sheet, really a charge sheet against the Government, if that is the way the Government functions. So, if we get the report-I do not know if we are going to get it or not-but that report would certainly reveal fully the misbehavior, I should say, of the Government in this sphere and also point out the great danger which exists. Unless these things are rectified, radically rectified, such disasters may recur over and over again. I call it a disaster. Nobody, now-a-days, you see, is bothered about thousands of crores of rupees going down the drain. People are getting so used to it, nobody is bothered. Therefore, Sir, public has to pay for it, the poor man had to pay, he is still paying for it. The price of sugar which went up, never came down again to what it was before this crisis was foisted on the country. So, who has gained? Somebody has gained. We must know who has gained. Whether they are big sugar mill owners who have gained, or the wholesale sugar traders who have gained or certain political patrons of these people who have gained, should not the people know? Should not the country know?

So, I think that Mr. Antony has taken a step which not only vindicates his own honour and his personal honesty but it will help us to see and to judge objectively what is the worth of a report like Gian Prakash Committee Report.

Sir, now, before I sit down I would only request Mr. Shukla once again that for goodness sake please give up this kind of, what should I call it, I do not know, it is not rigidity-gymnastical and acrobatical sort of exercise--"I can put it in your Chamber; I can put it in the Library, but I will not put it here; First the leaders can go and see it. If that is not enough, all Members can go and see. If it is put in the Library then the Press can also have access to it". Then what are you trying to dodge? I am not able to understand. Why should Parliament be treated like this?

Now, at least after what has come to light, why should not the report be made available in any form you like?

Copies can be given or it can be laid on the Table. We do not mind. But we must have a full and unrestricted access to that report. We means, not only the Members of this House, it means the public also. The public interest has been injured gravely and the public must know what is happening. Now, if you have still got some point about that question of not divulging all names and so on, you can think about it and tell us. We will consider it, though now it is very difficult for us to agree to the concealment of identities and names of people who have behaved in this manner.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: I do not have anything to conceal.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, I wish the Prime Minister was also here. Because I believe, from what I know, that the Prime Minister has got very high regard for Mr. Antony's honesty and his truthfulness and certainly I do not know that he would be happy about this that out of all the Ministers in the Council of Ministers only this one man resigns; he feels that it is his moral conscience and duty to resign. Everybody else remains staying put as they were. Nobody else is bothered about it. Then if such people are there, such thick skinned people are there, well it is up to the Prime Minister, of course, he is the captain of the team, he will have to decide what action to take and what to do. But as far as we are concerned, Sir, we insist that this report must be made available in full, *in toto* to the Members of this House.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I agree with the attitude of Shri Sharad Yadav regarding the question raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition. His language is different and I cannot use that language. But there are two points which deserve attention. First, the resignation tendered by Antonyji, he has just mentioned that whatever has been said about him is not correct. He repeatedly told the cabinet, as to what was the actual position of the availability of sugar and what was the extent of shortage. Secondly, last time when Shri Kalpnath Rai had spoken here he had also said that they had repeatedly informed the Cabinet that there would be shortage of sugar for public distribution system and that would need to import sugar to meet the demand so sugar should be imported. Thirdly, Atalji and the Cabinet Secretary said that they had apprised the Prime Minister of the latest position on several occasions that there would be shortage of sugar. There are three such statements. While another report says that there was lack of coordination and that the Cabinet as well as the hon. Prime Minister did not know it. It has also been said that the Cabinet Committee on Prices should also hold a discussion on that.

Sir, from whatever information we have regarding the parliamentary system we know that if a report is submitted by a committee then Cabinet may not be knowing it but the Prime Minister is aware of it. To say that the Prime Minister did not know is beyond comprehension. That is why what Shri Sharad Yadav has said that makes it more suspicious. In this Report efforts are made to defend somebody who is at the root of this Scam and who wants to suppress all facts. The statements made by the then

Cabinet Secretary, our Minister of Food and our Minister of Civil Supplies, Consumer Affairs and Public Distribution are somewhat different from the opinion of the Gian Prakash Committee. That is why we do not criticise it as it happens to be a correct question but their intention is not wholly honest and they do not come out with the facts.

Sir, I would like to submit that on the basis of that Report a Minister has given a statement or replied a question in this House...*(Interruptions)* What is the logic in suppressing that report from the House? For how long can it remain suppressed? If a Member wants it to be laid in the House anytime then how can the House prevent it and for how long it can be suppressed? If somebody takes it to the Press duly authenticated and holds a Press Conference then what will happen. I would like to say to my dear friend, the hon. Minister Vidyacharan Shuklaji that it is high time to change his stance otherwise for how long he wants to be insulted and to make a mockery of the parliamentary system. If you get the report of that Committee laid on the table then several people would be spared the plight of tendering resignations. But if there is a fear of their resigning *en masse* then of course you can suppress it. The only reason behind not tabling the report seems to be the fear of the probable accusing finger pointing towards them forcing the whole cabinet to resign. I am saying it with full responsibility that if once the report of the Cabinet Committee on Prices is submitted then if the Prime Minister Office or the hon. Prime Minister himself says it that they were in the dark about it then neither anybody in this country nor anybody in the world would accept it. Sir, that is why, as this matter is very serious so we should take action in view of its seriousness. If we go on like this in the House then it would be against the dignity of the House. The report of the committee will be out and it will disclose many facts. Your image will be further tainted though I am not worried about that but it is going to be a big blow to the parliamentary system. Sir, you must help us in preventing this blow to your parliamentary system. This matter cannot remain hidden for long now. As Shri Chandra Jeet ji has said that the matters are now going to be unearthed so the more you delay it the more tainted is going to be your image.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the outset I would like to congratulate my friend Shri A.K. Antony I do not know who are those Ministers who are going to resign but unless this report is made public even some innocent Ministers might also look guilty to us and the guilty people might be able to let themselves go scot-free. Sir, we can not accept such a situation. I am very sorry to say that the Government in a way has been trying to mislead this House on this matter and the Government is not ready to give up this attempt. As the leader of the opposition party drew the attention to certain points of the reply yesterday, its last line is:

[English]

"It is not considered necessary to place the Report on the Table of the House."

[Translation]

The Sentence before that States:

[English]

"The Committee under the Chairmanship of Cabinet Secretary has been constituted to examine the recommendations made by Gian Prakash. The Committee has been asked to give its Report by 31st December, 1994."

[Translation]

Sir, the Cabinet Secretary has the report in his possession. The whole bureaucracy can read this report. If the report is in the possession of the bureaucrats then neither the guilty persons are harrassed nor the people involved in this entire scandal are defamed. But if the biggest panchayat of the country gets this report in its possession then it poses danger to some people and it is sure to bring defame to certain other people. Nothing can be more insulting for this House then this logic put forth by the Government. That is why, Sir, when this matter is in your hands in any form and no matter whatever you say about this...(interruptions)

[English]

MR SPEAKER: I will made the legal point very clear so that it will not be repeated again and again.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not saying it in that sense. I am talking about the dignity of the House.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday, you were not there. I explained it very clearly.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not talking about that. I am merely saying that it is in your hands to protect the dignity of the House, when the Members of this House are being told that you are not fit to see what the bureaucracy can.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fernandes, the ruling says:

"However, if a Minister declines to lay it on the ground that its production would be inconsistent with the public interest, the Speaker cannot compel the Minister to lay it on the Table of the House."

I made it very clear.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali): They have not claimed that it is in public interest.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The hon. Minister has said that they do not want to hide anything.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You argue between yourselves.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: But this is the question of the dignity of the House and it is in your hands. Whatever decisions are to be taken should be taken by you. But the ministers verbally say that they do not want to hide anything yet this matter is concerned with the dignity of the House that they are ready to show this report to the

leaders but not to the Members of the Parliament. Are the Members of this House in any way different from the leaders?

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: It will be allegedly shown in the Speaker's Chamber.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I therefore would like to urge upon you to make it clear to the Government on this issue that the report should be presented before this House. Though it is another matter whether they accept it or not.

MR. SPEAKER: If I want to say it I will say it but you are asking me that I should say it.

[English]

Let me use my own discretion. I cannot use your discretion.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I can always request you. It is my right.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: There is a procedure, there are rules. One Member, by asking a question, could get all the information. And for two days you are not allowing the House to work without getting any information. If you follow the rules, you will get the information.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, The information that are have received just now is giving birth to all these questions.

MR. SPEAKER: This is what I am saying.

[English]

The rules are there to help you. You search the rules, find the rules, you will get the remedy. But you are not searching the rules, you are just asking someone else to help you. And one Member, By asking one Unstarred Question, got all the information he wanted.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say one more thing.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: On the first day, I said the same thing. If you were so much interested, why did you not ask a question. He asked a question, and got the information.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: From where did you get this information? If the information has been received then there would have been no dispute. My second point on this matter is that Shri Antony resigned then people started commenting on this. The former Cabinet Secretary Shri Saifullah on his behalf publicly discussed the letters sent to the Committee. While discussing he mentioned a couple of things. First of all, he said that whatever documents be had on this matter he has submitted all to the Gian Prakash Committee in the form of making 6 memoranda.

Secondly, he sent the minutes of every meeting of the Cabinet Committee on Prices and Committee of Secretaries to Shri Amamath Verma, the Chief Secretary to the Prime Minister in PMO. On the 15th of December, 1994,

he has said that he did it because it was his responsibility to provide information to the Prime Minister and he has performed this duty of his.

Thirdly, he has said that he sent all the related papers to the Chief secretary to the PM in the PMO at the outset of this dispute. Sir, you have said that the person whose name is being mentioned here and the comments are being made on that report, that particular person is not present here to defend himself. There is one more reason which necessitates the presentation of the report here that a former Cabinet Secretary who is talking to the media that they had provided this particular information to Shri Gian Prakash but in a reply to a question asked yesterday it is stated that

[English]

"The Food Minister, civil Supplies Minister and the Cabinet Secretary did not bring the matter to the notice of the Cabinet or Prime Minister."

[Translation]

Sir, no crime can be bigger than this? The former Cabinet Secretary is saying it publicly today and the newspapers are also reporting that they had furnished all these details. Shri Gian prakashji is saying that it is their finding that the Cabinet and the Prime Minister did not receive any information about the Committees.

[English]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: How can it be?

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: How is the Government functioning, though it is another matter that we also keep ourselves somewhat informed. But when these facts are made public through the report the House gets misled. The country has before it the two kind of opinions. We are discussing it that the report should be placed but the contempt of the House is being committed. The Government are bent on ruining themselves. it is their right and we do not want to deprive them of their right. But if it is somebody's resolution to ruin the whole party in order to protect some people then some bigger questions get raised. Who are they protecting? It is not for Shri Vidyacharan Shukla to decide whether this report should be made public or not? You are saying it at the instance of the Government.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: I have clarified it several times that there is only one reason behind non-tabling of the report.

13.00 hrs.

That the reports of such an administrative Committee, administrative enquiry or Executive enquiry are not laid on the Table of the House. It has nothing to do with me or the Prime Minister. This tradition has been going on since long. I am saying it in accordance to that. There is no other reason for that. Please try to understand it.

[English]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): This is not an administrative enquiry. Please do not treat this Report as an ordinary Report.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad to know that Shri Shukla ji has admitted that not to lay such a report in the Table of the House in their old

tradition. Then you should get up now and hold a press conference and make it public and we will lay it here duly authenticated. There is a solution to all your problems. I am taking you by your word. So why do you get entangled in web of wordy logics? Please go and hold a press conference and let us start our work. Why are you obstructing the proceedings of the House. If it your intention not to let House go on with its business? Sir, I would like to say the present role of the Government in this House is backed by the decision of the Prime Minister. That is why we want to know it.

[English]

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, this is wrong. The Prime Minister has nothing to do with all these things here, what is happening in the House. I have quoted an incident, a tradition, a matter which is followed in our House consistently. I have been repeating it time and again and it has nothing to do with the individuals. We are only upholding a tradition which is going on since 1952. Except that, we are doing nothing else...(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, please refer to Rule 370. It says:

"If, in answer to a question or during a debate, a Minister discloses the advice or opinion given to him by any officer of the Government or by any other person or authority, he shall ordinarily lay the relevant document or parts of document containing that opinion or advice or a summary thereof on the table of the House."

This is Rule 370 which is quite clear. The answer given by Shri Bhuvanesh Chaturvedi was based on the Report submitted by Shri Gian prakasah which is known as the Gian Prakash Committees report. Under the rule, the Minister is obliged ordinarily to lay it on the Table of the House. If an extraordinary situation is there, it is only the Speaker who can say that there is an extraordinary situation in which the Minister is not expected to divulge the Report. So, Mr, Speaker, Sir, now the ball is in your court. I never read the Rules. But I have some memory of the past. And, I thought that there was something like this Rule. Now, ordinarily, the Minister is obliged to give that Report to this House. If there is any extraordinary situation, it depends upon the Presiding Officer, upon you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, to say whether there is involvement of the security of the Nation or anything which is so serious. But saving certain individuals who are indulging in corruption is not an extraordinary situation in which the Government can deny this Report. This is my submission...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I do not know what is the meaning you are attaching to "ordinarily"

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: By "ordinarily", I mean that if there is nothing extraordinary.....

MR. SPEAKER: Where do you read that the Speaker can compel the Minister?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I did not say that you should compel the Minister, Who will decide whether it is an ordinary situation or extraordinary situation?

MR. SPEAKER: I have read out to you that if a document is not being placed on the Table of the House by a Minister, the Speaker will not be compelling him to do

it. If you have read a rule to me, I want to know from which part of this rule you can find out that the Speaker can compel the Government to lay the Report on the Table of the House. Which part of the rule do you cite?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: The Speaker can compel the Government to follow this Rule. If they are not following this Rule, what is the extraordinary situation in which they are not following the Rule? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Explain the reason for it. *(Interruption)*

MR. SPEAKER: Very carefully you have made this point. And you are saying that the Speaker should ask the Government to do it. I will read it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I asked you to let the House know what is the extraordinary position in which they are not doing it.

MR. SPEAKER: You ask him to explain.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I am asking through you, Sir. I cannot ask him directly. That is why I am asking you. That is because I am very conscious of my limitations. I cannot ask them. If I had the authority to ask them, I would have dismissed them by now. It is not my authority. ...*(Interruptions)* I am asking through you that this is the rule.

MR. SPEAKER: That point of order is upheld that you can ask through me.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I am asking through you or Mr. George Fernandes can ask also.

MR. SPEAKER: He can do it.

(Translation)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you we would like to know what is that special circumstance which prevents the report from being tabled; It will be easier if he gives a reply before I complete my speech.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: I have repeatedly cited the reason due to which this report can not be laid on the Table of the House. I have not said that we want to keep it secret or that we do not want to show it to the hon. Members. I am merely saying that this report cannot be tabled and there is no other reason for keeping it secret. As has been said that a synopsis of this report has been furnished on the basis of a written question in Lok Sabha and the hon. Members are free to see it in my Chamber as and when they desire. This will clear several doubts. There will be a detailed statement on behalf of the Government. We want that the entire public of this country should understand it that a confounding situation is being attempted to create. This needs to be cleared. That is why I want an immediate debate on this matter.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I only have to say that the reply given by the hon. Minister is meaningless. They are saying the same thing that is why I will not go into any dispute. But I would like to say that if a state of doubt is being created, it is being created by you...*(Interruptions)*

(English)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I am not saying this lightly. If the rule is there and if rule is followed by the Government, this is the responsibility of the Speaker. You cannot say, "you should ask the Minister."

(Translation)

MR. SPEAKER: This is what I have asked you. I have asked you as to which part of the rule says that a Speaker can do it.

(English)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: The rule says that the Government should follow this rule.

MR. SPEAKER: Ordinarily.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: If the Government does not follow, then what?

MR. SPEAKER: Ordinarily, if they do not follow, that is their discretion. This is exactly what I read out yesterday. I will again repeat it to you. I will explain to you. Yesterday I made it very clear.

"Most of the documents are required to be laid under the statutory or constitutional provisions or in pursuance of the Rules of Procedure and Directions of the Speaker. In respect of other documents, the Ministers have to use their judgement whether to place a paper on the Table or not or when it is for the Government to decide whether the Report of a departmental Committee or any particular Committee should be laid on the Table. The Speaker has declined to give any direction to the Government whenever requests by Members suggesting the laying of such a report has been made to him. And again, however, if a Minister declines to lay it on the ground that its production could be inconsistent to the public interest, the Speaker cannot compel the Minister to lay it on the Table."

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Sir, what you have read in that is if it is according to the Constitution and according to the Rules...*(Interruption)*

MR. SPEAKER: No, yesterday I made it very clear. If it is a document it has to be laid on the Table of the House according to the Constitution, I can tell them that this is the Constitutional provision and you do it. If there is a document which has to be laid according to the Statute, I can compel them. Now, if there is a document according to the Rules, I can compel them and if the discretion is given to the Government to decide whether to lay it or not, I cannot compel them.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): No, Sir. But, it is under the Rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The word 'Ordinary' is given.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: The last line says that if the Minister declines to give the Report citing public interest as the ground for not laying it, then you cannot compel him to lay it. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please understand. You please sit down.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: What is the last line?

MR. SPEAKER: I am saying what I have read to you. Now, you please understand. Even without Rules if the Speaker thinks that it is to be done, he can give the direction. But, I am telling you that this is a provision.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Please, if you consult the last line...

MR. SPEAKER: Now, you are questioning me which should not be done. Even then I ask you to sit down. I will explain to you the position. The position taken by the Government is that the Report will be shown to the Leaders; the Report will be shown to the Members and there will be a debate. When the debate is there and a statement is made by the Government which is contrary to the Report, those Members who have seen it can explain that this is not in the Report and they would say that this is in the Report. If that kind of a situation arises then the Government has to prove that what they are saying is correct. Now, we are fighting with the shadow. Now the Report is going to be available to all the Leaders. It is going to be available to all the Members. You are going to have it. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: The Report will not be available.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the Report is to be available to all the Members and to all the Leaders. They are going to make a statement. There is going to be a debate. What are you fighting for?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: The Report will be made available to all the Members. Now the trend is developing in this House that when you cannot own your own do it, you try to take the help of the Speaker. You should be on your own. You argue through yourselves with the help of books. Why are you asking the Speaker to intervene in it? If the Speaker feels like intervening on his own, he will do it. But, why should you ask me. You be on your own.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as you said just now that

[English]

The report will be made available to all the Members.

[Translation]

Please do not drag the matter any further, if the hon. Minister is ready to make the report available to every Member.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I would like to request the hon. Members to listen to the hon. Speaker carefully. He said that. *[English]* it will be made available to every body.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: The report will be made available to all the Members.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir as you have said that *[English]* the report will be made available to all the Hon'ble Memers

[Translation]

If the Hon'ble Minister is willing to make report available to all the Members *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Please appreciate the difference in connotation between the words 'seen' and 'made available'.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: That is right but Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will only conclude that it is indicative of a direct apprehension of the Government's intention. The

Government has malafide intentions and I allege that it is under Prime Minister's direction that this report is being presented in the House.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: It is totally untrue.

[English]

I strongly refute that. I do not agree to it.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The Hon'be Prime Minister is the leader of the House. He is a pivotal person in the Government. The whole Cabinet Functions at his pleasure and you say that the Prime Minister has no hand in it. You want to run the House as per the rules. The House remained adjourned for the past two days and now this matter is being debated here today.

Divergent views are being presented before the country. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I demand that the report should be made available and if this treatment is being meted out to the report then we demand that the Prime Minister should relinquish the office so that his party is saved even at the cost of his Government. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Well, you are very much concerned about saving our party *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Is not this report being brought before the house on the instructions of the Prime Minister? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Mr. Speaker, Sir I have said umpted times that we do not favour the violation of our conventions.

I would like to made one thing clear. Please listen carefully. I do not want to repeat it time and again. This convention was observed during the premiership of Shri Morarji Desai, of Shri Charan Singh and Shri Vishvanath Pratap Singh as well. This convention was never violated by any Government of any party and I do not want it should be violated now. This convention has been established and maintained as a healthy practice. Therefore, no endeavour should be made to violate it. We are not at all ready to violate it.

[English]

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (May Madaturai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wonder what the opposition is frightened about. Why are they frightened of needing the Gian Prakash Committee Report? The Government of India has offered to make the entire Report available without any amendment, without any censorship, without even preventing the disclosure of the names of the officials concerned to the attention of firstly every single Member of this House and secondly to the Leaders of the parties in this House through whom I have no doubt at all that the entire Press and the entire country will get to know exactly what is written in that Report.

We are inviting a discussion substantively on all these issues. This whole attempt by us to have the Gian Prakash Committee Report discussed here has been held up for two days owing to the fuss made by Shri Indrajit Gupta and his friends, owing to the totally adamant obstinacy of the Opposition in saying that unless a procedure recommended by them which is against the traditions of this House is observed, they are not even willing to enter into your Chamber and read the Report which is going to be made available to them. I

strongly object to my rights as a Member of this House being abridged in discussing the Gian Prakash Committee Report. Everyone of us here wants to discuss it. We are being prevented from discussing it only because the Opposition is insisting on a procedure of having access to the Report which, as Shri Indrajit Gupta said yesterday, is, in substance, no different to the procedure that is being recommended by us. So I would plead with my friends in the Opposition to give all of us an opportunity of seeing the Report and get on with the discussion on the substantive aspects.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Today we have two demands. The first is to place the Report in such a way that the public can have the knowledge of the Report of Gian Prakash Committee.

That cannot be done if it is placed in the Chamber. If it is placed in the Library we have no objection or if you like to place it on the Table of the House, which should be done ethically, because on the basis of the report a Cabinet Minister has resigned and a crisis has developed and so many other Ministers are offering their resignations—I do not know on what ground. So, it is a public matter and the whole Government is scandalized. On the basis of the report,.....(Interruptions) Yes, the trickles have come. It is not only a financial scandal. It is a thoroughly administrative scandal. This is what the statement that was submitted yesterday proved on account of that fact. Now, the point is, in this report, contrary to the impression given that it contains the whole of the truth, we find that it contains half-truth.....(Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: Without seeing the report, how can he comment on it?(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: I cannot ask somebody, who is not a Member of this House, who has no authority in this country, who was of former designation. I trust a Member of the other House, who has been in the Government. He says that he has been wrongly charged and we have a right to know. Now, today, in this House that report must come, Mr. Antony must come and give the statement. Both things must be read and heard and then we take a decision. No further committee is also required. We have enough commonsense to go into the depth of the matter. There is a conspiracy going on. I am not to impute any motive or attribute any motive on Mr. Gian Prakash, how he was selected and why he was selected. But we are surprised to see that you are afraid and we are also afraid that when Mr. Sharad Yadav goes on saying certain things, then some Minister will be provoked. Why is this good act of Mr. Antony not inspiring many, who are indicted by many Committees? They are sitting tight.....(Interruptions) If Mr. Antony has done something good, we appreciate that and if others, who are also named in many reports and in the Gian Prakash Report also do not follow him, then they must be thrown out. There is no other option but to throw them out if we want to save democracy and the nation.....(Interruptions)

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Gobichettipalayam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a new and serious situation has arisen out of the resignation of Mr. Antony. Mr. Antony says before the press that has acted on the dictates of his

conscience.....(Interruptions) We feel that the image of Mr. Antony has gone up, but the Minister who is directly concerned in this issue must follow suit in the interest of healthy Parliamentary conventions. There is no valid reason for the Government for not tabling the Report.....(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Be careful. What do you do in your Assembly? You find out from your Chief Minister what is being done in your Assembly.....(Interruptions)

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN: The Government cannot take shelter under the administrative report.....(Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: We must have the.....(Interruptions)

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN: He is deviating from the issue, Sir..... (Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: We want him to follow the same procedure here, as is followed in the.....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar, that kind of a demand cannot be made here, in this House.

.....(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Any reference to the Tamil Nadu Assembly should be deleted, Sir..... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I agree with you.

.....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It can be done there, but not here.

.....(Interruption)...

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN: The Government cannot take shelter under the pretext of its being an administrative report because, I submit, the Gian Prakash Report is not an administrative report at all because a departmental enquiry or administrative enquiry means that it should be instituted under a sitting Government servant. But the case of Gian Prakash Committee is entirely different. He has been brought from outside. Moreover, the Committee has been constituted on the promise and on the assurance given by the Government on the floor of the House. So, in that case, it becomes the property of the House. When it becomes the property of the House, the Government has no right to withhold the report. It must be tabled for the personal of the House.

[Translation]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Sheohar): Mr. Speaker, Sir I will take just two minutes. Yesterday, you asked us to be precise.

MR. SPEAKER: I said so with your throat in mind.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: I had suggested yesterday and I was reminding the Hon'ble Parliamentary Affairs Minister, Shri Vidyacharan Shukla of the Licence scandal that took place 20 years ago. The same situation had repeated itself then that time. the C.B.I.'s enquiry

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

report was placed in the Library. I can't understand why he is not reminded of that situation.

But I would like to make another point. I was carefully listening to the comment of our learned friend Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar made about Shri Indrajit Gupta. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have not come to this House so that the country's the Parliament's supreme person should be.....

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: This is very bad.

[English]

It cannot be allowed in this House. He cannot do that

[Translation]

He cannot speak like that.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I will not allow one Member to abuse the other Member. Otherwise, they will also start abusing like that.....(Interruptions) That statement goes off the record.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH:

[English]

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: peaker, Sir, he is abusing one hon. Member. He is using foul language here. What kind of a behaviour is this?(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It goes off the record.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: You are a great scholar of Parliamentary practice. You are the first Minister who.....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: Sir, I will take only one minute.

MR. SPEAKER: How much time will you take? One minute! It is very good.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, I will submit to you in all humility that it is not enough to only take it off the record. The hon. Member who used foul and abusive language against a sitting colleague here, should apologise to the House and to the Member.....(Interruptions) This is necessary. Otherwise, this kind of a thing will go on. This is not proper. Sir, I will request you to do this.

[Translation]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: You are teaching me practice.....(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Hari Kishoreji, please do not prolong it too much. If you abuse any other Member, it becomes a matter of privilege. Be careful about it. I have tried to deal with it in a proper manner.

(Interruptions)

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: I am prepared to face the consequences.....(Interruptions) I am prepared to face

the consequence. I would like to remind the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs.....(Interruptions)

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): Sir, he is saying that he is prepared to face the consequences; and we are prepared to see that he is taken to the consequences. Sir, we will move a motion. This is not the way in which he can take the House for a ride. This is not the way.....(Interruptions) This is the most abusive manner in which a Member is behaving in this House. He has to apologise. Hon. Parliamentary Affairs Minister has demanded an apology and we demand that he should apologise to the House. The hon. Member is saying that he is prepared to face the consequences; and we are prepared to see that he is taken to the consequences. This is not the way in which he can behave in the House. This is not way in which he can talk to the Members.....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Hari Kishoreji, you should make some amends please.

[Translation]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: I will obey your any order meant to protect the dignity of Parliamentary convention. But.....(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Hari Kshoreji, you should express regrets; that is all.

[Translation]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: If the dignity of the supreme Parliamentarian is injured then.....(Interruptions) I am speaking this from the depths of my heart.....(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not do it like that.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Kindly warn Shri Mani Shankar Aiyarji also against using such a language again and again.

[English]

In Congress Party, there are other hon. Members also. Why should only Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar do like this always?(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not prolong it. Mr. Hari Kishoreji, my request to you is this. Please hear me properly. My request to you is—mark my words—you should express your regrets.

otherwise, due procedure will follow.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Hari Kishore Singh, before you

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

say anything, you carefully mark the words I am using. I am requesting you to express the regret. If you do not do it, due procedure will follow.

.....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am also an elected representative of the Bharatiya Janata Party in this House. The people have certain expectations from me. Such incidents will hurt their sentiments. While expressing my opinion, sometimes I get agitated. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not get agitated deliberately....Nor do I intend to hurt the feelings of any hon. Member. Therefore, please make them understand that the issue should not be pursued further.....(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel sorry. I express my regret.....(Interruptions)...Please just listen to me or are you not prepared to hear me?

MR. SPEAKER: All right.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: I am of the view that there can be a heated discussion in the House which can create bitterness, but such a word hurts not only the sentiments of an hon. Member but also erodes the dignity of the House. I am of the opinion that Shri Hari Kishore Singh should not have used that word. In my opinion it is an unparliamentary word.....(Interruptions) You please observe silence. I am speaking at the moment.

In my opinion it is unparliamentary to term an hon. Member of Parliament as..... Why I am saying that.....(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: It will go off the record.

.....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I think, Mr. Chandra Jeet Yadav very graciously has tried to solve the problem. As he happens to be a senior Member of the House and a leader of the Party, it would have been proper for Mr. Hari Kishore Singh to express regret here. He has not done so. I think that he is not doing well. I warn Mr. Hari Kishoreji not to use this kind of words in future in the House. He has done it twice. Third time, he will not be excused.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, may I make a submission?

MR. SPEAKER: My warning is more than enough. It is a sort of punishment.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, an expression of regret-when the Member is present cannot be made on his behalf. My humble submission to you is that when the hon. Members, who has violated the sanctity of this House is present here, it is not for his leader to express the regret.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: My warning is a sort of punishment.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: There is another

point. The hon. leader of his group in his thoughtfulness repeated the abuse himself. That should also be expunged.

MR. SPEAKER: That has gone out of record.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: What language Mr. Hari Kishore has used should also go off the record.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already said that.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: In your kindness, Sir, if you want to do this chapter, I would have no objection. But this kind of a thing should not be repeated.

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY (Jagatsinghpur): Sir, I want to ask the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that if Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar can use these type of words...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar has not used a single unparliamentary word.

You please sit down.

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY: He has used 'obstinacy' word. Please see the record. He could have said in a different way.

MR. SPEAKER: That is different. That is a procedural matter.

.....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: These are just side issues. Why are you taking side issues?

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you were good enough to quote from 'Kaul & Shakhder' even just few minutes before also.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I do not want any commentary on my ruling. I would not be able to give the ruling at all in the House if everybody will be commenting on it every time.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: Sir, I am not commenting on. I only want to say that the rule does not apply to a document which is stated by the Minister to be of such a nature that its disclosure would be inconsistent with public interest. What I want to say is that the public interest demands its disclosure to be made public in the public interest because now the national interests are not being jeopardised. It is not such a secret document. The document is the result of an enquiry demanded by this House.

The second point which I want to bring to your notice is that day before yesterday the Government was taking a stand that the rules do not permit. But hon. Chandra Shekharji has made it very clear that the rules do not come in the way.

Lastly, in his resignation letter yesterday, hon. Shri A.K. Antony said that the reply given to the Unstarred Question was completely far from truth and he had informed the Prime Minister's Office many a time regarding the shortage of sugar that was going to accrue and the need to import sugar.

Keeping in view these facts, we demand, definitely, that the Report should be placed at least in the Parliament

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

Library to make all of us to go through that....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have already allowed your leader to speak. Every time you are imposing yourself.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Am I imposing myself? One day was wasted due to the continuous pandemonium.

MR. SPEAKER: Why was the pandemonium started?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: The pandemonium was so profound that ultimately the hon. Minister had to resigne.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Paswan, every Member take objection to your rising up again and again. I have not said this thing upto this time. But today you are compelling me to say this thing.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Am I compelling you? I am presenting a document before you. I am not delivering a speech here. Why are you chiding upon me?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Give me a notice then.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, I have given the notice.

MR. SPEAKER: When?

SHRI RAM VIALS PASWAN: Before 10 O' Clock.

MR SPEAKER: I have not received it.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Then it is a mistake of your secretariat.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: If you have given notice, then I am sorry. If you have not given notice, then I will check up.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, first you check up whether you have received my notice or not.

MR. SPEAKER: You should have said that thing.

It is about Zero Hour, not about the Document.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: It is the Zero Hour which is going on.

MR. SPEAKER: No, Please sit down, Mr. Paswan.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, sometimes you lose your temper.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I have to lose the temper, what can I do? I cannot continue doing that. Everybody wants to speak. Everybody objects to your getting up again and again.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Nobody objects Sir, what do you mean to say?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Paswan, you have not given a notice.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, I have given a notice. Zero Hour is going on.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Paswan, you have not given a notice for tabling the document.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have to worry for Mr. Rawale also. You have not given a notice for tabling the document. I am not allowing it.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, I want to make a submission. This is not a Party matter. This is a corruption issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Today, I am not going to allow.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Expunge it! Is it a joke? It relates to corruption. You are taking up other issue. Can't you allow even one minute....(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Paswan, I am at my wits' end. You have said that you have given a notice for tabling the document. Is that right?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Yes Sir, I have given the notice in the morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Where is it?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Please find out from the office.

MR. SPEAKER: The notice that you have given is about Zero Hour. It does not pertain to seeking permission to place a document on the Table.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Please verify it Sir, I too know the procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me see.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: This is too much. It is as though Mr. Paswan alone should speak on everything and no one else need speak on anything.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: How do you say so? We will pursue the issue of corruption to any extent... (Interruptions)

[English]

We will take the issue to the people. Parliament alone is not supreme. We will not allow corruptions... (Interruptions)...Why don't you please read my notice Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I am reading. His notice says:

[Translation]

"The resignation tendered by the Minister of Civil

Supplies Shri A.K. Antony has proved that large scale took place in sugar imports. In spite of this, the Government is not laying the Gyan Prakash Committee's Report on the table of the House. It is, therefore, requested that the issue be allowed to be raised during the Zero Hour."

[English]

This is not a notice for permission to table a document.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Despite that the Government is not laying the report on the table of the House. What is this?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: It is only a notice to raise the matter in the Zero Hour. This is too much. Mr. Paswan, you are going too far.

[Translation]

Shri Paswan ji, this is not so. You always behave like this. This is not good. Just now you stated before the august House that you wanted to present a document on the table of the House and you had given a notice for that. Is it the notice?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: You cannot make me understand in English.

[English]

I have written it in Hindi and you are explaining it in English ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You are going too far. I did read it in Hindi. I will again read it.

[Translation]

"The resignation tendered by the Minister of Civil Supplies has proved that large scale scandal took place in sugar imports. In spite of this, the Government is not laying the report of the Gyan Prakash Committee on the Table of the House. It is, therefore, requested that this issue be allowed to be raised during the Zero Hour".

[English]

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: He sought permission to raise the matter during Zero Hour. He did not give any notice seeking permission to table a document. ...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: You never give me an opportunity to speak.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I object to it. I am very sorry to observe that every time you get up to speak, I am giving you time. But you are misusing the leniency given to you. Now, you are going too far. You think you are the only Member in the House who has got to say something and no one else has anything to say. Mr. Rawle had come to me in a very agitated mood. I made

him to sit down. You just don't care for other members. This thing had happened yesterday. And today also, it is happening again. You have told me that you wanted to table the document on the Table of the House and that you had given the notice. You have not done any such thing. Your notice is to permit you to raise the matter in the Zero Hour. Now, you are contesting it. This is too much.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Please allow me to raise this issue. Only then I will be tabled of the House. ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You complete it and sit down.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I already told you that I would not take more than one minute.

MR. SPEAKER: This is your house and you behave as if nobody else is present here.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: The House is not mine. ...*(Interruptions)* I would like to speak two lines only. First the submission of Shri A.K. Antony has given the testimony of large-scale corruptions involved therein and secondly the hon. Minister has stated it in his reply that the Cabinet Committee on Prices, the Food Minister and the Civil Supplies Minister and the Cabinet Secretary did not bring the matter to the knowledge of the Cabinet and the Prime Minister. I would like to say in this regard that this is totally false. I have the total documents which show that this matter was referred by the Cabinet Secretary to the Prime Minister. I have the complete file thereof. I authenticate it. If you permit, I would like to lay it on the table of the House. This is what I said. The Cabinet Secretary had brought it to the knowledge of the Prime Minister. I have cabinet note, the CCP's Cabinet note with me. ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

AN HON. MEMBER: From where did you get it?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: You cannot ask such a question....*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

If you permit me, I am prepared to authenticate it. Therefore, while quoting the report the hon. Prime Minister has made a false statement and that misleads the House. Only this much is my submission. I would like to point out that minute perusal of the report will put the Prime Minister in the dock. Therefore, if any single person should resign it should be the Prime Minister. I want to submit only this much ...*(Interruptions)*...If permitted, if you allow me I will produce it herein the House; and if not, I will keep it with me.

MR. SPEAKER: You are a very senior member.

[English]

You should know the rules. The rule says that you have to give the notice.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: I have not written before for laying document. That I know.

13.46½ hrs.

RE. NON PAYMENT OF WAGES TO WORKERS OF TEXTILES MILLS IN BOMBAY UNDER NTC CONTROL

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN RAWLE (Bombay South Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I apologise to the House for having wasted 15 minute time of the House during the Question Hour

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I sympathise with you and you please have your time.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN RAWLE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Late Shrimati Indra Gandhi had nationalised mills to ensure job security to the mill workers and also to promote textiles industries. But unfortunately all these mills are running in loss. There are 10 mills in Bombay viz. Jupiter, the Bombay Textiles, the New Hind Mill, the Digvijay, the Bharat Textiles, the Alfisan, the Madhusudan, the Poddar Fabrics, the Kohinoor and the Sitaram mills. It has appeared in every newspaper in Bombay city that 10 thousand labourers have not been paid their salaries for the month of November. It was discussed here. I was on hunger strike to press for the resolution of the problems of NTC. The discussion was held in this House only for two hours. Hon. Sharad Digheji, Surya Kanta Patil and Shastri ji also took part in it. At that time he and Venkat Swamiji had said that according to the industrial Act the payment should have been made within seven days but the salary for the month of November has not been paid as yet. Today the organisations like INTUC, AZTUC, CITU, H.M.S., B.M.S and N.I.O have organised a procession here. The Government wants to give only rupees one crore for 120 mills. The mills of N.T.C are paying rupees one crore only but the Government have been giving rupees three hundred crore to opt out under V.R.S.

Sir, I would like to urge upon the Government that we do not have any objection in modernising these mills but before bringing any resolution in this regard I would like to say that there is urgent need of nationalisation of these mills. Shri Ashok Gehlotji was sitting here but he has gone out now. My submission to him is that the mills of N.T.C. should be nationalised, if it is not done within 15 years then it is there in the rules that these mills will have to be returned to the mill owners. Shri Venkat Swamiji had said to bring a resolution for modernisation but just now he said that no privatisation, no retrenchment whereas he had said that they would bring the resolution for nationalisation. Now the mills, which are closing down need raw material and these can be saved if the working capital is given to them. He has said in the last meeting to bring a resolution in the House in this regard. I urge upon the Government that where is the Bill for nationalisation of Textile mills, as he had made promise to bring it in the House.

Sir, today the mill workers are dying of hunger. The Government can not recover the amount of rupees 5 crore involved in the scam and whether it is unable to give salaries to the mill workers. The bill for electricity was of rupees four thousand and five hundred crores, which the Government did not pay and the electricity supply was to be disconnected due to it. The mill was about to be closed down but we raised this issue and the Government took action on it to restore the electricity supply. I would like to request the Government that to get back wages and back dues a resolution for nationalisation should be brought and rupees 200 crore should be given to the mills running in loss so that these mills can run smoothly. I would not like to repeat what has been said by the Government in this House and Shri Venkat Swamiji that these mills are running in loss on account of the corruption by the General Managers and he has admitted it in the House. I urge upon that Government that we should be informed if the resolution regarding back wages and the back dues is to be brought in the House or not.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is present here, I urge upon him that he should made it clear whether the Bill is to be brought in the House or not. Around 10000 workers have been rendered jobless and they are not getting their wages. I am raising this issue because it is very important issue. There is a difference of two and a half to three rupees in the price of the cloth manufactured in the organised sector and the unorganised sector, while the workers of the unorganised sector get half of the wages as compared to the organised sector workers. The Government should clearly understand that they do not get even that properly. The Government should find a solution to remove this difference.

Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to urge upon the Government through you that if the workers do not get their wages till tomorrow and if the assurance to bring the Bill in this session is not given ... Thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: You should not say so.

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA): Mr. Speaker Sir, will it go on record?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: It is going off the record.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: Sir, I would also like to draw the attention of the Government to the serious problem of the textile workers, particularly the textile workers from Bombay. Today, nearly 10,000 workers from the textile centres spread all over the country have come in 'marcha' to Delhi. They had a meeting here. They also had a delegation which was taken to the Prime Minister. I want to mention two things in this regard.

Firstly, that about 13 taken over mills are not still nationalised. An assurance was given by the Minister concerned in the last Session of the Parliament that a Bill

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.