

Rural Development released a sum of Rs. 37.75 crore at the rate of Rs. 5 lakh to each Member of Parliament from the funds allocated for the implementation of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana during 1993-94. But, during the course of the discussion on the scheme in the Monsoon Session of Parliament it was clarified and many of the Members expressed their difficulty in implementation of this scheme and we have decided to remove those difficulties. After a detailed discussion it was decided that a separate fund will be constituted for implementing this Scheme. Hence, an Ordinance was promulgated and we have provided Rs. 790 crore which has to be borne by the Central Government and these funds are to be released directly to the District Collector. We have already disbursed directly to the District Collectors to execute the work suggested by the Members of Parliament and we have released funds in respect of 533 Lok Sabha Members of Parliament and 214 Rajya Sabha Members of Parliament to the concerned District Collectors for which they have given their option and the entire scheme is monitored by the Ministry of Rural Development. They have already issued guidelines. Regarding the revised guidelines, they are being discussed, and you are also well aware, Sir, that the revised guidelines will be issued shortly. I request the hon. members to pass this Bill.

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not get the reply. It is my submission that the time limit should be extended. As Ram Naikji has told that there is only two-three months time, ahead this amount can not be spent during such a short period... (Interruptions) Besides it the amount of Rs. 1 crore should be raised upto Rs. 2 crore. It should be reviewed. Smooth guidelines should be issued for it and it should be monitored. It will be difficult of this writ petition will be accepted. We have been given an opportunity for the first time to spend the money.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister has told about it precisely. Details will be given. Rs. 2 crore will become a big amount. Do not delay and properly utilise the funds allocated.

DR. CHATTRAPAL SINGH (Bulandshahr): please do make timely arrangement for next year.

MR. SPEAKER: You are a very intelligent Member. You should understand the hint, please do not drag the issue.

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA: Sir, I seek the leave of the House to withdraw my statutory Resolution.

[English]

The Resolution was by leave, withdrawn

MR. SPEAKER: The questions is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Contingency Fund of India Act, 1950, be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: The House shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

The question is :

"That clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Statement by Minister

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title stand part of the Bill."

The Motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKHARA MURTHY: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

16.06 hrs.

[English]

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

(ii) Gyan Prakash Committee Report

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY AND DEPARTMENT OF SPACE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI): A Preliminary Administrative enquiry to ascertain and report to the Prime Minister facts and fix prima facie responsibility for lapses, if any, in dealing with the situation arising out of shortage in availability of sugar in the current season was ordered in July, 1994. The enquiry was entrusted to Shri Gian Prakash, Retired Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

Shri Gian Prakash had submitted his report on 5th October, 1994.

The report has been placed in the Library of Parliament to enable Hon'ble Members to peruse it.

The issues relating to the projections of availability of sugar in 1993-94 and imports to meet the shortage have two major facets. The first one relates to procedures within Government, for dealing with the situation that arose. These are issues having administrative implications. The other facet deals with issues relating to the allegations that the prices paid for import were unduly high and domestic industry was also given unreasonable profits at the cost of the consumer. Motives for deliberately delaying decisions have been imputed and it has been said that some beneficiaries of the inflated import prices have made money at the cost of the country. Similarly, releases were manipulated to jack up prices and allow extra profits to mill owners.

At the outset I have to make it clear that Shri Gian Prakash has conducted a Preliminary Administrative Enquiry and he has not investigated any question regarding lack of integrity on the part of any individual. He has looked at acts of omission and commission while

dealing with a certain situation. His report therefore, identifies the causes of the situation that arose, administrative lapses in handling the situation and he recommends some steps that should be taken to handle similar situations if they arise in future.

In setting up this enquiry the intention was clearly that after Shri Gian Prakash had looked at all the documents and had a chance to discuss matters with different functionaries he would give his views from primarily and administrative angle. That would enable Government to decide on further action.

As Hon'ble Members have become aware of the contents of the Report, it might not be necessary for me to detail them here. The gist of the causes identified by him as leading to the situation are:—

- (i) Unreliable and inflated estimates of sugar production.
- (ii) Mismanagement of available surplus stock and releases.
- (iii) Delay in the decision to import sugar.
- (iv) Delay in implementation of this decision.
- (v) Poor Coordination.

The Report contains recommendations to the following effect:

- (i) An integrated policy on sweeteners—sugar, gur and Khandsari.
- (ii) Maintenance of a buffer stock of sugar.
- (iii) Use of scientific forecasting and estimation methods.
- (iv) Setting up of a Committee of Secretaries to monitor future shortage situations.
- (v) Important decisions to be brought to the notice of PM and referred to CCP/CCEA wherever required under rules.
- (vi) Close monitoring of international commodity markets.
- (vii) A common Ministry with Civil Supplies and Food as separate departments.
- (viii) Code to sort out differences and resolve conflicts between Secretaries.
- (ix) Examination of import and distribution of raw sugar through PDS.
- (x) Import of sugar on OGL with zero duty should be reviewed only if it adversely affects domestic production.

A Committee under the Chairmanship of Cabinet Secretary with Finance Secretary, Commerce Secretary, Secretary, Civil Supplies, Secretary, Agriculture and Secretary, Food has been set up to examine in details these recommendations. The report is to be presented by 31.12.94. Government will take a decision thereafter.

The Report has also identified administrative lapses in handling the situation. The points made are being examined in greater detail, where necessary, by obtaining

comments of persons concerned. After the exercise has been completed suitable action will be taken.

The Report as has been stated earlier, does not investigate any issues of loss and lack of integrity. There is reference in the report to delay in the decision to import having been responsible for higher prices as with loss of time imports were made at higher prices. Lack of confidentiality of deliberations/decisions regarding imports is also said to have raised the international prices leading to avoidable increase in import costs. Similarly in respect of domestic industry there is reference to unjustified reduction in releases even when prices were rising thus fuelling further increase of prices. The extra margin benefited only the millowners. While the administrative implications of these matters have been gone into, the report does not mention any matter that would create any suspicion of malafides on the part of any one.

It is alleged that the report has been manipulated by certain Ministries and the PMO. It may be submitted that the enquiry was entrusted to Shri Gian Prakash, ex-Comptroller and Auditor General of India, who had circulated a questionnaire to the concerned Ministries and organizations to ascertain the facts regarding the sugar situation. The replies received by Shri Gian Prakash from various Ministries and organizations are available. It would not be fair to say an officer of the stature of Comptroller and Auditor General has been influenced to manipulate the report. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you to make the points one after another. If all of you stand up, it is difficult for us to hear.

Now, Shri Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must state my deepest disappointment and dissatisfaction with yet another cover up, which is called 'a Statement from this Government'.

This covers up, unfortunately, even the functional inefficiency. The critical page wherein everyone is cleared of all wrong-doings is not even circulated to us. Every single point that has been made by Shri Gian Prakash, whatever may be the other merits or demerits of that Report be, is rebutted here.

Since the beginning of October, this Report has been lying in the portals of this Government; and from the beginning of October, till almost Christmas, for almost three months, all that this Government has to say 'these four unsatisfactory pages of cover up'. This is, Sir, in the name of a statement of reaction from the Government. This is highly unsatisfactory; and in most unequivocal terms, I certainly reject it.

Secondly, I seek your observation as to why deliberately the fifth page which is the significant page in which everybody has been absolved, has not been shared with the rest of us.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is nothing but an absolutely clumsy effort to indulge in what I call, 'banalities' and an effort to try to cover up very important issues. Very significantly, nothing

has been — not any portion of the report—rejected by the Government. This Report has been available with the Government since October. Sir, the statement tries to project that nobody has been found guilty of any *mala fide*. But, administratively the matter has been gone into and this finding has not been disputed. I am quoting:

"It is thus clear that by opposing imports in every forum and showing least concern when prices were rising rapidly, by reducing releases at the crucial time and above all, by these ill-conceived statements issued from time to time, justifying rise in prices with a view to make sugar industry more profitable, it was the Food Minister who was entirely responsible for the sugar crisis."

This part has been even commented upon as not arriving at the correct assessment of the situation by a very senior bureaucrat in this country who was selected obviously by the hon. Prime Minister for his assumed expertise in this matter. After going into this matter and after looking into all correspondence, all documents and papers—as it appears from what has been said by Mr. Chaturvedi, in his prepared statement, prepared by whom, I do not know—in that portion of the report, he has come to a certain conclusion on administrative assessment of the situation.

But, here the Prime Minister says nothing about it. The question is, will the Prime Minister react to this since it has been under his consideration. I am not, at the moment, going into the question of whether the PMO had acted properly or not and whether the things are brought to the notice of the Prime Minister's personal attention or not. These are very serious issues and these would have to be gone into. But what is there to be looked into? Will the new Committee of Secretaries—a Committee over a Committee decide about the finding in para 6.5, where the Food Minister has been held entirely responsible for this, on the basis of an objective assessment of the facts?

Therefore, the least we would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister, who is here, is whether he considers that somebody in the Cabinet or in the Government is indispensable for him. I thought that he has learnt a lesson by keeping some of them in his Cabinet. But, it seems that his lesson is yet to be finally learnt. Well, it is for him. It is for him; and I cannot advise him nor is it my duty or within my power to advise him. But, I demand this, standing here in the Parliament of India, when crores and crores of rupees have been involved and when this country has admittedly suffered huge loss and the common people of this country have suffered. You have thought it fit to hold direct inquiry. The choice was of the Prime Minister himself that he would hold the inquiry. He has, after considering everything, come to a finding. So many other matters have to be looked into; we shall make our submissions when the discussion takes place. But, Sir, I find that it is amazing that the Prime Minister feels that nobody has been found to be responsible for this.

This statement cannot go together with the findings of the Gian Prakash Committee's Report which has not been disputed. Both things cannot remain together. If that is so, then this is nothing but contempt of this House, contempt

of the whole democratic system of functioning, contempt of the very concept of parliamentary Government that you are allowing people to remain in Government. They have been found responsible for all the losses apart from *mala fides*. *Mala fide* is not the final deciding factor. It cannot be the only deciding factor. The question is of commitment to certain basic norms, commitment to the people of this country whether somebody, who has been found guilty in this manner and whose conduct has been commented upon, should remain a minute more in this.

If the Prime Minister does it in spite of this, we shall have to go on exposing, criticising and opposing at every stage. I am sorry, Sir, this is bound to happen. The Parliament is being taken for a ride. The country is being taken for a ride. Everybody is allowed to accept everything that is happening. Corruption has become institutionalised. So many issues of corruption, one after another, are coming and no action is being taken. All their heads are so important that nothing will roll although they are found to be absolutely steeped in this.

Well, even Mr. Unnikrishnan is finding himself uncomfortable. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Why Mr. Unnikrishnan?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Now he has new love.... (*Interruptions*) Therefore, I demand that the Prime Minister will kindly announce here and now what action he is going to take... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I see that so many Members want to speak. ... (*Interruptions*) if you want, I can start the debate even now. ... (*Interruptions*) You take your seat. Let me decide how to go about it, please.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): We want to hear from the Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: I see that so many Members want to speak. I would not like to refuse them the opportunity. But if you want, we can start the debate right now.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: No debate.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I want to make a submission on the point of starting the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me clinch this issue. Now if you want, I can allow you to speak. You can take any time you like.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: No debate.

MR. SPEAKER: What else?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Roseria): The Prime Minister is sitting here. Why doesn't he take action?

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: What action has he taken?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: We are interested in action.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: What action has been taken against those who are responsible for this? He must tell the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Acharia, I will ask the Government also to respond to the points you are making.

Now please hear me first. ...-

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot continue talking when you are talking. I can understand your anxiety to speak. I am inclined to give you as much time as you want.

Now, if you wish, I can start the debate now

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It can continue tomorrow for the whole day...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You shall have only those who are prepared on it. Those who are not prepared, they can speak tomorrow. But do not speak without preparation.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): I want to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: You can speak. I will give you the next chance. I am inclined to give you the chance.

(Translation)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not the first chance when Members are asked to comment on the Gian Prakash Committee. On that day we had expressed our views on the basis of the written reply to a question which was given by the hon. Minister. But there is no reply to the issues raised at that time. If you wish to discuss it again and the outcome will be the same as it was earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want to discuss it or not.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: No, Mr. Speaker, Sir, why to discuss.

MR. SPEAKER: No, not so.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will accept it that discussion should be useful and it should not remain only up to discussion. There must be some outcome. (Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will accept it that discussion should be useful and it should not remain only up to discussion. There must be some outcome.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know that.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, debate should be meaningful. Debate should satisfy the House and the country. But the reply given is just an eyewash. What is the use of discussion if the Government has decided to hide the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: Vajpayeeji, you have raised a very good question and what you say, that is very important.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are saying to us only, please say something for ruling party also.

MR. SPEAKER: I am saying that only. A statement has come. Perhaps you would like to speak on the basis of this statement and the report. I cannot continue like that. I would allow you. Members who are ready to speak on it today can speak and who are not ready to speak can speak tomorrow, and if discussion remains incomplete

even tomorrow....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, pardon me, you are not doing justice.

MR. SPEAKER: Please tell me, what do you want.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, I had taken part in discussion on that day.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I had raised some issues. For example I had said that Gian Prakash Committee has....

MR. SPEAKER: There is no reply to it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: No, reply is there. I had said that during the month of May...

MR. SPEAKER: Vajpayeeji, this all will be included in discussion.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: If it will included in reply then what about the reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Please listen to me.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It has been said that none is malafied. The Government has decided it and it has not waited for any discussion on it. The Government is not ready to take action against any Minister and you say that it should be debated.

MR. SPEAKER: If you do not want to debate then leave it.

...(Interruptions)...

[English]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, after receiving the Report, I have called for the comments of my colleague, the Minister of State for Food. He has sent his comments and I need a little more time to go into the past practices.

On *mala fide*, I entirely agree that there are no *mala fide*. This is what I have come to conclude....(Interruptions)... Sir, I would like to be allowed to speak.

But, some loss has been caused to the Government. Delays have occurred and the delays are serious. All this is accepted. The only thing is, there is no *mala fide*....(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: How do you say that there is no *mala fide*?...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I will have to go into it....(Interruptions). There is a difference....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: One minute,. Mamataji.

The Leader of the Opposition has raised certain issues. In response to the points which he has made and in response to some of the points made by other leaders also, Hon. Prime Minister is giving his version.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Mr. Acharia, if for every word spoken, you get up and say something, you are depriving other Members the opportunity to hear.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Acharia, I will give you time. Note down all the points you want to make. I will give you an opportunity. You make your points and to your points, if the Government wants, the Government will reply. But, if every word is spoken, you get up or somebody gets up and say something that is no fair. You please respect others' right to hear what the Government has to say.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I am making a careful statement. I am saying, I am actually waiting for the views of the hon. Members in the debate. After the debate is over, within one week, I will take a final decision on what is to be done. This is my commitment. Let us go on with the debate.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I am on a limited point.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): Please allow me for one minute Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Jaswant Singhji, I will give you time. Jenaji, I will allow you also.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I wish to make a very small point...

MR. SPEAKER: Jaswantji, I will give you time to make as many points as you wish to make. But at one go please. Now, please sit down.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: This is a very small point that I wish to make. When is this discussion to be held? You were kind enough to suggest that the discussion be started.

MR. SPEAKER: I have not said that. I only said, "If you want, you can have it now."

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No. Sir, I will tell you what the practical difficulties are. Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has said that after due deliberations, he has reached the conclusion that there are no *mala fides*. Now, this is the statement of the Government of India on the Gian Prakash Committee Report. There are simply five copies of the Gian Prakash Committee Report. All members did not even have a chance to go through the Report, copies of which are kept in the Library. We have not had a chance yet to go through the Report. We would Sir, for the sake of discussion and if the discussion is to be proper, need to compare this statement with the five copies of the Report which are kept in the Library. The number of copies is very limited...

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with you. If you don't want, I am not forcing a discussion on you today itself!

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The Government has already said that there are no *mala fides*. If there are no *mala fides*, why should the Government rule that there would be only five copies in the library? Now, you want us to say, "Start the discussion." That would not be fair.

MR. SPEAKER: Jaswant Singhji, you are a very careful gentleman. But this time, probably, you have not spoken with care.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: You did not say, "Start the discussion." You have only said, "If you want, you can start the discussion." Is that right Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, If you don't want to discuss, then sit down.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am explaining why we cannot have a proper discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't want that thing.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: The statement of the hon. Prime Minister made just now and the statement of Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi are contradictory. The position as per the statement of Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi is that the Government has already set up a Committee under the Chairmanship of the Cabinet Secretary, which will go into the recommendations of the Gian Prakash Committee Report in detail and thereafter, will submit its recommendations by 31 December and then only, the Government will take a final view. Finally, in the last para it is also stated that there are no *mala fides*. But the hon. Prime Minister now says that he will make up his mind after hearing the debate and will take action within seven days. (Interruptions) What is the position now? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He is posing a question. Let us hear the question. If the Government wants to reply, it can do so.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Now I want a clarification. I want to know whether the position obtaining in the statement is correct or whether what the Prime Minister has stated just now will prevail. Let this thing be clarified.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would like to appeal to Shri Somnath Chatterjee. There is a difference between *mala fides* and actual loss to the Government with or without *mala fides*.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Yes. That can be so.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is what I am saying. That distinction is correct. I have not found any *mala fides*...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Up till now. After hearing us, you may change your view.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: After hearing all the hon. Members in both the Houses, if I feel that there are *mala fides*, I will tell you. Otherwise, whatever loss has been caused, with regard to that, I will have to decide what is to be done. I will have to decide and I will take a decision within a week. That is my commitment...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon'ble Prime Minister says that the loss caused to the public exchequer is a normal process.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is not a good sign but the loss has caused to the public exchequer.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The Government

has arrived at the conclusion that nobody is found guilty for this loss, on the basis of the evidence. Then, on what basis the Government reached to this conclusion?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: It was on the basis of that Report.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Which report?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Gyan Prakash Committee Report.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am referring to the statement given by the Government. The Government has admitted in that statement that the price increase has benefited only the mill owners. Now, whether it was a wrong decision or the mill owners were given the benefit?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I had already said that I would reply at the end of the debate.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You have made up your mind that there is nothing *mala-fide* and it is useless to discuss the issue....(Interruptions).. You reached to the conclusion. Sir, it should not be like that. Had the Hon'ble Prime Minister kept his mind open... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: They will like to hear you.

[Translation]

He has said that if after the discussion he finds the views fit for action, he would take the action.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: After hearing our views? Whether he has reached to the conclusion after hearing our speeches or on the basis of the evidences with them?

[English]

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is a difference between action taken in these two cases. The action may be the same or may not be the same. But when the ground is different, the effect of the action also becomes different.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Therefore, the hon. Prime Minister should have said that till now he had an open mind. He did not say that.

MR. SPEAKER: He did say that. Now, Shri Paswan.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Indrajitji, I will allow you.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Gen. Khanduri I will allow you also to speak. But not like this.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know if the Hon'ble Prime Minister has gone through the Report or not. However, I am one of those persons who have read each and every line of that Report. After going through the report, one cannot arrive at the conclusion that the Hon'ble Prime Minister is directly involved therein but another conclusion is very clear. Sir, I would like to quote only two lines. Despite that, the Hon'ble

Prime Minister says that there is no *mala-fide* intention. It has been stated in the report that:

[English]

"It is thus clear that by opposing imports in every forum and showing least concern when prices were rising rapidly...."

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I am on a Point of Order. The rule of the House says that if any report or any portion of the report is quoted then that report be placed on the Table of House. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Who is quoting?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, he is quoting.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, I am quoting.

MR. SPEAKER: To which rule are you referring to? I will just look at your Point of Order— which rule you are referring to.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, in *Kaul and Shakhdar*, if I am recollecting right, on page 872 it says that if any portion of the official document is quoted then there is an obligation to place that document on the Table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: He is quoting from something. He has not said...

(Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am sorry to say that he said, it is from the report. He has said, it is the report.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, I am quoting from the report.

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever you have quoted, if the Government says that it is not wrong, will the report be necessary?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, my Point of Order is that if anything is quoted from...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You refer to the rule. I will analyse the rule and I will tell you. You can give him the book, you can go through it and let me know. Now, let him continue.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, I am quoting:

"It is thus clear that by opposing imports in every forum and showing least concern when prices were rising rapidly by reducing releases at the crucial time and above all by these ill-conceived statements issued from time to time justifying rise in prices with a view to make sugar industry more profitable, it was the Food Minister who was entirely responsible for the sugar crisis."

[Translation]

Despite this, the Hon'ble Prime Minister says that there is nothing against anybody in the report. I would like to speak on two points. Firstly, the Government has no faith in the report. We have been speaking from the beginning to set-up a judicial commission or ask a Supreme Court judge to inquire into the matter. Shri Kalpnath Rai has rightly stated that only he has been made a scapegoat and the real culprits are still at large.

Therefore, he has demanded that an inquiry should be held by a Supreme Court judge.... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: The senior Members are now speaking and I think that they would like to make their points very forcefully. While making their points we would expect them to keep the rules before them. Direction 118 says:

"If a private member, in the course of his speech wishes to quote from a secret Government document, paper or report, he shall supply a copy thereof in advance to the Speaker and also indicate the portions thereof which he wishes to quote in order to enable the Speaker to decide whether permission should be given. If the Speaker permits the member to quote from the document, the member may do so at the appropriate time. If the Speaker does not accord the necessary permission, the member shall not quote from the document nor refer to its contents."

Have you followed that rule?

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Yes, Sir. The day before yesterday, when we had raised the matter you had given the permission. You can go through the record. We had stated that "May we quote?" You said that:—

[English]

"You will have the right to read this Report and you can quote it also". I cannot challenge it today, but if you go through the record you will reconsider it. You have already given your ruling. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT SINGH (Midnapore): Are you suggesting that he has no right to quote from the Report? ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Let us understand that we are discussing an important matter. You should follow the rules. If I have said anything, I will go through it carefully and I would like to see as to why I said so. At the same time, I would like to stick to what I had said or I will interpret the law in a proper fashion.

The point is, you were making a statement and you did not say from where you are reading. You could have said that this is the portion which you want to quote from such and such document.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: I have said that I am quoting from the Report. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If you do not want to go into the substance and you just want to try and touch the fringe of it, it is for you to do it. I am saying that you will not only be allowed to discuss the Statement made by the Government but if you think that the Statement is contrary to the Report which has been placed there, you can come to me with the Report and say that whatever has been stated in the statement is contrary to the Report and you would like to quote from the Report. You shall then be given an opportunity in a proper manner to see what you should do about it.

....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If you are standing up every moment like this, it will create confusion. I am trying to help you. I am trying to allow you to make your points in the fashion you should do but if you are not interested in doing that and are interested only in making the side issues, it is up to you.

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA): Sir, the Minister has made a statement. There is now no need for further clarification. We may now fix the time and date for the discussion so that the debate can start. If hon. Members like it, we can start the discussion tomorrow itself. We are ready to start the discussion now itself if the hon. Members so desire. You may please ascertain the views of the Opposition Members. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: We have certain questions to ask. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: This is exactly what I am trying to do. Supposing, Members have made certain points and on behalf of the ruling party some response is ready, the Government can give that response. If all of you do not want to start the debate, I cannot force the discussion on both the sides. If you want to reply to the points that are being made here, you can do so, otherwise, I can leave it there.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, what about my point of order? I have raised a point of order based on Direction 118.

MR. SPEAKER: Under which you say, "I will interpret the law".

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Now, I do not wish to enter into a legal...

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot give the ruling without going into the law.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Of course, Sir. I am referring to law and...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You read it, please.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am raising a point of order that if a private member desires to lay a paper or a document he shall supply a copy thereof. That is Rule 118(1). Now, (2) says, if a private member, in the course of his speech, wishes to quote from a secret Government document, paper or report,— now a paper or report is after a comma, so it need not necessarily be secret— he shall supply a copy thereof in advance to the Speaker. Here, Sir, a direction of the Speaker earlier says that if you quote from a document then you are under an obligation to supply a copy to the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Where is it you are reading from?
... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It is prior to his reading, not after it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I am raising a point....

MR. SPEAKER: Which is that?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My point here is, Sir, that

you know well that in the three days or four days turmoil, we were, in fact, denied access to possessing a copy of this very document that we are quoting from. I would appeal to you, Sir, on the one hand we are under an obligation under the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business to supply you a copy in advance of a document from which we wish to quote, secondly, on the other hand, we are unable to have access to that copy because there are limited number of copies, and those limited numbers are kept in the Parliament House Library. And as per your directions, the issuance of the document is subject to the rules of the Library and the Librarians have said that they cannot issue them. Now we are caught in a cleft stick. Thirdly, to make a meaningful discussion out of this— the Government is giving certain assertions and the Report says certain things and there are only five copies...

MR. SPEAKER: Jaswant Singh Ji, let us come to the legal point. You have raised a point of order. What is that point of order?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My point of order is, Sir, that in this case when hon. Ram Vilals Paswan Ji quoted from a particular document, it is for me to establish my understanding of that document. I am citing this reference and I am appealing to you that that document be laid on the Table of the House so that I or any other Member can have free access to it.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. That is a demand you are making.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, I feel the propriety demands that the hon. Prime Minister should agree to place it on the Table of the House. What is the difficulty? How can there be a meaningful discussion, Sir? The hon. Prime Minister wants to hear us on this Report before finally making up his mind and he wants to hear us without our knowing fully what is that in the Report. He should kindly make the copies available to the Members. Let them be made available.

MR. SPEAKER: I have ruled that that is not a point of order.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, may I just remind you, when the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs was for two or three days stubbornly resisting to our demand that it be laid on the Table of the House, it was for no other reason but that it will be a technicality which has to conform to some conventions and traditions of the House that such administrative reports are never laid on the Table of the House, nothing else. He never mentioned any other reason. Now, when that Report has been quoted from, and copies have been put in the Library, what is there to prevent it from being laid on the Table of the House? Will the Prime Minister and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs kindly explain? What is it all about, this hush-hush business?

MR. SPEAKER: If you have completed your point, I am giving my ruling on this.

One, if Mr. Paswan wants to quote from some document which is in his possession it is his duty to give

that document to me underlining the portion which he want to quote.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You have not done that.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: That Report is already with you.

MR. SPEAKER: I can interpret law but I cannot give you understanding of law. It is possible for me to interpret law but I cannot make you understand law. Now, I am saying that if you have a document and if you want to quote from it you shall have to give that document.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. If you go on speaking, how the things will work?

[English]

If you want to quote it, please let me know from which portion you want to quote. It is because you have access to the document and if I come to know that what you are quoting is in accordance with the Report, then you will be allowed.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: From Page 97, point number 6.5.

MR. SPEAKER: You must give me beforehand.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Alright, I will give you tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: You are quoting today and will give the report to me tomorrow...

...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, I was saying that in the report, strong remarks have been made against the Food Minister as well as STC and MMTC. It has been stated therein that:—

[English]

“ Food Minister is entirely responsible.”

[Translation]

But the Food Minister says that he is not responsible. There are other people responsible for that. It has been stated in the report that STC is “professionally incompetent.” Despite the orders of the Hon’ble Prime Minister, CCPP held its three meetings. Even after that, STC did nothing.

[English]

The words are “professionally incompetent”

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

I am not discussing but I want a discussion against the Hon’ble Prime Minister...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Paswanji, if you want to speak in this way, I would allow you. You can take your time but you will not be speaking on it tomorrow. If you want to speak today, you can do so in brief and then sit on your seat.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Sir, I want one line clarification. There is a big difference between his earlier statement and today's statement. In reply to a question, Shri Chaturvedi has stated...(Interruptions)...

[English]

It was not brought to the Prime Minister's notice...(Interruptions)...

MR. SPEAKER: That is not proper.

...(Interruptions)...

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Alright Sir, through you, I would only like to urge that there is a mention of PMO or the Food Minister. MMTC and STC violated the orders of the Hon'ble Prime Minister for two months. They again violated the decisions of CCP and COF. At least some action should have been taken against them. What does it show? The Government should either take the action or fact the charges. I would like to know whether PMO is involved in this scam...(Interruptions)...

SHRI CHANDRAJEET YADAV (Ajamgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I regret to say that not only we people but the whole nation is disappointed with the Statement of the Hon'ble Prime Minister. As per Gyan Prakash Committee's report, the loss is estimated to be around Rs. 8—10 thousand crore. I am not quoting the report but we have been allowed to go through the report. It has been stated therein that with the price increase of Rs. 1 per kilogram, the mill owners have been rich by Rs. 750 crore. The mill owners have themselves admitted that due to non-import of sugar, the prices increased from Rs. 9 per Kg. to Rs. 20 per Kg in November, 1993. As a result, the country had to bear a loss worth Rs. 10—12 thousand crores.

Sir, the Hon'ble Prime Minister has clarified his position by saying that there was no mala-fide intention. I do not agree with this view. Here, the Hon'ble Prime Minister has taken a wrong decision. He said that the Government incurred the loss but I would like to say that those crores of consumers of this nation borne the loss who had to purchase sugar at the rate of Rs. 20 to Rs. 25 per kilogram from November 1993 to July, 1994...(Interruptions)...

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a regular debate.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRAJEET YADAV: The consumers had to purchase sugar on higher rates. Who should be held responsible for that?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a regular debate.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRAJEET YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not quoting this report. Shri Gyan Prakash has brought the Food Minister into the dock. Four charges have been levelled against him. Firstly, he deliberately did not want to go for import. Secondly, he kept the file with

him for 18 days and later on, everybody resented this move in the sub-committee.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a regular debate and I will allow you in a regular debate.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRAJEET YADAV: Please listen to me for one minute. Thirdly, he has been giving ill-conceived statements. I would like to ask the Hon'ble Prime Minister whether he would take action after hearing our speeches and not go by the charges in the report? I would also like to add that an inquiry committee was constituted by the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: It is irregular.

SHRI CHANDRAJEET YADAV: Please listen to the last sentence. The Committee constituted by the Government has itself stated that it was worth paying attention that the committee had no briefing to enquire into the allegations of corruption.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You can refer to the terms of reference in the report.

SHRI CHANDRAJEET YADAV: In the terms of reference this was not mentioned. I allege that there was a large scale corruption in this case and, therefore, the Prime Minister should immediately set up an inquiry to find out who were the people who indulged in corruption and take immediate action. This is my demand...(Interruptions)...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, I think, we are justified in seeking for this report which has been a statement rather. The fact that it has been read out here by Shri Chaturvedi shows that it is approved by the Government. The Government has accepted the statement. Otherwise it would not have been officially read out here. This statement has listed five points which according to Mr. Gian Prakash amount to the gist of the causes leading to this situation. The causes of the crisis:

(1) Unreliable and inflated estimates of sugar production. This is what was going on. It means that estimates of the sugar production given to the country and to the Parliament were unreliable and inflated.

(2) Mismanagement of available surplus stock and releases. This was being mismanaged.

(3) Delay in the decision to import sugar.

(4) Delay in implementation of this decision to import sugar after the decision had been taken.

(5) Poor coordination between the various Ministries/Departments and officers concerned.

Now, Sir, I seek one clarification from the hon. Prime Minister who said a little while ago. "Yes, I admit that there has been a loss, a loss to the country and a loss to the Government. But loss can take place even without mala fide." This is what he said Loss can take place

without *mala fide*. I want a reply from him to my question: "Even if there is no *mala fide* suppose there is no *mala fide*, does it rule out accountability?"

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: No, I have not said it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: No, you have not said it. I am glad to hear from you.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is why, Sir, I have called for the comments of my colleague. I have received the comments. I am considering what is the appropriate action. I think even that is also made available.

17.00 hrs

That is why I said, accountability is different, *mala fide* is different.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I thank the Prime Minister for this clarification. I tell you why I thank him, because it is a denial or a contradiction of a new theory which has been invented and is being propagated by his colleague, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, who, on the question of ATR, when we had discussion with them told us when we were pressing the question of accountability. Accountability is the bedrock of this parliamentary system. There is no parliamentary system without an accountability. If an accountability is finished, this system is finished. Let us go to some other system. He said, "There can be no accountability unless criminality is established." It is on record. He said, "If you can establish criminality, there will be accountability. It is not otherwise."

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know.

...(Interruptions)...

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: He is misquoting the term. It was said entirely in different context; it has nothing to do with it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: What is the different context?

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: That context was different altogether.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Therefore, I am very much thankful to the Prime Minister for having clarified that. He is at least very categorical on this point that *mala fide* is something, accountability is something else. We are concerned with accountability. Otherwise, there is no point in remaining in this Parliament.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know whether Mr. Vidyacharan Shukla has made that statement. I doubt it. If he has made that statement, probably we will look into it.

Secondly, if some Member makes some statement and if it is correct, we can accept it; we may not accept it.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Accountability is never used in criminal cases or in matters in which offences come. Then it becomes culpability
...(Interruptions)...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Accountability has been shut out. It is pre-empted in this statement.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh): I am

on a point of order. While I express my gratitude to you for permitting a debate on this matter tomorrow, I want to refer to Rule 372 — a statement made by a Minister....(Interruptions)...

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: That is not for corruption charges....(Interruptions)....

MR. SPEAKER: Will you allow me to give my ruling?
.....(Interruptions).....

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Responding to what Mr. Ram Vilas Pawan has said, I want to reiterate again that we want a debate on this. I am grateful that you have permitted a debate on it tomorrow. But, at the moment, the point that I want to raise is this. Rule 372 reads as follows:

"A statement may be made by a Minister on a matter of public importance with the consent of the Speaker, but no question shall be asked at the time the statement is made."

What are we doing now?

MR. SPEAKER: I will give my ruling. The point that you have raised is very valid. I uphold that point. But, at the same time, let me tell you that when this matter came up, we were discussing as to how to discuss this matter in the House. Now the Statement is made; and then it was said that let us discuss that statement. There is an agreement; if there is any agreement, you know, we will be able to overcome this statement. On the one hand, your point of order is upheld. On the other, the agreement which is between the Members will facilitate discussion.

...(Interruptions)...

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: It is only to facility debate. As the hon. Prime Minister has said that he is open — after the debate is over — he will make up his mind and he will take a decision. The crux of the main issue was that it was not the Food Minister. His perception and Gian Prakash's perception are two different things. His perception is that he has written in the Gian Prakash Report that he was opposed to import.

But in the perception of Gian Parkash Committee report, it led to this kind of a situation...(Interruptions).... According to the Gian Parkash Committee report the main issue is, had it been reported to the Prime Minister in time, this situation would not have arisen?...(Interruptions)....That is the main issue...(Interruptions)....I would like to know whether this issue was brought to the notice of the Prime Minister or not in the Month of December after the CCPP meeting...(Interruptions)....The then Cabinet Secretary says that this was reported to the Prime Minister through his Secretary.... (Interruptions) The main issue is delay in import and delay in implementation of the decision. The main issue is whether the Prime Minister was informed after the CCPP meeting through his Secretary by the then Cabinet Secretary. That is the crux of the problem....(Interruptions) Therefore, the Prime Minister is under cloud. The Prime Minister Office is under cloud. He must clarify that to the Parliament....(Interruptions) I request the Prime Minister to clarify whether in December

1993, the proceedings or the minutes of the CAPP meeting were reported to him or not. That is the main issue....(Interruptions) Why are you making noise?....(Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, why Mr. Bansal is making noise? Let me submit my point....(Interruptions) The whole issue is, the Prime Minister and the PMO are under cloud....(Interruptions) The Gian Parkash Committee Report has pointed finger towards the PMO. That report has pointed finger towards the Prime Minister....(Interruptions) The Prime Minister has to clarify whether he was informed about the inadequacy of sugar or not....(Interruptions) I am not going to yield to it....(Interruptions) When the question of Food Minister comes nobody says anything, but when the question of Prime Minister comes everyone starts shouting....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No, not like this. You can reply if you want. I will allow you to reply but not like this. Mr. Jena please, let us be very brief on this point. If you have made the point, let others also reply... (Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, I have only one more point to make.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, what is your point?

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: My only point is that the responsibility has been fixed by the Gian Prakash Committee straightway on the Food Minister. But the point is that the Gian Prakash Committee has also pointed finger towards the PMO and the Prime Minister. The point is, had it been reported to the Prime Minister in time, this situation would not have arisen(Interruptions) this is underlined in the report. This is mentioned in the Gian Parkash Committee Report....(Interruptions)

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

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: I would like to know whether the Prime Minister was informed about the shortage or not....(Interruptions)

SHRI UMRao SINGH (Jalandhar): You can not say that this part of the Report is accepted or this part is rejected....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you. Mr. Jena, please. I think, if you are saying something from the report, you shall have to take the responsibility.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Yes, Sir, I take the responsibility....(Interruptions) I can show it right now. This is the exact verbatim proceedings of the report....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No, you hear me first. You have said that something has been stated in the report. You will be asked to substantiate it.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttuck): Yes, Sir. That is in report itself in black and white.
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: This is exactly what I am saying. Do not quote the report in such a fashion as to create misunderstanding. Now the question is who is responsible for ordering the import—the Minister, the Prime Minister, the Cabinet or the Committee—who is responsible?

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: It is the Cabinet, Sir.
....(Interruptions)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: If I got you correctly when you were giving your ruling on the point of order raised by me, you had said that the small discussion that you are having with the Members is only directed in one direction and that is to work out the procedure for the debate. What I find unfortunately is...

MR. SPEAKER: You will not comment on my ruling. If you have any other point, you can make that....(Interruptions)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, what I unfortunately find here is that....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want to reply to Shri Jena's point?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: I am referring to that. What I unfortunately find here is that the hon. Members are not contributing to find out a way in which a discussion can take place on the subject. But biased as they are, Sir, reckless allegations, which are being levelled at the moment, are wholly unwarranted. Sir, the point was being made by them that they have not got copies of the Report. But what they are referring to it is from the document itself. It is my submission that the allegations which were being made even day before yesterday and certain documents were sought to be placed on the Table of the House, I say with all the responsibility at my command that the allegations that are being levelled are unwarranted and, Sir, the framing is done by the people, who perhaps had played a role in all this....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have said that the debate will go on and the Hon'ble Prime Minister has also announced that he would take action within seven days. However, if one goes by the terms of reference of the committee, one would find that Parliament has no right to take action. It is also in the terms of reference....

[English]

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the statement has to be made in the Rajya Sabha at 5 p.m. The Prime Minister and the Minister will have to go to the Rajya Sabha.

MR. SPEAKER: I think, they can go there....
(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Sir, you adjourn the House. We do not want any discussion on this subject without the Prime Minister(Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Sir, kindly adjourn the House....(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, you adjourn the House....(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): The Prime Minister has to go to the Rajya Sabha. Listen to the

Speaker....(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: You should not behave in this fashion....(Interruptions) He is not the SPG to the Prime Minister....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If the matter is complicated, we shall do it in a cool manner. The Government has a responsibility towards this House as well as the other House. If the time is fixed in the other House and if there are other Ministers to take down the points and reply here, I will allow the Prime Minister and the other Minister to go to the Rajya Sabha.

....(Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: I beg that the House be adjourned. We do not want to discuss this subject without the Prime Minister....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Fatmi.

....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: There is other business also to be translated in the House.

[English]

If you do not want, I will take another business. When the concerned Ministers are there, we will take it up. But I cannot ask the Prime Minister not to go to the other House....

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Sir, I am on a point of order.(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I must hear Shri Acharia's point of order. Please sit down. Point of Order has a precedence.

[Translation]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Hon'ble Prime Minister was replying, I wanted to ask a question. At that time you had said to note down the point. However, I noted the point. I was about to ask the Prime Minister. Now the Prime Minister has gone. To whom would I address my question?

MR. SPEAKER: You ask him. He will reply tomorrow. Every word is noted down.

[English]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: From whom will we get the reply?

MR. SPEAKER: From the Government.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: We want to get the reply from the Prime Minister and not from the other Ministers....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You show me the rule and then I will answer. The House will not go according to your sweet will.

....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You show me the rule that the Prime Minister has to reply. I cannot do it as per your sweet will.

....(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: You have told us that the Prime Minister will reply to your points....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have not told that.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: You have told us that the Prime Minister will reply to your points. Now you have allowed the Prime Minister to go to the other House(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have not said the 'Prime Minister', I have said 'the Government'.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Then you adjourn the House for one hour.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very sorry to say that some Members do not want to allow other Members to make the point.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am allowing Mr. Fatmi.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: From whom we will get the reply?

MR. SPEAKER: From the Government.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: No. Not from the Government. We want the reply from the Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: You show me the rules for that.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon'ble Prime Minister has announced that he would take action with a week. I am not quoting from the terms of reference of the Committee Report. However, there is no mention of corruption or action. It has only referred to the administrative lapses. Sir, you have disallowed me to quote but I would like to quote the figures only.

MR. SPEAKER: You can refer to but don't quote.

[English]

There is a difference between "referring" and "quoting".

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: It is like that:—

"Katkari Juban Meri Kah Raha Oh Jalim,
Ab Tumhen Izazat Hai Hale Dil Sunane Ki."

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: It is not poetry. It is Parliament. You understand the difference between "quoting" and "referring".

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to refer to Chapter III. The target for the production of sugar for the year 1994-95 was 98 lakh tonnes. In addition, there was an old stock of 31 lakh tonnes. It is a very important point. The total consumption for the whole year was estimated to be 120 lakh tonnes. However, the shortage of sugar was deliberately created in the country....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you to speak.

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: The committee besides Food Minister has also pointed towards other institutions and P.M.O.

MR. SPEAKER: Please let us know.

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: It is useless to debate over this administrative report. I therefore demand that the debate should take place only after judicial inquiry.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Mr. Rao please. You are a very very intelligent Member. You understand the difference. Let us not go on the regular point which you will make tomorrow.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: This is uncharitable. Even before I make my submission, you are commenting.

MR. SPEAKER: Because I have to control all the Members.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: You have had the occasion to hear the view points of several other Members for so long. You have no patience to hear me even for a minute. This is not doing justice to the Member. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I seek a categorical answer from the Government. Here in the statement made by Shri Chaturvedi today, the Government has accepted that there are two major facets. One is the lapses and the second thing is that in the Report itself, some allegations have been made. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the most important point is in the terms of reference given to the Gian Prakash Committee, the second facet has not been entrusted because of which in the entire Report, every sentence of which I have gone through, that facet was not at all examined by that Committee and with all due respect to the hon. Prime Minister, with great respect to him, we feel so sorry when he said that there are no *mala fides*. How can the Government say and on what basis they are telling that? With all responsibility, I would like to say in this House that apart from the great loss to the consumers in this country and great loss to the exchequer by way of import of sugar at higher rate, the other most important thing I would like to say is that it is true that though the international prices have increased, yet the prices at which our STC and our MMTC have procured and purchased, are much more than the actual international prices and Sir, a lot of cushion money went to some politicians and some bureaucrats and this aspect has not been examined.

Sir, I would like to have a categorical reply from the Government about this particular aspect. Several crores of rupees have gone to the politicians and corrupt bureaucrats.

Secondly, the same hon. Minister, Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi gave a reply just a few days back to an Unstarred Question which has given scope for suspicion that the Minister for Civil Supplies, Consumer Affairs and Public Distribution had not informed the Prime Minister's Office regarding the impending shortage of sugar.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you to make all these points.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: I will not take more time. I want to make only one point and it is because of that I gave the notice of privilege. In these entire five pages have you found a single word against Shri A.K. Anthony? I have gone through every sentence of Gian Prakash Committee Report which has not pointed any lapse on the part of Shri Anthony. But it clearly mentioned that the Minister for Civil Supplies, Consumer Affairs and Public Distribution has informed the Prime Minister's Office quite early regarding the impending shortage of sugar. The hon. Prime Minister has said that after hearing the hon. Members, he will take action in a week. I would like to know what prevented this Government from taking action against Shri Kalp Nath Rai, who is found mainly responsible for this sugar crisis and he continues to remain without any shame....(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Kindly start the Government business.(Interruptions)

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA (Balasore): Sir, I want to make only three points.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you tomorrow.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. In this House, we demonstrate but we are also required to guide. As the demonstration is over, let us come to the business. Thereafter, we will act as guide. Let us complete the Government's business included in today's agenda. You can have full day tomorrow for discussion.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS) AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MUKUL WASNIK): I would just like to inform the hon. Members, as in the morning it was decided to continue the House till late tonight so that the Government business is completed, we have made arrangements for the dinner of all the hon. Members, staff and the Press. So, I wanted to inform the House that we have made this arrangement so that they should not go before completing the Government business.

MR. SPEAKER: It is very good. We appreciate it.

Now, we will take up Supplementary Demands for Grants, Discussion and Voting.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Kindly allow us to make our submissions.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you tomorrow.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: No, Sir. I am not going into the debate in the same manner as Shri Pawan Kumar Bansa: started on a point of order. I will try to make some points.

MR. SPEAKER: But why?

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: I am not going to enter into a debate. But I want to make observations. That is why I am seeking your time. What I want to say is a very simple point and that point is...

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA: Sir, I have not been given a chance to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you after this. Now, I am duty bound to allow you. I will allow you after this. I cannot compete you in shouting.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: The whole thing at least to some and perhaps to outsiders is appearing quite funny and I am convinced of that. May I just draw your attention that as a sovereign supreme body of the country, we are fully entitled to make ourselves the laughing—stock of the country? I have no doubt in my mind. We want to discuss things. What is there in the statement to discuss about Gian Prakash Committee Report? The Government has authenticated it and placed it in the Parliament Library. So, it is an authenticated document, which the Government has placed in the Parliament Library.

Every single member of the Press knows about it. There is only one institution which is debarred from discussing that directly and the name of that institution is the Parliament of India. Is it not funny? Do we not make a laughing stock of ourselves before the whole country? Therefore, the pre-condition of a debate on this issue itself is that that Report is placed before the House immediately so that we can make a reference to that without any difficulty, without following any circuitous route. This is my first point.

The second point that I want to...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Are your points going to be that long?

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Sir, you will certainly recognise, though I am not as gifter in intelligence as you are, that I am...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I do not say that you are saying the truth.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I am complimenting you.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Sir, the second point that I want to make is that there is another difficulty in discussing even this Report and that difficulty is that it is stated that this Report is of administrative consequence only. In the House we are not only concerned with administrative consequence, we are also concerned with the other dimensions involved in the issue. How do we go about it? Even while the reference is only to the administrative aspects, if despite that Gian Prakash Ji has been able to make a mention of responsibility of the Ministries, to that extent it has become more than an administrative enquiry. Therefore, I request you to enable a debate which will do honour to this House to get this copy of the Report laid on the Table of the House.

My third point is that whatever has been stated, concerns the tremendous unconcern of the Government. Let us appreciate that, with or without the Report, the

tremendous lack of concern about how much has been looted, also talking of that. It is the unconcern of the Government. The Finance Ministry says it will not allow funds for imports, the Commerce Ministry says...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Now you are going beyond the...

(Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Sir, what I am trying to underline is... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: But why is it necessary? What is your point?

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: My point is that even as an administrative body, the Executive has demonstrated its tremendous unconcern in the...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You make that point tomorrow.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: I shall certainly make that point again. But what I insist is...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Tomorrow you will not be allowed to speak.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Tomorrow you cannot be allowed to speak. You have made your speech today.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Once again I want you to be as intelligent as the Speaker so that you also understand me. That point is simple...(Interruptions). Therefore, Sir, either that Report is placed on the Table or there is no discussion on the issues.

My next point is...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If you make this point, people will judge you.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Sir, my next point is that if this cannot be discussed, can anything else be discussed in the House, that also should be decided by all of us and that we shall decide today and tomorrow...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Right. O.K.

...(Interruptions)

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA: Sir, thanks to our Government that they had instituted an administrative inquiry in July, 1994. The Government invited a Report and a Report was submitted in October, 1994. The Government also invited criticism from the hon. Members. They are at liberty to criticise the Government but they are repeating the same thing. After the discussion, after the comments received from the hon. members, our Prime Minister has assured the House that he will take necessary action within a week's time. I submit that after that there is no need for discussion before starting a debate in this House...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up Supplementary Demands for Grants (General)...

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South): Sir, it is most unfortunate that all the people from that side are speaking and we could not speak. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You will have to decide whether you want to have the Budget passed or you want to have this discussed, because I was inclined to allow you to discuss it. Now somebody says 'discuss it' and somebody else says 'Do not discuss it.'

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you tomorrow.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: Sir, from that side so many people spoke.

MR. SPEAKER: Mamataji, I will allow you tomorrow. You make a good speech tomorrow.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: There is a categorical recommendation by the Gian Prakash Committee...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It is not going on record.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, I am on a point of propriety. The hon. Prime Minister has said that only after a week after the end of the debate he will take action. He has taken time to decide. Therefore, after we say anything here, there will be no response from the Government. Therefore, the House will not have the benefit of governmental reaction. We will have no response from the Government or from the Prime Minister because it will be after the session is over, the purpose of the Government will be served. How can that be? We will have no response from the Government. That is why I said that no purpose will be served.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P.M. SAYEED): You speak tomorrow...(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: How can it be? We will have no response from the Government. Please do not treat it as a routine matter. You are taking it as a routine matter. Corruption has become routine with you. But we cannot accept it...(Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: Please say something about corruption in your Government...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Well, my understanding is that after hearing the Members, some Members from this side also are going to speak and my understanding is that the Government is going to respond. Am I correct?

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Yes Sir. It will be tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, not today because today we are not taking it as a debate.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Sir, regarding action to be taken, the Prime Minister has said that he will take another seven days.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Why seven days?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Sir, it is a very serious matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us understand...

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Why action cannot be taken during this session? Why should it be after seven days after Parliament session is over?

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: You please sit down first...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Saifuddin Choudhury, you take your seat having made your point. Would you like to repeat what you said?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Sir, I am not repeating.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, take your seat.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Will you not allow me to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: I am asking whether you want to make your point or repeat what is said earlier.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: There is no question of repetition.

MR. SPEAKER: What do you want to say?

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: The corruption can be repeated.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Sir, for so many days this issue has been raised in this House. Now we have to go without any action being taken. That is the point. We do not accept this.

MR. SPEAKER: If you sit down, I will say that...

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: We do not accept this. It is a simple thing.

MR. SPEAKER: What do you want?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: We want action.

MR. SPEAKER: When do you want it?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: There is nothing more to debate on this. Everything is clear. There is deliberate leak of decision to import. What for the Prime Minister wants time? Does he not understand that...

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: The intention of the Government is very much clear.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: Sir, action must be taken against all the corrupt people in this country.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Sir, in the statement it is said that...

MR. SPEAKER: I am not entitled to reply. The Government will reply.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: You should not reply.

In the statement it is said that when the prices in the domestic sector were rising, then a decision was taken to reduce the release. Who will take responsibility for that?

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Who took that decision? Who is responsible?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Why the Prime Minister requires time to punish the guilty, we do not

understand.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: Sir, they are raising one issue or the other. We must say something on this.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Why are you supporting the corrupt Minister?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Action has to be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: You decide it after hearing the Government.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: There is no need for any further debate.

MR. SPEAKER: What do you mean by that?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: We will not allow this.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: We also want action...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: No, you are not the master of the House. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: We do not want to debate for the sake of debating it. *(Interruptions)*

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: Sir, we also want action. But let them not play their double standard game here. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Everybody knows who is guilty.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: We also want action.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: You take action, come and then debate it.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: You are playing double standard game here.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: It is not a talking shop.

MR. SPEAKER: Mamataji, I am allowing you to speak. You can speak now.

(Interruptions)

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (Uluberia): Sir, one after the other corruption cases are mounting, but no action is being taken. How can it happen? *(Interruptions)*

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this House is very much grateful to you for allowing us to make some comments on the Gian Prakash Committee's Report. But it is most unfortunate on the part of the Members of the Opposition Parties that when they spoke we listened to them very carefully, but when we want to say something they do not allow us to speak. We also want that action must be taken against the culprits and whoever is responsible for this scandal. The Prime Minister has said that he would take action after listening to all of them. *(Interruptions)* I have every right to speak here. We, the Members belonging to the Ruling Party, want that action should be taken against the culprits. There is no doubt about it. But at the same time, these people who are shouting here, they are playing their double standard game. In their State, they have taken more than Rs. 1,000

crore of chit fund money to their party fund and they have joined hands with Hinduja's to set up industry. Here, they are playing their double standard game. I think the Prime Minister would take proper action so that the people of this country know about it and the double standards of these people is made clear to all the people. *(Interruptions)*

17.38 hrs.

At this stage, Shri Sudhir Roy and some other hon. Members came and stood on the floor near the Table.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI TEJ NARAYAN SINGH (Buxar): The action must be taken...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, by this strategy they want to get the House adjourned. You have mentioned that the House will take up the Supplementary Demands. I think we can take up our normal business and pass the Supplementary Demands. Let this shouting go on. But we can get along with our normal business. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MUKUL WASNIK: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister had very categorically stated that he would be deciding within seven days after listening to the whole debate in the Lok Sabha as well as the Rajya Sabha. Whenever such matters are taken up, the total approach of the Opposition Parties is such that the Government do not reach a stage where those who are responsible would be punished and booked. It seems that the approach of the Opposition Parties is just to create a situation where they will try and derive political mileage.

Sir, there was an understanding in the morning that today there will be Government business in the House throughout the day. But this kind of a behaviour on the part of the Opposition Parties is totally unbecoming of the House. The Opposition Parties are taking the Parliament for a ride.

This is the behavior which the country should witness and once the country will witness the behavior of the Opposition Parties they will come to know as to what is their position in the people's eyes. Sir, we would like to urge upon you that the tactics employed by the Opposition Parties should not lead to a situation where the proceedings of the House are stalled. Already several days have been wasted. They are completely wasting the time of the House. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to make a submission.

SHRI MUKUL WASNIK: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you had very kindly given an opportunity to the Opposition Members to express their views. Sir, on the one hand, you were kind enough to even say that if the Opposition and the House want a full discussion, you are prepared to give a chance to start the discussion right away but on the other hand, the Opposition Members do not want any discussion. They only want to stall the proceedings. The

Parliamentary Affairs' Minister had stated that we are prepared for the discussion right away. But no Opposition Party was prepared for the discussion, Sir, this is not a proper thing in the House. We are prepared and they are absolutely not prepared.

AN HON. MEMBER: We want action not discussion.
(Interruptions)

SHRI MUKUL WASNIK: You may have your view point but you cannot dictate what the Government should do.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: We are representative of the people.

SHRI MUKUL WASNIK: So, we are also representatives of the people. We have not fallen from the sky in this House. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: You do not represent now. Three years ago you represented.

[Translation]

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: You won't be able to get a reply here. Please sit on your seat. You go there and ask them. You would know the reply... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: May I tell you one more thing? Whatever you are doing is being recorded, it can be shown to the people. People are watching from outside whatever you are doing.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: They are watching that you do not want the discussion, you want to stop the discussion.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: You show it to the people. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: May I say that in order to facilitate the discussion on this point and in order to pass the Supplementary Budget, if any action is required, I will be taking the action.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is meaningless to hold a discussion... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I am warning you. I am warning you. If this House is not allowed to discuss and if any action is required to be taken, which I have not taken up to this time, I will take. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You discuss it. Why are you shouting like this? You should not shout like this. You have not come here to shout. You have come here to discuss.

(interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI TEJ NARAYAN SINGH: Action will have to be taken.

(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We want action.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, you must name the Members. Then, I can move the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Not today. I will give them some latitude.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am again saying that some of the Members who have come here to discuss are not discussing. They are shouting; they are obstructing. I do not appreciate it. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am giving an opportunity to mend their ways tomorrow. Tomorrow if they do not do that, the law will take its own course.

... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I adjourn the House to meet again tomorrow at 11 a.m.

17.47 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, December 20, 1994/Agrahayana 29, 1916 (Saka)