

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Well, I would like to congratulate all the lady Members who have supported this Resolution by making the speeches as well as by endorsing the spirit in the speeches. I should be allowed to say that all of them agree with the spirit and the principle of the Resolution. Not only that, but it is not disclosing anything to the House which should not be disclosed. All the leaders of all the parties have in principle explained to me that they agree to the principles which are contained in the Resolution. Over and above, the hon. Prime Minister has made it very explicit what is the stand of the Government. I am sure this House unanimously agrees to accept in principle what has been stated in the Resolution by thumping the desks.

The Resolution was adopted by thumping the desks.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN RAWALE (South Central Bombay) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, bomb blasts are taking place at various place in the country.....(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : At least one day allow us to conduct the business in a proper manner.

.....(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : No.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : It should not be recorded.....(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Rosera) : Sir, we oppose this. This should not go on record.....(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : The poisonous allegations should not be recorded.....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN RAWALE : I am walking out in protest .

Shri Mohan Rawale then left the house.

12.28 hrs.

MOTION RE : EXPRESSION OF DISSATISFACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT'S FAILURE TO ANSWER CHARGES RELATING TO THE 'HAWALA CASE' AND TO ALLEGATIONS ABOUT ILLEGAL PAY-OFFS TO SOME MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT -CONTD.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I will request the hon. Prime Minister to say a few words.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V.NARASIMHA RAO) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, a detailed factual reply will be given by my colleague Mrs. Alva. Meanwhile in a very brief intervention, I would like to say that the Government has never sought to interfere in any manner with the investigation. The hon. Supreme court has been overseeing the various stages of the investigations and CBI has been acting under the directions only of the Supreme Court.

AN HON. MEMBER : From when?

SHRI P.V.NARASIMHA RAO : Right from the beginning. In its order dated 1.3.1996 the Supreme Court observed and I quote,

"To eliminate any impression of bias and avoid erosion of credibility of the investigations being made by the CBI and any reasonable impression of lack of fairness and objectivity therein, it is directed that the CBI would not take any instructions from or report to or furnish any particulars thereof to any authority personally interested in or likely to be affected by the outcome of the investigation into any accusations.....(Interruptions)

Sir, I would like to be heard. Now that there has been so much insistence on my speaking here, I would like to be heard.

This direction applies even in relation to any authority which exercises administrative control over the CBI by virtue of the office he holds without any exception.

We may add that this also accords with what the learned Solicitor-General has very fairly submitted before us about the mode of functioning of the CBI in this matter.

We also place on record, the further statement made by the learned Solicitor-General on instructions from the CBI Director that neither the CBI Director nor any of his officers has been reporting to any authority about any particulars relating to these investigations.

Sir, the earlier sentence is from the Solicitor-General himself. The next para is again from the Solicitor-General, on advice from the CBI Director who was present there in the Court.

The order of the Supreme Court accords fully with the Government's view as to how the CBI should act in this case. The Supreme Court has asked the CBI not to do something which the CBI has not done, is not doing and will not do. The law of the land should be allowed to take its course; there will be no departure from this under any circumstances.

Since the case is pending in the Supreme Court, it may not be advisable for me to add anything more at this stage.....(Interruptions)

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali) : Sir, the Supreme Court's Order is a censure against the Prime Minister.....(Interruptions) The Prime Minister should say something about this.....(Interruptions)

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal) : Sir, without saying this, they can say, what provoked the Supreme Court to pass that Order.....(Interruptions) The Supreme Court has made certain observation; there must be some reason for that....(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Sir, It should not be taken as a mere routine matter. We have been insisting on hearing from the Head of the Government. Hon. Prime Minister is further in charge of the Department which is dealing with this and which has the administrative control over the CBI. What is the consequence of the direction given by the hon. Supreme Court on the 1st of March? If the hon. Supreme Court was accepting the position of the assessment of the CBI Director, as expressed through the Solicitor-General, then such a drastic Order need not have been made by the Supreme Court at all. This is one point.

The second aspect is very important. What we have been wanting to know is, what is the effect of this Order. So far as the CBI is concerned, it has become, today, *sui juris*, there is nobody to control it in the Government. It has no political authority over it. No Minister is any longer responsible for what is happening from the 1st of March, regarding the Hawala transactions entirely. Therefore, we would like to know this. Is the Prime Minister in a position to answer anything about the CBI's functioning on and from the 1st of March, even with regard to the earlier happenings, after the Order of the Supreme Court? Does the Prime Minister think that he retains the political authority over the CBI or the administrative authority of the CBI and is it not a reflection on the Prime Minister's handling of the CBI?.....(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBER : No.....(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : That is why, the Supreme Court has interdicted the Prime Minister or any other authority without exception from looking into this matter or even learning about it. The CBI cannot even report to them. This is the position....(Interruptions) I would like to know, does the hon. Prime Minister, as the Head of the Government and as the Leader of the House feel disturbed or does he not feel disturbed about it?

Can the Parliament of India today take up the question of the Prime Minister's responsibility in the matter of investigation? Sir, therefore, very important work of the Parliament cannot be discharged today because I cannot hold anybody responsible (Interruptions)....Let us not treat these matters always on a partisan basis. There is a constitutional question involved in it; propriety is involved in it. The question is whether Parliament of India can face a situation where it cannot hold the Government accountable on certain executive function also. Is this the concept of the Constitution of our country or the accountability of Ministers to Parliament of India? These are basic questions. The hon. Prime Minister does not choose to answer it. We have also read what he has read out. It is not for this only. Therefore, please do not treat it so casually. It is being treated casually; you do not mind your authority being taken away but, as a Member of Parliament, I do mind my authority being taken away. This cannot happen in this country... (Interruptions) Therefore, Sir, I earnestly request the hon. Prime Minister to respond as he is the custodian..... (Interruptions)..

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : May I just say a few words to elaborate it?

The Supreme Court and the High Courts of different State have been entrusting several cases to the CBI for investigation. The cases include a wide variety such as alleged failure of local agencies, violation of human rights, disappearance of persons, murder, custodial deaths, atrocities against women, etc. Some of the cases are those relating to the incidents of Allahabad High Court, Uttarakhand, Muzaffarnagar, Shri J.S. Kalra, Pilibhit, illegal detention by two IPS officers of some individuals at Hissar, forgery and false affidavit submitted to an IPS officer, disappearance of persons near Gurdaspur, etc. In all these cases, the Supreme Court and the High Courts concerned have ordered CBI to submit reports to them. The CBI have accordingly been reporting to the concerned court directly...(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : No, that is not the point.....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Let us hear him first.

.....(Interruptions)

SHRI P.V.NARASIMHA RAO : No reports are sent to the Government or any other authority in these cases, only when a prosecution is needed or information is to be provided to Parliament, is information supplied for that specific purpose. There is nothing unusual in the CBI reporting to the Supreme Court or a High Court directly in compliance with the direction of the concerned court. The Government have not called for reports from the CBI nor otherwise interfered in such cases. The whole exercise, in such cases, has been as per the due process of law....(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : The House has been awaiting with great interest and great impatience for the last few days to get the response of the Government and particularly of the Prime Minister, his reaction to, I should say, unprecedented order of the Supreme Court dated the 1st of March.

Sir, whether I am correct in doing so or not, I wish to place on record on the floor of the House our deep appreciation of the role which is being played in this *Havala* affair by these three justices of the Supreme Court, M/s. Verma Bharucha and Sen and also four petitioners of the Public Interest litigation case, Mr. Vineet Narain, Mr. Rajinder Puri and two others. But for that, but for their vigilance, but for their persistence, these matters would never have come to light. They would have been suppressed and who would have suppressed them, Sir, is anybody's guess.

This list of names which have been disclosed from the so-called Jain diary is dating for the last four years. They were revealed four years ago. But nothing was happening about it. Despite the fact that these reports about these people and about this money, the sources of this money, where these funds were coming from - apart from the question of who has been receiving them - where the funds were coming from; for what purposes these funds were being spent here in the country, has distinct tones of subversion, of links with foreign subversive forces which would like to destabilize the system in our country. Apart from that the linking with some militants, at least who have been operating in Kashmir, the people who are now talking very loudly about morals and about their cleanliness in this matter and all that are people also who know very well that these funds were also being used in order to finance terrorist outfits who were working openly against the integrity of our country. And also, Sir, as I had mentioned earlier during the Question Hour, these *Havala* funds have been responsible for a large scale destabilization, I should say, of our whole economic system. The loss to the country which runs into millions and millions of dollars, which is a direct result of malpractices and illegal practices

being carried out by various people in this country, whether it is through evasion of taxes, or stashing away funds illegally in foreign banks, or through under-invoicing and over-invoicing all is connected this massive operation of the *havala*. In spite of all these, are we to take it that none of these reports were available to the CBI when these names were divulged through the famous diary? Did they know nothing about it? Are we now to assume as the Prime Minister said, that none of these reports were made available to the Government? The Government did not know anything about what was happening! If so, then the CBI has also failed in its duty. Certainly, the CBI which enjoyed a reputation at one time of being perhaps the only independent investigative agency in this country at the highest level has failed in its duty if it did not keep the Government apprised of this very dangerous angle to this whole operation which was going on.

It is not a question only of morals and immorality. I do not want to discuss this thing only on this plane - who is clean and who is not clean. I could talk about it of course. I have nothing to fear about. But it is not the only question that you can go into. This was an operation being carried out by certain foreign forces-- foreign powers, I would say -- who through these various conduits are financing people in this country in order to destabilize the whole system:

Sir, We are living in a parliamentary democracy whether we like it or not, some people do not like it. Some people do not like it, occasionally they talk about their preference for military rule and all that kind of a thing. What I am saying is, Sir, in a parliamentary democratic system, unless you decide to change it, the Executive is responsible and is accountable to the Parliament.

Over the last three-four years we have been having numerous examples of how accountability is being completely denigrated and destroyed. Nobody is held to be accountable for major scams which are taking place for thousands of crores of rupees of public money which is being embezzled and lost; nobody is made accountable for it. This is system we are now working under. As I have said on a previous occasion, if accountability is given a burial, then you might as well say goodbye to this parliamentary democracy. It has not meaning without the principle of accountability which is the bedrock on which it rests.

Here we find from what the hon. Prime Minister has said just now, if I understand anything from what he has said, that the Government has never been accountable for what the CBI is unearthing and discovering or for not taking action on that. This is an astounding thing, Sir, which I am not able to follow at all. If all these things

have been happening and nobody is accountable for it in the Government, in the Cabinet, then what role is the Parliament to play? Nothing! I cannot now ask questions about the progress of investigations as far as *hawala* is concerned because nobody is there to reply; nobody has the authority or the right to reply after the Supreme Court's latest order. Even the documents have all been ordered to be kept under lock and key in the vaults of the Reserve Bank. Nobody is to have access to that. This is unprecedented thing.

I want to know, Sir, in the view of the hon. Prime Minister what was the sudden provocation for the hon. Judges of the Supreme Court to come out with an order like this? If nothing was required, if everything was proceeding all right before, this if there was not interference what so ever by them, why has it become necessary for this Bench of the Supreme Court to express its apprehension about the idea which may get around that it is not being done impartially, that there is a lack of credibility, that there may be a bias? They used the word bias. If there was no bias, why did these Judges go out of their way to make this kind of an order? It does not make any sense. It does not make any sense why these Judges suddenly..* without any provocation, without any reason, without any evidence, without anything, have come out with this order and virtually taken away the control of this whole Department -- if you like to call it -- or this agency, taken it away from the Government, from the Prime Minister, from the other Ministers? Why have they done it?

Obviously, there was some *prima facie* evidence before the hon. Judges that there was interference going on, that instructions were being given to the CBI thereby hampering the independent nature of its functioning, and that, Sir, they were also having to report, of course. In the recent days in the press and everywhere there have been so many suspicions expressed about one aspect, let me say, about selectivity. Who is deciding that some people are to be proceeded against and some may not be proceed against; some may have to be charge-sheeted and others may not be charge-sheeted? There is a clear case of selectivity. Was this selectivity entirely only at the independent initiative of the CBI or were there any guidelines or instructions or anything being given to them from above? I do not know. But we should know about it because something or other has aroused this suspicion or misgivings in the minds of the hon. Judges which has led them to make these remarks and which has led them to make this order saying that you should have nothing further to do. If they had nothing to do with them before, why should they come out of their way to make such an order that you should have nothing to do

* (Expunged as ordered by the Chair).

with it, to absolutely remove it from their control, their authority and everything? Therefore, Sir, as any man can understand - anybody who has got any common sense, who does not want to hide the facts - it is quite obvious that this agency was not being allowed to function independently.

It is quite obvious. Therefore, if we are discussing now only about the implications of this order..... (Interruptions).

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA (Balasore) : If we, at the moment, are discussing or making our observations only on the political and other implications of this order of the Supreme Court...

MR. SPEAKER : No, we are taking into consideration the Motion itself.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : Probably you are concentrating on one point. But if you want to dilate and go to the other areas, I think, it is better if you do it at one go..... (Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : There may not be 'later on'. This 'later on' has landed me..... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : The time constraint is there.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You will please permit me. I do not want to take time. I will take only a few minutes. What I wish to say, Sir.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, of course.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI : He wanted to say something on the Prime Minister. The Deputy Leader wanted to say something. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : He will be allowed Certainly Vajpayee ji will be allowed to say something.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, if it is being discussed, then I will have to respond. The Prime Minister has intervened just now and only the issue concerning CBI has been taken up. Several other issues had also come in the discussion. Has the Prime Minister thrust the responsibility on Margret Alva to reply to all these issues? Mr. Speaker, Sir, some issues are of such a nature that these could only be replied by the Prime Minister and none else.

MR. SPEAKER : He has given me in writing

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : You are well aware that when I moved the motion I had raised two issues. One was the Hawala scandal and the other related to the purchase of some hon. Members in the wake of the 2nd No confidence Motion. The Prime Minister did not say anything about the second issue and all those hon. Members who rebutted that they had taken money have also admitted that they were taken to meet the Prime Minister... (Interruptions) Shri Mandal's statement is recorded in the proceedings, in which it was said that Shri Buta Singh took them to Prime Minister's House. Mr. Speaker, Sir, who will reply whether they went there or not and what happened there so as the question of CBI is concerned, my friends have raised some issues. They are very serious issues and this House as well as the country would like to know as to what prompted the Supreme Court to issue this kind of directive? Such a directive cannot be issued without any reason. The Supreme Court has referred to the fact that it should not be biased, it wants to leave no room for this at all. This was not sound that the Supreme Court had a doubt that some foul play there?

THE MINISTER OF POWER (SHRI N.K.P. SALVE): Atal jee, this is wrong.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, please also give an opportunity to reply all these things.....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I may be allowed to complete. Please allow me to complete my submission. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : It is only Mr. Gupta's statement will go on record nothing else.....(Interruptions)*

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : So far, I was dealing with the implication of the Supreme Court's order of the 1st of March, which is concerned only with the investigations into what is known as the *hawala* case, and nothing else. The second point--which Vajpayeeji has again reminded us just now-- is that there are serious allegations which may be true or may be false. I do not know..

But very serious allegations were made publicly by no less a person than the Leader of the Opposition, who is after all a responsible person....(Interruptions). I know at other times, you consider him very responsible. Now you do not.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI : That allegation has been accepted by the Government.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : No, it has not been accepted by the Government. He has made very serious allegations. On 18th January, Mr. S.K. Jain had told the police in a statement that on 11th March, 1195 an amount of Rs. 2.50 crore or Rs. 3 crore was paid to the Prime Minister.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : No. That is false.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It is a question of Parliamentary propriety and Parliamentary tradition. The Court has told the CBI also that any allegation which comes- maybe true or maybe false - has got to be investigated to the end by you, even if they involve some persons of very high status and high standards.

MR. SPEAKER : Let us be very clear on one point. The Motion has been allowed to be discussed. But at the time we granted the permission for the discussion on this Motion, all hon. Members were aware of the fact that this matter is pending before the court and in spite of the fact that the matter is before the court, we did allow this discussion. The understanding of all us should be that we should discuss it in such a fashion that principle of *sub judice* is not violated and the principle of *sub judice* will be violated when we say certain things on the floor of the house which are likely to affect the judgement. That nicety, that subtlety has to be borne in mind. I leave it to the judgement of the Members.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I fully agree with you, Sir that just as the principle of *sub judice* has to be respected, I am arguing that the principle of accountability can also be respected.

MR. SPEAKER : That is why we have allowed the discussion.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Yes, exactly. Now, if the Government says or anybody on behalf of the Government says that these allegations which were made, according to the Leader of Opposition, by Mr. S. K. Jain in a statement to the police, these allegations were not under interrogation. They were not under inquiry. If they make that statement categorically, than I can understand. But as far I understand from the documents available, this particular matter has not been excluded from the scope of inquiry by the Supreme Court. They have said all these things. It was because Mr. S.K. Jain is the main figure in this *hawala*. Who is he? He is the main figure

* Not recorded

involved in the *hawala*. Therefore, what I wish to say is that so long as an inquiry is going on or is proceeding against these allegations which have been levelled against the Prime Minister about his having been given money by S.K. Jain -- I do not know for what purpose; it may be connected or not connected with the question of getting some hon. Members to vote one way or the other or whatever it is - is it proper, is it in conformity with the propriety that person so accused, especially, when he has an administrative control over the CBI that he should remain in Office? Why should he remain in Office? I am not even going so far to say that he should resign. I am saying that during the pendency of that inquiry, he should step out so that an impression is not created that this inquiry will prejudice in any way by the fact of his remaining in office.

13.00 hrs.

If the same sort of apprehension of bias and lack of credibility is there, can he rise above this? ...*(Interruptions)* I am not yielding to you...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : You will have a chance to say what you want to say.

...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. SPEAKER : I will allow you.

...*(Interruptions)* .

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : My second point is that in our view, so long as investigations are going on into this very serious allegations made by no less person publicly than the Leader of Opposition and so long the propriety demands that in the interest of objectivity and lack of bias and independence of that inquiry the accused person should voluntarily step down from his office and allow the inquiry to go on without any fear or favour...*(Interruptions)* That he is not doing and he is not saying anything about it ...*(Interruptions)*

There are many aspects to this whole *Hawala* affair which will take a long time to digress on. Some other hon. colleagues have spoken at a great length already in the security aspect and on the economic aspect. All these are very important aspects of this whole affair. It is not a question of who is moral and who is immoral. This is a question that the whole system is facing the danger of destabilisation and we should try to identify the forces not only in the country but outside the country, who are working to see that India as a power, India as a country ceases to count in this world.

I think, you know very well who are those forces. They may spend money like water. They have got no lack of money to see that some people in this country are

completely discredited and the whole thing is destabilised. Therefore, this security aspect and the economic aspect are very important sides of question. About morals and so on, we can go on discussing. We will have to work out some other norms, codes and things for that. That is a different matter. I am very keen of that, We, of course, the Left Parties, could have taken a very high and mighty stand because none of us figured in those lists...*(Interruptions)*

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South) : So what, there are so many diaries.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : The point is, something much more serious is going on. She is only interested in discrediting some Ministers in West Bengal...*(Interruptions)* But the much more important and serious matter is that the whole system is facing destabilisation and some people here wittingly or unwittingly, I do not know, have fallen into this trap. They may not know about it and by taking this money they have played the game of these destabilisers. They should be very careful about that. This is what I am advising them to do...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (Barrackpore) :*(Interruptions)*

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, he is using filthy language in Bengali....*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I expect the Member to maintain the dignity of the House in the use of language also.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Finally, Sir, I am saying that it is all very well for somebody to say, " yes, I took this money, it was given as a donation for some political work or for my party work, that is all I have spent it and it is not being used for any other purpose". Somebody may claim like that.

Though there are people here who really baffle me and these people who have got vast amounts of private wealth -- anyhow it is not a crime, they may have private wealth, family wealth running into crores and crores -- how such people are tempted to take this money of Rs. 30 lakh or Rs. 40 lakh, I do not know. Anyway the point is if it is somebody's mere allegations mere do not constitute truth. *(Interruptions)*.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF NON CONVENTIONAL ENERGY SOURCES (PROF. P. J. KURIEN) : You presume that they are correct. They are only allegations. Unless they are proved, you cannot say like this....*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Shri Kurien, mere allegations do not amount to proof; mere denials also do not amount to innocence. You see, that is the point.

You can say, "I have not taken it. This is all false. I never took any money." Well, it is up to the CBI or somebody else to prove that he actually took the money. If I say, "I took the money as a donation for my party work," then I must be able to show some accounts; I must have a record somewhere. If I do not, then the income-tax people will be on my neck. I must show that these accounts are there, this is how the money has been disposed of and this is how it is being cleared... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA MAYAK (Phulbani) : Sir, he only wanted two minutes... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I have allowed him to speak on this motion and you will please not interfere

MR. INDRAJIT GUPTA : Sir, they can speak afterwards.

So, the point is that who are not able to clear themselves in accordance with the law, I hope that they will be made to pay for their sins that they have committed. That is the purpose of the Law. The hon. Prime Minister has said that the law will take its own course. but the law never took its course during the last four years; the law was sleeping; the Government allowed it to sleep and the CBI was too scared to do anything.

Therefore, Sir, I wish to conclude by saying that this whole affair, a murky affair, which, I think, has not increased our stature in the International comity of nations also; the foreigners are writing, talking and saying, "Oh India! India is one of the most corrupt countries in the world." This is not the kind of reputation we like to have. Therefore, I would say that those who are guilty, who cannot get themselves cleared according to the law, they will have to pay the price; they should be made to pay the price. And it is not simply enough to resign from some posts and then come and sit here again.

I agree that by mere hurling of allegations do not amount to proof; simply denying a thing does not amount to innocence also. If they have taken this money, they must account for it. Do the big parties, the major parties in this country, maintain any register for donations received? There is nothing wrong in receiving donations. They may have received political donations for their party work but that must be entered somewhere; it must be accounted for somewhere; it cannot just disappear into the thin air. And then people say, "Yes, I took it for this work but I did not maintain any accounts." That would not do. I hope that the Finance Minister agrees with that. Otherwise, so much money will be just siphoned off and disappeared.

Therefore, Sir, ultimately I would say after all, the Head of this Government is the Head of this administration also. I do not know whether any administration now exists at all. The administration is in a shambles because of what has happened with the resignation of Ministers and all that. So the hon. Prime Minister is looking after so many portfolios now. They are all concentrated in his hand. But anyway we, on this side of the house, all feel, in view of what has happened and with a view to vindicating the reputation and the honesty of this country also, the standards for which we have worked all these years, the hon. Prime Minister should voluntarily step down from his office and allow the investigation to proceed without any kind of hindrance and without any kind of suspicion of bias and all that.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE : Mr. Speaker Sir, please allow me to speak... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Salve, I will allow you after Shri Chandra Shekharji speaks.

... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : Mr. Speaker Sir, I only said in Bengali *Na bujhe boina*, that means, 'without knowing do not talk'. This is not unparliamentary at all. This is not a filthy language... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : If it is not, then you are not responsible. If it is, you are. Now, I call Shri Chandra Shekhar to speak.

[*Translation*]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question raised by Shri Somnath Chatterjee was in my view, more important. The basic question after the judgement of the Supreme Court is whether we are wholly independent in discharging our responsibility in regard to the dignity of the House, its rights and its duty towards the people? if we are unable to answer this basic question, then by accusing one another and indulging in high moral talks we would neither be enhancing the dignity of the House nor the nation.

I agree to majority of views of my friend Shri Indrajit Gupta. I am not prepared to believe that a person becomes corrupt merely on the basis of an accusation... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I did not say so... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Did not you say that it was surprising as to how a person who is immensely rich and has ancestral property, can accept money? It means that such a person has accepted money. If we

go into the records of money transactions, most of us would not dare talk of dignity. Therefore, I do not want to say anything about it. The only regret I have is about the Prime Minister's statement that surprised me. After the Supreme Court judgement, I was under the impression that the Prime Minister would request the Supreme Court to spell out the reasons for this kind of an observation. But from the statement made by him today, it seems the Solicitor General too has admitted this fact. As long as the Supreme Court did not point out to the Solicitor General that the Government was interfering or there is something fishy about it, there was not need to make such a statement. If the Solicitor General has given an assurance to the Supreme Court that the Prime Minister would not issue any directive or orders to the CBI nor supervise its working, then he is neither aware of his duty nor the legal system and the Parliamentary system. As has been said by Shri Somanth Chatterjee, we may agree that the Prime minister has no authority in this matter either to give instructions to the CBI or interfere in its working, but when an apprehension that a charge can be levelled against anyone is expressed and for this reason the CBI has been directed not to seek any instruction nor give any information to any authority, this is an ominous portent. Mr. Prime Minister, you are not mindful of your dignity. But in the Parliamentary democracy, you are the leader of Lok Sabha. If you come under cloud, even indirectly, it is a blow to the dignity of the House.

I do not plead for anyone's resignation. To resign from a high post is not that easy. I know it requires a lot of will-power. But, the hon. Prime Minister is adorning an exalted post. I have never commented on the judgment of the Supreme Court. It is within their jurisdiction. Whatever they do for justice is binding on all. But the Supreme Court has no right to interfere with the powers of the Prime Minister in a Parliamentary democracy. If that right by the Prime Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali) : Sir, I am on a point of order ...*(Interruptions)* How are you challenging the Supreme Court's authority.

MR. SPEAKER : What is your point of view?

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali) : Under Article 141 of the Constitution of India, the law laid down by the Supreme Court is binding on all...*(Interruptions)* It is binding on all which include the Parliament. It has been laid down in the Bharti's case that even the Parliament has got no authority to amend the basic structure of the Constitution which includes the supremacy of the judiciary.

Therefore, the hon. Member is not entitled to challenge the authority of the Supreme Court to give a direction to the Prime Minister or the executive authority or all authorities concerned. Sir, what the Supreme Court has said, is this is one line only :

'To eliminate any impression of bias and erosion of credibility of the investigation being made by the CBI and any reasonable amount of lack of fairness and objectivity therein, It is directed that the CBI would not take any instructions from, report to or furnish any particulars thereof to any authority personally interested in or likely to be affected by the outcome of the investigation into any acquisition.'

Sir, what I want to raise by way of this point of order is that the hon. Member is within his rights to say anything in Parliament except to challenge the supremacy of the Supreme Court under Article 141 of the Constitution. If the authority of the Supreme Court is challenged under Article 141 of the Constitution, Your Honour is the custodian and, therefore, Your Honour should stop him from challenging the authority of the Supreme Court and the Prime Minister should go before it. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please do not confuse me. Now, please, I have heard what you have said very carefully and I am sure that all members have heard what you have said carefully. Article 141 reads like this :

"The law declared by the Supreme Court shall be binding on all courts within the territory of India."

The decisions given by the Supreme Court will be respected by the High Courts and lower courts. This article says nothing more than that and I do not think that your point of order is relevant.

...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. SPEAKER : Not like this please; not like this. Do not disturb. please, let us understand what Shri Lodha has said.

...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. SPEAKER : Please; not like this.

...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. SPEAKER : If you carry on discussions like this, the discussions is derailed.

...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you not stop at least now? What Shri Lodha said is not without substance on facts, but on 141, I think, he had quoted wrongly.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, in view of your directive I have nothing to say. But I fail to understand what caused the hon. Member to think that I am challenging the authority of the Supreme Court. I had said that the Supreme Court has full authority in legal matters. I have never held the office of a judge but I have certainly studied the constitution.

The Constitution has explicitly defined the powers of various States and Institutions and they enjoy autonomy in their fields. Similarly, the Parliament and the Executive enjoy independent status. If the Supreme Court gives an inkling that it has doubts on the role of the Executive head in certain matter then it would become difficult to implement the Constitution provisions. What I mean to say is that the Government on that very day should have asked the Supreme Court to spell out the reasons that necessitated this observation.

I was surprised when the hon. Prime Minister said in his statement the Solicitor General agreed to the observation of the Supreme Court. If it is so, the situation then becomes onimous. In such a situation any discussion here becomes meaningless. Because when the Supreme Court casts a doubt on the Leader of the House and he does not rebutt, I fail to understand how a leaderless Parliament can have a discussion on this issue.

Mr. Speaker Sir, I do not want to go into the issue of allegation and counter-allegation. I neither seek anybody's resignation nor make an appeal in the name of morality. But those people who are making a hue and cry should remember the fact that the foreign forces are bent upon creating a situation of instability in the country. It should be always kept in mind that instability can be created by levelling charges on one another. India is not a corrupt country. Here 80 percent population earn their livelihood by dint of their hard labour. The remaining 20 per cent populace which comprise Government servants, army jawans and others, lead a respectable life. I would like to request that we should not speak irrelevant things about India in our speeches. Sir, through you, I would like to urge the hon. Prime Minister that he could have served the country and the House better had he not read the statements prepared by his officers.

[English]

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE : Sir, I do not have the benefit of listening to the entire debate. Therefore, very respectfully I am craving your indulgence and the indulgence of hon. Members Shri Vajpayeeji and Shri Chandra Shekharji to mention a very limited issue.

An inference is sought to be drawn by the order of the Supreme Court that the Supreme Court expressed distrust in the Prime Minister. I asked a senior advocate of the Supreme Court; where was the warrant for Supreme Court to make this kind of a statement or this kind of an order where, as it is the Prime Minister cannot interfere in the criminal investigation of the case?

Sir, I know very well, in tax matters the Finance Minister has no business to interfere with the matter of an assessment in the case of an assessee. ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : That is a quasi judicial matter.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE : Shri Somnath Chatterjee will appreciate what I am telling him. Why was this order made? I am told-- I was not there personally -- If I am wrong I would like to be corrected. ... (Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER : You are not a judge. ... (Interruptions).

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE : Sir, I am craving your indulgence because whatever I say may throw some light on the issue both for ... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : I welcome your statement and request the Members to understand what he is saying.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE : What I have been told by Senior Counsel is that *amicus curiae* made a statement today before the Bench that persistently it is appearing in the newspapers that Prime Minister is interfering in the investigation of this case since he himself is involved. When that statement was made by an *amicus curiae* they said : 'will the statement come' ? Then he said that it has not been refuted by the Government. I am told, then the Solicitor General got up and said that there is absolutely no intervention whatsoever and he cannot intervene and there has been factually no intervention. It is on that this sort of an order was made. ... (Interruptions). What does not suit to their convenience they are not willing to listen. ... (Interruptions). I have said that this is what I have been told. It is under these circumstances that this order has been made.

The newspapers were carrying out that the Prime Minister was interfering, and when that was brought to the notice of the court by an *amicus curiae* story, the Supreme Court thought it proper to make it express that the matter will be reported directly to them. Therefore, I submit respectfully that if what I have stated is factually correct, then there is absolutely no warrant to draw an interference that by its order, the Supreme Court has cast any aspersion on the integrity of the Prime Minister ... (Interruptions).

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI : Mr. Speaker Sir, what Mr. Salve has said, is coming from a third person. Why can't an official version of that be given?...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI SOMANTH CHATTERJEE : Sir, is this the way of interpreting an order?...*(Interruptions)*. You are giving the background of an order. Is an order to be interpreted in its background? If there is no ambiguity in the order, then do not mislead the House*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE : As I have said that a senior lawyer has told me like this.*(Interruptions)*. Were you there in the court?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You are misleading the house. No order is interpreted unless there is ambiguity on the basis of the background.*(Interruptions)*.

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA : Sir, in favour of the Motion, the Leaders of the Opposition have told everything. But sometimes there are some puzzles in their mind. The House should appreciate that earlier also similar cases have been brought in this House. Harshad Mehta has said that he given Rs. one crore in a suitcase. The *Hawala* matter was brought to the court when the Jain brothers' farm house was raised and a diary was found. It is evident that some names have found their place in that diary. We are bringing in the name of our hon. Prime Minister into this matter but the CBI has clarified the matter. When S.K. Jain was in custody at that time he had stated that he had given money to ...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Patra, I am not allowing you to go into the details. That is exactly what I said to Mr. Indrajit Ji.

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA : I am coming to the point. They are telling why the Supreme Court is making this sort of remarks and why this power has been withdrawn from the hon. Prime Minister. The hon. Prime Minister has categorically stated in Calcutta to the reporters on 17th January that law will take its own course. Perhaps he has given his mind that even if he is found to be culprit, the law will take action against him also. This is a very clear and stark image of our Prime Minister. That is why the remarks of the Supreme Court will not vitiate any sort of investigation. The CBI, on January 23, 1996, had said that there was no corroborative material to substantiate the oral statement of S.K. Jain....*(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Patra, please hear me first. This is a matter in which, on one hand, you should have

the freedom to speak and, on the other, you should not trespass into the area which is before the court. So, there is a lot of tight rope walking. I think you have made your point and it should be sufficient now.

DR. KARTIKESWAR PATRA : Sir, I will submit two points here. The hon. Opposition leaders are puzzled that whether the Prime Minister has to step down on the basis of the allegation of Shri S.K. Jain. That is totally denied by the court of law. If the court of law recognises a *prima facie* then that can be considered*(Interruption)*. Secondly, they are saying that this supreme House has been degraded. No, this is not the case because the hon. Prime Minister voluntarily has stated that law will take its own course and the Lordship of Supreme Court will give verdict and the Lordship of Supreme Court directed the C.B.I. to investigate into the matter if there is any *prima facie* issue. If there is no *prima facie* issue nothing could be done. So, we should not be afraid of any sort of constitutional problem that our Supreme Court is giving any sort of indication, ...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : Very good. Shri Arjun Singh to speak now.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH (Satna) : MR. Speaker, Sir, I will confine myself very precisely to the issue that had to be addressed this morning which was addressed by the hon. Prime Minister in this house and which, I think, was what all the Members of the Opposition wanted to happen this morning. I am conscious of the fact that for whatever reason it may be, I am one of those accused of having taken some money. I would like to state what I have stated outside that I bow before the majesty of the law. The laws of the land are large enough, powerful enough to decide what is right and what is wrong. I submit to it and I am confident that through the legal processes my innocence will be established.

Having said that, I will not go in that aspect at all, I will confine myself, Sir, entirely to what hon. Prime Minister has said here in his statement. If I can recollect and relate properly, the burden of his statement was that this is a matter which is being investigated by the C.B.I. under the direction of the Supreme Court. Everything flows out of that. The ultimate order of the Supreme Court on 1st March, 1996 follows almost as a natural corollary to what was happening for the last years. Therefore, there is no need to be alarmed about it and certainly not to feel that anything has been done to influence the investigation. This is, in essence, what his entire statement meant to say, according to me.

With your kind permission, because this issue is not confined to individuals, it is not the subject matter of a debate only for the purpose of scoring a point, in my humble opinion, this Parliament which represents the sovereign will of the people of this country, is passing through a very trying phase of its history.

What we do and what we do not do will ultimately, could ultimately affect the credibility of the institutions of this Republic and at some point of time could even affect this Republic itself. We should be conscious that we will, one day, stand at the Bar of history, may be physically not. But at that bar of history, this generation will have to answer whether at a point where all the values, beliefs and ideals that we cherish -- I do not count anybody out of it, we all do it -- when they came under attack, how this Parliament, how did we rise up to the occasion to protect these ideals, those principles, the republican character and the basic characteristics of the edifice of this Republic?

• Having said that, Sir, now I would kindly request you to give 4-5 minutes to delineate and then to seek certain specific clarification from the hon. Prime Minister. according to reports which have not been denied, it is in July, 1991 that this entire matter came to the notice of the Government after a raid was carried out and certain seizures were made.

The first clarification I want to seek from the hon. Prime Minister is at what point of time did he personally come to know about this entire issue? The second point is that from 1991 to 1993, a certain procedure was being adopted. Whatever was being done, I am sure, it must have been done under the laws of this land. None of us is privy to it. But the fact has emerged that in 1993 a public interest litigation was filed in the Supreme Court that perhaps what needs to be done is not being done. Therefore, the hon. Supreme Court should intervene and ensure that what is desirable and what is necessary according to the law, by which the CBI itself is also governed, should be done. The Supreme Court became seized of the matter. We are not aware of the day-to-day progress and the orders that were given. The newspaper gave us the impression that the Supreme Court was not initially satisfied about what needed to be done was being done expeditiously. So, it was asked to do everything. The second point which the Prime Minister has attempted to make here is that the entire exercise in this matter, is being done under the direction of Supreme Court. In all humility, Sir, I would like to say that perhaps that is not the fact as it exists. The Supreme Court came into this matter late in the day and even when it did come into it, it took notice, it did not direct day-to-day action of the CBI. They did not monitor the investigation. They only wanted the CBI to do its duty. According to the press reports, we have been told that in November and December the day-to-day monitoring was being done by the Prime Minister himself or the PMO. None has contradicted that. By that as it may, the order of the Supreme Court on 30th January 1996, perhaps for the first time, has brought this whole issue in bold relief, in proper perspective and actually the word has been used that we are passing this order so that is

placed in the record of this file to keep everything in proper perspective. In that order, Sir, for the first time, the Supreme Court said that all allegations against whomsoever they may have been made have to be investigated and if at any point of time the CBI comes to the conclusion that on the basis of an investigation, no case is made out against anyone, before that case is closed, it will be done only after the satisfaction of the Supreme Court and not otherwise. This is the order the Supreme Court passed on 30th January, 1996. On 22nd February, when this matter again came up before the Supreme Court to be reported to, according to the press reports, the CBI did suggest that they did not have any specific information on which they could conclude that a case can be made out against two people.

They did not name anyone. Subsequently, I do not know why the Supreme Court did not say 'yes' or 'no' to that and the CBI itself said that they will continue that investigation, which means that either they did not place the facts to the satisfaction of, the hon. Supreme Court or did not choose to do so for whatever reason it may be.

Now, Sir, it is only on the 1st of March the specific order which is not the subject matter of debate here was passed. I do not want to repeat the wordings of that order. The hon. senior Member Shri Chandra Shekharji has summed it up correctly. But it is a matter which deserves very close scrutiny. If that is the case or if it is the case that was done at the prompting of the Government, that the Solicitor-General prompted the Court to pass the order, then we would like to know about it. ... (*Interruptions*). It is not uncorroborated. The Prime Minister's statement in this House says that.

Sir, the point is this, There are a number of petitions in the Supreme Court and in some of those petitions through the *amicus curiae* Shri Anil Deewan, very specific indications have been made, specific allegations also have been made where it has been alleged that the charge-sheets have been tailored.

MR. SPEAKER : It is this thin line, anything need not be said which can affect or influence the judgement.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, I am very small person.

MR. SPEAKER : No; you are a very senior person.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : I do not think the hon. Supreme Court is going to be influenced by whatever I say. If that be the case, then, I think, nobody should say anything. Then, let us close the debate, if accountability is of no value..

MR. SPEAKER: Arjun Singhji, we have allowed the discussion on it. We have allowed you to make a statement on this. I am very responsibly making a statement

that when we have not disallowed the discussion on this important matter which can help us to make a policy or reform the system, when we are entitled to make the laws, there is the other institution which is entitled to enforce interpret the law and there is third institutions which is entitled to enforce the law. We shall have to keep all these things in view while making the statement. This is what I am saying.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, I bow to your superior wisdom and I have no intention to transgress any line, much less the line that you draw, because I know that as the Speaker of this House you will draw a line only where it is a necessary. Therefore, I am not going to cross that line.

MR. SPEAKER : Generally I do not draw any line.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : I am not going to cross that line. But the point still remains as to what prompted the hon. Supreme Court to pass this order. My contention is not voluntarily because I have also not imagined it, it has appeared in the press the proceedings of the Supreme Court have appeared in the Press, all of us know it, it has been quoted here -- that perhaps the investigation was not going on the correct and proper lines. Therefore, I presume -- unless there is something contrary to rebut this presumption, whether it comes from the hon. Prime Minister or from another order of the Court, I am entitled to make that presumption and I would very much like this presumption of mine to be rebutted by something which Prime Minister himself says, because I do not consider him an individual alone.

As the Leader of the House and as the Prime Minister of this country he is in a position, a very important position. He represents the people of this country. He is the highest executive of this country and therefore it has to come from him whether my presumption is wrong or not.

In the end there is one simple question which I would like to ask because it is only he who can enlighten this House. I will not say the thing that follows therefrom. I would like that he informs this House, by his own mouth, whether in the Jain Hawala case, he, as Prime Minister, is under investigation or not. ... (Interruptions)...

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you later. Now, today is Friday and at 3.30 p.m. we have to take up the Private Members' Business and in the wisdom of the leaders of the parties it is decided that this discussion should continue up to 3.30 p.m. Then, tomorrow on the next day, i.e., Monday, we will take up essential business so that it can be transmitted to the other House and later on the reply will be given... (Interruptions)...

MR. SPEAKER : After one or two Members have spoken, if you want to break for the lunch, we will do that and if you want to continue, we can continue. But in that case I will allow the Members to go, if they want to go.

... (Interruptions)...

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI : Sir, after the Private Members's Business, i.e., at 6.00 p.m., would the discussion be resumed?

MR. SPEAKER : If it is necessary, we will do that.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, we were... (Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMTA BANERJEE : Sir, I was on my legs.

MR. SPEAKER : You will be called.

... (Interruptions)...

MR. SPEAKER : I think, you may be please. The matter is being recorded and it will be handed over to you and the Ministers also.

... (Interruptions)...

[Translation]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Mr. Speaker Sir, through you, I would like to submit that the hectic activities going on in the ruling party today...

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, please adjourn the House for the lunch hour. ... (Interruptions).

[English]

SHRI ANNA JOSHI (Pune) : Sir, our party is not being allowed and all others have spoken.

MR. SPEAKER : This is not correct. I will allow Mr. Vajpayee to speak.

... (Interruptions)...

MR. SPEAKER : Jaswant Singhji, I would like to know whether you want to speak now or at 6 o'clock.

... (Interruptions)...

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, we would also like to know whether the clarifications asked for on the floor of the House are going to be answered by the Prime Minister or not.

MR. SPEAKER : My reply to that is that this discussion is going on and Mrs. Margret Alva is to reply. You have said that the Prime Minister should reply...

... (Interruptions)...

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Sir, you will recollect that this issue was brought up before you that whether the Prime Minister is under investigation or not. It is only the Prime Minister who can reply. So, before he leaves for Hyderabad, let him come before the House and say what exactly the position is, whether he is under investigation or not. That is precisely we want to know.

MR. SPEAKER : Neither I can compel him to make the statement nor I can stop you from speaking. If he wants to reply, he can and if he does not want to, I cannot compel him. ... (Interruptions)...

[Translation]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Mr. Speaker Sir, I was stating that with the arrival of the hon. Prime Minister to the House, hustle and bustle is witnessed and when he leaves the House, it often happens that.....

[English]

I understand the personal difficulties that the hon. Prime Minister has in finding it convenient to be present in the House. But that is precisely the point, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister intervening just now chose to explain that he has come to the House upon our insistence on speaking. That, Sir, is an injustice to the House and an injustice to the concerns of this House. Our insistence upon his coming here and clarifying the situation was not an inconvenience that was being caused to him by this House.

[Translation]

We hoped that when the hon. Prime Minister comes to the House next time, he will throw light on the prevailing situation which will guide the treasury benches and opposition as well as the country to the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a matter of request that the hon. Prime Minister read out a written statement in the House, in which he did avoid a reference to Hawala or a person. He did not make it clear that the subject of his statement was a charge born out of S.K. Jain's diary.

[English]

I find it revealing and telling that the hon. Prime Minister, in fact, fought shy to even mention the name of Hawala or even mention the fact that this whole issue that is currently seizing the Parliament, in fact, arises from a testimony given by S.K. Jain to the Central Bureau of investigation, an official testimony. Now, Sir, I do find it necessary to refer to the other point that the hon. Prime Minister made. He stood up and, in subsequent interventions, read out another written statement which, presumably, somebody in his office had give to him

saying that it is not unusual either for the High Courts of the land or for the Supreme Court to, every now and then, direct the Police or the investigative agencies or the Central Bureau of Investigation to take specific actions. He cited the examples of Muzaffarnagar and, if I recollect right, the Dabwali and other such cases. But that again, Sir, is exactly the point. If the Courts of the land, whether the High Court or the Supreme Court, have found it necessary... (Interruptions)

Sir, I am not finding fault, but I really wish to appeal to you about this disturbance.

MR. SPEAKER : Please do not disturb the Member.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : We were informed, Sir, when the hon. Prime Minister left from here, that somebody, some diligent junior member of his Ministry of this vastly depleted and a further fast depleting Ministry, would make notes so that he is apprised when it comes to replying.

MR. SPEAKER : Every thing is recorded. They take the copies and not a word spoken is deleted.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I am touched by that, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : By now, we all know that it is in writing, it is in audio and it is in video.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA) : Sir, I apologise, I am taking notes here. The Prime Minister has asked me to see him for a minute, so I had to go out.

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you not sit down in the front row?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I have no doubt about the diligence of my charming friend, Mrs. Margret Alva. But her diligence does not. Sir,...

MR. SPEAKER : She is quite disarming.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : She is charming too, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : That is correct.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA : Thank you for that, at least.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : The other point that the hon. Prime Minister read out from his prepared statement was about these cases that have been referred by

the Supreme Court relating to Muzaffarpur or Dabwal or Kalra or Pilbhit, all these, But that really begs the question because in each of these instances wherever the court has intervened and directed the inquiry to be focused in a particular manner, it is only when the court has had a reason to believe the *prima facie* there was sufficient ground.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He is regretting on these matters.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Exactly. I am amazed at the Prime Minister's own admission that all these cases that have been referred by the Supreme Court or the High Court are, therefore, sufficient ground now for the Supreme Court in the case of S.K. Jain's diary, to also refer this and say what they have said. But this is an embarrassing admission by the Head of the executive, the Leader of the House, the Leader of the Government, the Prime Minister to make because in each of these cases there existed (a) a crime, (b) sufficient grounds to believe that the crime was not being investigated well enough and (c) that not only was the crime not being investigated, in fact, the investigation was being perverted by executive action, and it is on that account that those courts whether it was the Supreme Court or the High Court directed that you will now not report to the executive and you will do what we direct. I am astounded that the Prime Minister has found it fit to cite precisely this to say that what the Supreme Court has now said is perfectly in order. Let me remind the hon. Prime Minister that it is not, simply not, in order. This statement by the Supreme Court is a direct expression of lack of confidence in this Government. After all, the Supreme Court, as has been pointed out, did not arrive at his conclusion only on the 1st March. The Supreme Court has persistently been cautioning you. The Supreme Court has been slowly moving towards removing this responsibility from you because whenever you have gone to the Supreme Court, gradually the Supreme Court has been telling you that you are exercising selectivity, that you are not approaching this issue as you ought to, and on every hearing that the Supreme Court has had, it has on one occasion after another, cautioned the Government, it has cautioned the Central Bureau of Investigation, it has used words from the bench like you are selectively investigating. The Supreme Court is not convinced that what you are doing is correct and it is out of that, that finally, on the 1st of March, this observation from the Supreme Court comes. What are the three major components of this observation?

To my mind, the first component is that the Supreme Court finds that *prima facie* there exists a case, and there exist grounds for investigating the Prime Minister in the statement given by S.K. Jain to the Central Bureau of investigation. If the Supreme Court had come to the

conclusion that *prima facie* there has nothing to investigate, which after all is what the CBI itself had enclosed to, because the CBI had gone to the Court and said "Here are these two about whom we do not find sufficient grounds to investigate." The Supreme Court, by saying what it has -- I do not repeat by reading out what the Supreme Court said -- it used words like 'biased' and it is because the Supreme Court after hearing the CBI, after hearing the Solicitor-General, came to the conclusion that *prima facie* there exists a case against the Prime Minister and because *prima facie* it is not in agreement with the CBI, that that case does not warrant investigation, that it said "You will no more investigate. We will investigate because there are grounds for bias." After all, against whom could this bias be? Can the bias he spoken of as bias of the Central Bureau of Investigation itself? Is it an apprehension of bias about what the CBI might be doing?

14.00 hrs

Or that the bias might be the bias of the CBI itself? Then, certainly, Sir, what the Supreme Court would have said is: "we are not convinced that you, the Central Bureau of Investigation, are conducting this investigation without bias. Therefore, we direct the CBI to give up this investigation and we will direct some other agency to do so". It has said it wishes to remove bias. If the apprehension of bias are not against the CBI, then, is it an apprehension of bias against the political executive to which the CBI reports? Obviously enough, Sir, the Supreme Court has clearly expressed apprehension about the political authority against the Executive ..(*Interruptions*) I will not sit down now. Because simply by shaking your head, the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs and Personnel cannot negate the point. You will certainly dissent. That is obvious. But I am astounded at the casualness of the Prime Minister when he simply reads out a prepared statement and says that Shrimati Margaret Alva, the Minister of State in the Ministry of State yearning to become a full-fledged Minister, who is a Minister of State in the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and Personnel, she will reply to the factual matters. How can the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs or Personnel reply to this wholesale massacre of the Prime Minister's Cabinet colleagues by this case? Is Shrimati Margret Alva going to answer for all the ministerial berths that are empty today? Is it Shrimati Margaret Alva who forwarded those resignations? Or, is it Shrimati Margret Alva who forwarded those resignations? Or, is it Shrimati Margret Alva who forwarded those resignations to the President? I am amazed at the casualness.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Did she take over those portfolios?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : (Chittorgarh) : Has she taken over all those portfolios?... (*Interruptions*). I am amazed. I am astounded at the casualness. It is truly casualness. I can recognise that the Treasury Benches are filled with the...* of the worst kind, that... which persuades them to be present here when the Prime Minister is here... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : No, That word will not go on record.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : You can certainly object to it. But how is an unparliamentary word? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I am declaring that words which can offend the other Members will not go on record. They will go. There are the categories; words which are unparliamentary; words which are offensive.*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : But how has ... become an offensive word?

MR. SPEAKER : This word, In this context, is offensive. So, I am deleting it from the record.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Sir, I am amazed... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please.

[*Translation*]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Today when the hon. Prime Minister is present in the House, all the Members of the ruling party are also present. When the hon. Prime Minister does not come here, they also absent themselves from the House. We are discussing about the presence of the hon. Prime Minister. In what words his casualness of brief presence be termed? ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK : (Bombay North) : Sir, should we not speak if they resort to such act. The truth must come out.

[*English*]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I am amazed that the Prime Minister chooses to transfer everything. What factual information can the hon. Minister give me about the conduct of the leader of the party and the leader of the Government?... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : (Chandigarh) : Is it part of the Motion that is under discussion? ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : It is a part of the Motion. Let me repeat what I have started by saying.

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer) : Please persuade the hon. Members not to interrupt the speech.

MR. SPEAKER : All the Members are requested to keep this thing in mind.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I started saying that I have reason to believe that this observation from the Bench, of first March, confirms that the Court believes that *prima facie* there is ground to investigate the charge against the Prime Minister, that allegation against the Prime Minister further. Secondly, this charge about the possibility of bias is directly against the Prime Minister and not so much against the CBI. Thirdly, about this expression of the Supreme Court, which it has made in all responsibility, we can have and we do have views about the recent case of judicial activism through which the country is now going. But notwithstanding this aspect of judicial activism, I must recognise what the Supreme Court has observed from the Bench. If this is not a direct expression of non-confidence in the Prime Minister and the Government that what the Supreme Court has actually observed from the Bench is actually a vote of confidence in the Prime Minister?

AN. HON. MEMBER : This is what they think.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : After all this, all that the Government can say and this is an interpretation that I would make of what the hon. the Prime Minister has said, that notwithstanding what the Supreme Court has said, this is not a vote of no-confidence, this is not actually an expression of no-confidence in the Prime Minister. Then are we to interpret that all that is happening is actually an expression of confidence in the Government? What an amazing attitude for the Government it is to take that even this is covered, turned around and put across by you, and simply for the remaining few weeks that remain of this Government, simply to stick to office! The whole question then boils down to one thing and that is that under the weight of such observations which are direct and unambiguous, what ought to be the response of the Prime Minister or the Government? Either it is for the Prime Minister to recognise the enormity of the responsibility that he carries even ordinary by the virtue of the fact that he is the head of the Government but to recognise now that in the wake of what the Supreme Court has observed, the responsibility is multiple, is manifold more and to recognise that responsibility to act accordingly. The hon. Prime Minister chose to use a phrase to suggest that the Central Bureau of Investigation has not done, is not doing and is not going to do anything that it has not done

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

earlier etc. etc. It is simply because we make appeals to the hon. the Prime Minister to recognise the enormity of the situation that confronts us today, in the Parliament I have no hope, however that the response from the Government or the Prime Minister will in fact be in accordance with the challenge of the situation. I have no doubt your response will be grey, that your response will be circumambulatory, that you will avoid confronting the issues. You will not face the facts. In fact, not only will you not face the facts, you will take every opportunity not to face the Parliament either. And if that happens then certainly we will have casualties, We will have casualties which are not merely in the ministerial ranks, the casualties will be of public morality, a casualty will certainly be accountability of the executive to the legislature and a casualty will definitely be the aspect of probity in public life. All this has been happening and this has been happening from the 16th of January. Since the 16th of January, if I were to describe how the Prime Minister has responded to all the challenge, then I would say he has been idling along in neutral gear. You put the car in a neutral gear, it is neither going forward nor going in reverse, nor moving. If it is pushed by events it will get pushed. This attitude of neutral gear of governance will bring great harm. It has already brought great harm to us. It will bring much greater harm...*(Interruptions)* You do not even need breaks on neutral gear. This neutrality to issues of high importance of the day and this neutral gear style of governance is precisely why we have today a situation in which we, daily increasingly, go through a paralysed legislature and a debased consequence of this is a paralysis of the legislature. Consequence of this is also the debasing of the political and public leadership of the country and its one of the consequences is also the leadership of the country and its one of the consequence is also the imbalance that we today confront in the constitutional arrangement of things.

There are some clarifications that I would want from the hon. the Prime Minister, and if he has transferred the responsibility wholesale to his junior colleague in the Cabinet. Well I hope it from her or some body. There is the question of Hawala and the question of Hawala allegations of pay-offs to Members of Parliament. This is amongst the issues that we are seized of, and if we charge that the Government's response to it is of prejudice, that it is partisan, then there are grounds for it.

Now I would like to know if so many Ministers have resigned and have been charged with illegal receipts of money, does this Government or does the hon. Finance Minister have any knowledge whether the Income Tax Department has issued notices of income tax to any of these Ministers?. And, if you have issued to the Members of Parliament against whom there are allegations? And, if notices have been issued simply on the basis of

these diary entries and charges, then I would like to know, Sir, on what authority and on what grounds have notices not been issued to some others that have been named in these diaries, like...^{*} and some other Ministers against whom there are allegations of either paying or having being paid off? Why have notices not been issued, for example to...^{*} I read in item in the newspapers to say that the Finance Ministry of its own have taken a decision that income tax notices will not be issued to some, for example, the estate of...^{*} There are charges that ...received funds. On what basis or on what law, under what law...

MR. SPEAKER : Before raising issues should we not keep the Minister informed that you are raising this issue...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Why is it not fair, because you have not issued. When it comes to...you have also, Sir, simultaneously ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Supposing some Member gets up and says something against any Member...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : No, Sir, these are reports. This is precisely what is contained...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Rule requires that we should*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : Does he have anything authentic information against him? Unless something is proved anybody, why should we talk of that...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : This is a part of the Hawala case.

THE MINISTER OF CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD) : Sir, these names should not go on record....*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I will just go through it.... *(Interruptions)*...

MR. SPEAKER : Let us restrict it to the Motion.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : But this is a Motion dealing with hawalas... *(Interruptions)* This is what has been given by the Reference Section of the Parliament itself. There are names.

MR. SPEAKER : It is not necessary for me to tell Mr. Jaswant Singhji. You knew very well. You do not have to depend on this.

^{*}Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : No, Sir. This is precisely the point.

MR. SPEAKER : You should have asked and the question...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : But I am asking the question.

MR. SPEAKER : You should asked the question in a proper manner by giving a notice.

[Translation]

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani) : Mr. Speaker Sir, these names have not been mentioned for the first time. It would be better if the hon. Minister refutes the charge, otherwise concealing the facts will create more suspicion.

[English]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Even in the middle of the debate if I cannot refer to ...

MR. SPEAKER : This is exactly why I say instead of thinking about reforming the system, bringing about a better policy, we are interested in saying things against each other. Others are also interested in saying things against each other.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : By all means, because unless we accept what the reality is...

MR. SPEAKER : You please follow the rules and do anything, I am not going to obstruct you.. But you will follow the rules.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : If I have violated the rules at any stage...

MR. SPEAKER : May I quote the rule?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Certainly Sir, in the middle of the debate, if I have violated the rules by saying ...

MR. SPEAKER : I will quote the rule and you will follow it, please.

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply."

This is Rule No. 353

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Right Sir, I fully accept the rule. I am not making any allegation of a defamatory nature. I am referring to a decision taken by this Government that in certain cases this Government has chosen *ab initio* not to move in income tax matter against the estate of some persons. I simply want to know on what basis has that decision been taken? That decision has been taken ; the Government can stand up and say that decision has not been taken. Have you served notices on various ministers? That is an income Tax requirement. If that is not served...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : It was done after certain evidence was available to the department on the basis of regular investigation.

MR. SPEAKER : Now he is following the rules.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : You are not getting into that.

MR. SPEAKER : if you want to explain, you can explain. If you do not want to explain, then you can sit down. Now he is within his right.

[Translation]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not interested in it. If mere mention of the names makes him so restless ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : You mention the name to defame the person. (Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Shri Ram Niwas who hails from my home state, Rajasthan is sitting here... * has left for his heavenly abode. Name ofalso figures in it ... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : This is not going on record. I am not allowing it to go on record.

[Translation]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Then whose name are there, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : You continue your speech. Who is obstructing you? No names go on record..

... (Interruptions)

There is an alternative way. You may follow that.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair

[English]

When we do not do it, we lose our authority. I am repeating. When we do not do things in a proper manner, we lose our authority.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : One of the charges and one of the reasons why the Supreme Court has had to move as it has moved, is precisely because of this -- this apprehension in the mind of the Supreme Court. A point that has been made by all of us here earlier, and even now I repeat, is the selectivity of the approach of the executive and the Government. The Government is moving in this whole matter with an inbuilt selectivity, a selectivity about which there are no criteria. We do not know on what ground that selectivity is determined. If that selectively continues to be the guiding principle on which you approach this major issue that has confronted us today, then certainly by all means have the remaining few weeks that you have in office, be by all means partisan and selective, but then you will certainly not have moved even an inch towards correcting a great wrong that has already taken place.

You have been very kind to permit me. I wish to point out just one more aspect. I would appeal to my friends to please hear this. I am truly worried about corruption and selectivity and prejudice and partisan approach. We are all prejudiced. As we are subjective political animals. This is a political assembly. We gather here. I cannot claim that when I speak from here, I speak with total objectivity. But I have not in the last five years witnessed what I am witnessing today, particularly as tendency in the Treasury Benches. I refer to those of you who have earlier been victims, I refer to those of you who have earlier been victims. I refer to an incipient authoritarianism.

[Translation]

The attitude of the Government now a days clearly reflects authoritarianism.

[English]

I sense fear in the Treasury Benches. They are fearful of their own shadows. They are fearful that tomorrow a piece of paper might not be handed over against them. Because a piece of paper is handed over by the head of their Government, head of their party, they will then have to end up by answering all kinds of charges.

I caution you. I am very glad that my friends in the Treasury Benches can still smile. But smile in the comfort of the office that you hold but this office has been snatched from your very colleagues without notice, without as much as the courtesy of a prior consultation. And this has, believe me, in your ranks bred a kind of fear psychosis, which fear psychosis, is the beginning of

authoritarianism. You have a Head of Government that does not have a Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs, and a head of party which does not have a Parliamentary Board and a head of party, which does not have a Parliamentary Board and head of party, who does not bother to consult any of you on any important decision. And then, if, still, you can smile and if, still, you are not worried about the possibilities of authoritarianism, and if after you have lost in a wholesale manner.

[Translation]

A number of Ministers of your Cabinet have left one by one in a wholesale manner,...

[English]

There is not a single one of you that had the sense of loyalty and continuity and courtesy to the colleagues with whom you had worked to stand up and say, 'How can you do this to your Cabinet colleagues and you alone be the saviour or the sole paragon of virtue and yet continue to keep with yourselves all authority and yet not answer to Parliament?' In this are the seeds of incipient authoritarianism and if I do not caution you about this -- whether you take us to the polls towards the end of April or you take us in July, you have to go to the polls--the seed that you have sown will cause irreparable damage yet again to your political organization.

Look back on the five years that you have sat on those Treasury Benches and look at the catalogue of what you did in those five years starting from the infamous Bofors-Solanki to banking and security ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Jaswant Singhji, one minute.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Sir, I think, you want me to conclude.

MR. SPEAKER : You can continue, but I think, we may not break for lunch. Those who want to go for lunch can have their lunch. I have invited some MPs for lunch and I am handing over the Chair to him. The Members who want to speak after the Private Members' Business is over may also speak, but they will have to wait.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Let him complete please. Yes, Jaswant Singhji.

...(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA : Sir, I am constrained...(Interruptions)

PROF. PREM DHUMAL (Hamirpur) : Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, what is your point of order?

PROF. PREM DHUMAL : I wanted to know that. After this, the Members continue the discussion and the Private Members' Business start. So, what about Matters under Rule 377 and the other items listed on the agenda?

MR. SPEAKER : We will take a decision on that. That is not a point of order.

...(Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, I am not allowed. You are not allowing me. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You will be allowed.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : When, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER : But then, where is the time? We do not have the time. How and what I can do?

...(Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, they are discussing all these things... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I have allowed all.

...(Interruptions)...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Sir, I will be concluding. I will conclude in a couple of minutes.

I have said, you look back on the catalogue of your five years and I have spoken of the infamous Bofors and Solanki and St. Kitts and Banking and Securities and Sugar and Disinvestment and Oil because none of these ... (Interruptions)

SHRI UMRAO SINGH (Jalandhar) : Sir, we are not given a single minute and you see, he is being given this much time. ... (Interruptions) it has nothing to do with today's issue. ... (Interruptions) it was only with respect to Supreme Court judgement. You cannot have the whole time of the House. After all, we have a right to be heard. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Sir, I am concluding. It is my belief if this had not been your approach, if this kind of responsiveness and sensitivity to probity in public life had not been there, then we certainly would not have had the culmination that we presently have in this question of *hawala* and that, Sir, brings me to my concluding thought. It is my belief that the curative aspect really starts from the beginning. Curing the wrong that is afflicting the entire political body is really to make a distinction between the moral and only legal. If you think that the present problem fits into an answer simply

by changing laws, or by fine tuning a law here or fine tuning a law there or improving this legislation or bringing about another legislation and to yet keep the moral dimension of it all outside of our consciousness, then, no matter what laws we have, we would have failed in the very initiative, in the very beginning, because in the ultimate, the question is not legal but moral. In the ultimate what you are failing to answer is the enormity of that moral question. The absence of the Prime Minister today, whatever personal obligations that he has, is really exemplifying the vacuum that exists in your rank on the moral question. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI UMRAO SINGH : Sir, please give me a chance. ... (Interruptions)..

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, you can speak after Shrimati Alva.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA : Sir, I am sorry to come in at this stage. Mr. Jaswant Singh seems to have directed all his agony and anger against me. I do not know why. But I am not going into that.

Sir, I am rather dismayed at the report which has appeared in one of the newspaper today. It is about a meeting which you had with the Opposition leaders of which I am not a member. There is a report that the Opposition leaders of this house have objected to my replying on the ground that my name appears in the diaries. This is the front page news item today. To say the least I am very upset.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : No one has objected.

MR. SPEAKER : That is not a fact. Nobody has said that. If it is reported it is not a correct report.. No Member has said that.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA : Sir, that is all I wanted. ... (Interruptions).

SHRI UMRAO SINGH : Sir, the reason behind the Supreme Court's judgement is not the reason which has been alleged. All the Opposition leaders, including Mr. Advani and Mr. Arjun Singh and others have alleged that partial investigation had been made. They have openly alleged in the House and outside also that the CBI has been very partial against them. It was alleged that the Prime Minister was giving instructions to the Director, CBI. It is because of the fair investigation that so many people are involved. It is because of the fair investigation that the Supreme Court has given its order that the CBI should report to Supreme Court only and it is for the safeguarding the interests of Advaniji and Arjun Singhji whose names are involved and not for any political reason. I think the whole House should appreciate it because now you will have a very fair investigation. ... (Interruptions).

14.27 hrs.

(MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South) : Sir, what about Adjournment Motion? ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We shall take up Papers to be laid on the Table.

14.27 1/4 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Annual Report and Review of the Working of International Airport Authority of India for 1994-95 etc.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table :

(1) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the International Airports Authority of India for the year 1994-95, along with Audited Accounts under sub-section (4) of section 24 and sub-section (2) of section 25 of the International Airports Authority Act, 1971.

(ii) Statement (Hindi and English versions) regarding Review by the Government of the working of the International Airports Authority of India, for the year 1994-95.

(2) Statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (1) above.

[Placed in Library See No. Lt 9160/96]

(3) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Indira Gandhi Rashtriya Urban Akademi, Raebareli, for the year of 1994-95 along with Audited Accounts.

(ii) Statement (Hindi and English versions) regarding Review by the Government of the working of the Indira Gandhi Rashtriya Urban Akademi, Raebareli for the year 1994-95.

(4) Statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (3) above.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 9161/96]

Notifications under Emigration Act, 1983 etc.

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, on behalf of Shri G. Venkat Swamy, I beg to lay on the Table :-

(1) A copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under section 44 of the Emigration Act, 1983:--

(i) The Emigration (Second Amendment) Rules, 1996 published in notification No. S.O. 159(E) in Gazette of India, dated the 28th February, 1996

(ii) The Emigration (Amendment) Rules, 1996 published notification No. S.O. 111 (E) in Gazette of India dated the 8th February, 1996.

[Placed in Library See No. LT 9162/96]

(2) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Jute Manufactures Development Council, Calcutta, for the year 1994-95, along with Audited Accounts.

(ii) A copy of the Review (Hindi and English Versions) by the Government of the working of the Jute Manufactures Development Council, for the year 1994-95

(3) Statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (2) above.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 9163/96]

(4) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Wool & Woollens Export Promotion Council, New Delhi, for the year of 1994-95, along with Audited Accounts.

(ii) A copy of the Review (Hindi and English versions) by the Government of the Wool & Woollens Export Promotion Council, New Delhi, for the year of 1994-95.

(5) Statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (4) above.

[Placed in Library See No. LT 9164/96]

(6) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the All India Handloom Fabrics Marketing Co-operative Society Limited, Delhi for the year 1994-95, along with Audited Accounts.

(ii) A copy of the Review (Hindi and English versions) by the Government of the working of the All India Handloom Fabrics Marketing Co-operative Society Limited, Delhi for the year 1994-95.