

independent of the railway system. That is how they have come out in the Press. So, the point is that, on their own, they should have come here to make a statement both in regard to the implausible incident that occurred in Maharashtra and also the incident relating to Chakradharpur Express. Instead of trying to deny it, they have to say how the Railways are responsible, apart from what compensation they are giving.

12.54 hrs.

RE: Laying on the Table of Gyan Prakash Committee's Report on Sugar Imports.

[Translation]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit in regard to the sugar scam. It was clear in the months of February and March that there was heavy shortage of sugar, that is why the import policy was changed in the month of March and the import of sugar also started. I do not want to go in all the details. Several related questions and problems have risen. There was a demand for an enquiry into it as it was said that some bungling was being indulged in. The sugar was available abroad at the rate of 200-250 dollars per tonne whereas the Government was importing it at the rate of 350-400 dollars per tonne. It was also insinuated that several highly placed people, politicians, Government officials were involved in this bungling. When repeated demands were made to the PMO to enquire into the matter the Prime Minister perfunctorily ordered an enquiry into the whole matter. With your permission I would like to quote a couple of sentences from that order:

[English]

This is a copy of the order issued from the Prime Minister's Office.

"It has been decided to conduct a preliminary administrative enquiry to ascertain the facts and to fix *prima facie* responsibility for lapses.

The report was to examine and report on the steps taken to accurately forecast the production etc., etc; secondly, the steps taken to facilitate and monitor details of contracting by private traders; and thirdly, adequacy of contingency plan etc."

[Translation]

It became imperative to quote these lines as this enquiry was not an internal enquiry of the Prime Minister's private office. If the Prime Minister had appointed some officials to enquire into his administrative machinery to find out what went wrong and where then it would have been a different matter. When the public demanded it he ordered a public enquiry to distract their attention. This was also an administrative enquiry. We had demanded that the public enquiry be made public. It was a public enquiry and the facts were not to be suppressed. It has raised several other issues also. Several allegations have been levelled against the hon. Minister also. After the hon. Minister returned from his foreign tour he levelled charges against his officials and the Secretary. The Secretary levelled

allegations against the hon. Minister. A kind of atmosphere of allegations and counter-allegations was created which pointed a finger at the PMO also. This is a serious matter. The former Cabinet Secretary said during a T.V. Programme that this scam involved an amount to the tune of Rs. 2500 crore and not Rs. 500-550 crore. This former Cabinet Secretary was in service at that time. Such a public statement aggravates the seriousness of the matter. Earlier a report was submitted by Shri Gian Prakash, the former Chairman of CAG which should be discussed in the House.

It should not happen that it is quoted outside, reported in the news-papers, discussed by the Minister, Officials and employees but this discussion is not held in the House. The Government is not willing to do anything but if they do not give a statement on it and do not allow us to discuss it we will not accept it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have four demands—first, the Government should come out with a statement in the background of the enquiry report submitted by the CBI. Secondly, the report submitted by the Gian Prakash Committee be laid on the Table of the House. Thirdly, the Government should give a detailed statement in regard to the report of the Gian Prakash Committee and the statements made in regard to this sugar scam and fourthly, the House should allow holding of a discussion as to whether the scam involved Rs. 2500 crore or Rs. 500-550 crore.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, a meeting of the leaders of all the parties had been convened by the hon. Speaker before the commencement of the session where this point had been raised. This was a national issue and the public had been forced to buy sugar at the rate of Rs. 20 per Kg. in the last 3-4 months and this happened due to the ongoing sugar scam which was a result of a wrong policy of the Government. Due to this wrong policy the Ministry of Food, the Ministry of Commerce and the Prime Minister's office were involved in a kind of tussle. In fact the then Cabinet Secretary and the Secretary of Food were also involved in a tussle. As a result thereof no timely decision could be taken and since the Government could not take a decision in time the same sugar which was available at one time at the rate of 225-250 dollars per tonne had to be bought at Rs. 400-425 dollars per tonne.

Thus crores of rupees were wasted. It was the foreign traders who sold sugar to India but the most deplorable act was that allegations and counter-allegations were publicly levelled at each other. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you may be remembering that the discussion was also held that time and it was demanded thereafter to hold the judicial enquiry of the case as the office of Prime Minister was also found involved in this case in the report.

13.00 hrs.

The hon. Prime Minister was on tour that time. He was informed that a crisis had arisen in the country due to the hiking sugar prices. The hon. Prime Minister is reported to have stated from there that further delay would aggravate the situation all the more. He added that it would cause hike in sugar price and embarrassment to the people. As

3-4 Ministries, their Ministers and officers are involved in this case, the country has to suffer such a big loss, they are levelling allegations and counter allegations at each other. I had stated it earlier that it was not only a sugar scam but Bofors scam security scam, oil-scam are also there. The country has to suffer a loss of crores of rupees because of all these four or five major scams. Attempts are being made to cover up all these scams. Shri Vajpayeeji also might remember that the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs had stated in the leaders' meeting that the report would not be presented. When we insisted as to what was the purpose of holding the enquiry—if the report was not submitted, thereafter he said that he would look into the matter and then he would decide whether the report should be laid or not. This report has already been submitted. I, therefore, demand the Government to present the report immediately and all the facts should be brought into light. I not only request to submit it but opportunity should also be given to discuss this matter in the August House. I would like to know whether the Government fixed any responsibility on someone or not, whether any action has been taken against someone or not. A former Cabinet Secretary has stated that about two and a half thousand crores rupees are involved in this scam. He has mentioned the name of Shri Kalp Nath Rai, the Minister who is responsible for this chaos. This issue turns more serious. When a Minister and a former officer are alleged by name publicly. I, therefore, request you to issue directives to the Government. The hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is not present here. There are three or four Ministers dealing with Parliamentary Affairs, but none of them is present here. This shows how responsible the Government is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shri Mallikarjun is present here.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: Shri Mallikarjun is talking with somebody. I haven't seen him. If the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is present here, the hon. Chairperson should direct the Government to present this report in this House during this very session and hold discussion thereon.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I myself wished to raise this issue. But I am not feeling well while speaking, therefore, I did not speak in the beginning. Shri Jaswant Singh and Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav have presented this issue here very clearly. The sugar scam has already been discussed here. But it did not yield any result. Its judicial probe was demanded but the Government did not accept it. But under the duress of public opinion, the hon. Prime Minister entrusted this job of inquiry to a former Comptroller and Auditor General under heavy public pressure. A press note from the Prime Minister office was issued in this regard. Neither it was a private investigation nor it was meant for public welfare. The hon. Prime Minister told Shri Gyan Prakash to unearth the facts and tell him as and when he deems fit. This was not the situation.

Here is the note issued from the Prime Minister's Office. So far as it was an administrative inquiry or a

preliminary inquiry the moto was right but the intention behind it was that if it would be a case of prima-facie, the detailed inquiry would be made thereafter.

Now the report is not being submitted before the House. Why? Whom does the Government want to shield? Such suspicion is natural. There should be transparency and openness in the administration. It is being discussed all over the world that there was a scandal. Thousand million rupees were transacted. The Ministers and their Secretaries are fighting with each other. A former Cabinet-Secretary has levelled serious allegations.

Now it is high time to present the report. There is no use of drawing curtain on it. We won't allow the Government to do so. The report should be submitted at the earliest or the Government itself should submit the reasons for delay in presenting the report. Would it hamper national interest? Would our national security be endangered? What are the facts of Gyan Prakash Committee which cannot be presented before the House? Even if the report is not presented in the August House, it is very much appearing in newspapers and we Members of Parliament are being befooled here and demanding the report. But we want report from the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is not a minor issue. This issue will take a serious turn and turn into a ugly shape. I would like to ask the Government to lay the report on the table of the House in a day or two and the August House will decide about the follow up action. If necessary, the Government, will be asked to answer certain points in this regard. If there is sufficient scope for taking action against any hon. Minister, we would pursue accordingly. But the August House has the right to know about the report of the investigation. We are emphasizing on this point. (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nirmalji, it is already 1.10 p.m. It is already late. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (DUMDUM): This is an important subject. ... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The matter has been discussed at length. We are getting late.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (CUTTACK): The point which has been raised about sugar scam, the Government somehow is trying to cover this up.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (ROSERA): Not somehow but totally.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: The Cabinet Secretary just after his retirement goes to the television and tells the nation that about Rs. 2,500 crore is involved in this whole scandal. When we discussed this issue in the last session, the Government said, "yes, the enquiry is on and the report will be known to the Parliament." When we took up this matter in the leaders' meeting with the Speaker, then the Government said, "We cannot; we will consider whether the report will be placed on the Table of the House or not."

Another CBI Report on 1989 Sugar Scam is pending

with the Prime Minister. PM is not taking any action. CBI has indicated one Minister. The Minister is there; the PM is there and the sugar scam report is pending on the Table of the Prime Minister. The other report is the Gyan Prakash Report. That is pending before the Prime Minister. The people of this country want to know what happened to the sugar scam. Rs. 2,500 crore is not a small amount. We had been agitating on this issue during the Monsoon Session. Till this Winter Session, nothing has happened. It is just not a ritual that opposition will raise this for the record sake and nobody will respond to this—neither the Prime Minister nor the Parliament Affairs Minister nor the concerned Minister. It is a serious matter. We just want it today. Tomorrow or day after this will be a serious matter because the Government is not coming with this Report to this House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nirmalji it is getting late.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: We have to express our feelings on this, otherwise, people will haul us up saying that when this was being talked about, what you were doing. And, therefore, we have to say this. More importantly, this is a very shoddy story.

One aspect is that of non-functioning of the Government, that is, the relationship between the Ministry and the bureaucracy. The second aspect is that in this whole episode it also reflects the implementation of one facade of the economic policy. I will remind you of this. An OGA was granted to the private sector and at the same time there was denial for the public sector to import sugar. This is the essence of the new economic policy and that was also reflected here. The third aspect is that it has generated, as is normal, huge amount of income, not one lakh crore as in the share scandal, but quite a substantial income was generated. The presumption is that it has been shared not only by the International Sugar Manufacturers Association but also by the domestic producers and it has percolated to the Government also. One of the important reasons for the wonderful results in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka is the non-action from the Prime Ministers's office or from the Prime Minister himself. He is continuing on this and the report is there. There is, of course, variation about whose report is that; whether that report should be presented to the Parliament. I have a simple submission. Either that report is presented in the Parliament or....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You should be very gracious that I....

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: I have two sentences to add. Sir. An ex-Cabinet Secretary has come with a open statement. In any case, we would like that another Joint Parliamentary Committee must be formed in order to investigate into this. There all these people should be called as witnesses and we should submit our report.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, though I do not want to say anything on this topic yet it is a clear cut case of corruption and the P.M.O. along

with Shri Kalp Nath Rai and many other Ministers are involved in it. They will certainly want to hush up this case. I had requested the Speaker during the discussion on Action Taken Report that day to allow us to raise this issue. But he assured us to discuss it later on. The Leader of the Opposition has given us two days' time. I request you to ask the hon. Minister to take up this matter tomorrow. It is a very serious issue. (Interruptions)

The Government of Karnataka fell mainly because of corruption. This very issue of corruption will have its cascading effect as well...(Interruptions). Let it meet its downfall. But we are very much concerned for our country. Right from the P.M.O. to hon. Ministers are involved in it. Therefore, we will not forsake this issue. The hon. Minister should be asked to give reply here tomorrow. If reply will be not given tomorrow we can go to any extent. Through you this is my warning to the Government.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Though one or two persons are very much inclined, for want of time, I have to take up the next subject. You kindly excuse me.

Now, papers to be laid on the Table of the House.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

13.14 hrs.

[English]

Annual Report and Review on the working of Central Power Research Institute, Bangalore for 1993-94.

THE MINISTER OF POWER (SHRI N.K.P. SALVE): I beg to lay on the Table:

- (1) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Central Power Research Institute, Bangalore, for the year 1993-94, alongwith Audited Accounts.
- (2) A copy of the Review (Hindi and English versions) by the Government of the Central Power Research Institute, Bangalore, for the year 1993-94.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 6525/947]

Notification under Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 and Annual Report and Review on the Working of Mormugao Dock Labour Board for 1993-94 etc.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): I beg to lay on the Table:

- (1) A copy of the Merchant Shipping (Examination of Engineer Officers in the Merchant Navy) Amendment Rules, 1994 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 738(E) in Gazette of India dated the 4th October, 1994 under sub-section (3) of section 458 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958.
[Placed in Library, See. No. LT-6526/94]
- (2) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and