The Leader of the Opposition (Mr P. Bérenger) (By Private Notice) asked the Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, Home Affairs and External Communications, whether, in regard to the MCB/NPF affair and the judgement of the Supreme Court delivered in relation thereto last Wednesday, he will -

(a) for the benefit of the House, obtain from the Commissioner of Police, information as to the details of criminal cases still pending before our courts;

(b) table copy of the judgement of the United Kingdom Court which discharged Mr Teeren Appassamy from extradition proceedings, and

(c) say whether he will agree to the setting up of a Select Committee of the House to inquire into the way the Teeren Appassamy and Robert Lesage cases have been handled by the Authorities concerned.

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I stated in my reply to Parliamentary Question 1B/71 on 22 June 2010, the MCB/NPF case was uncovered on 06 February 2003 when a massive shortfall of about Rs860 m. in the accounts of the NPF at the Mauritius Commercial Bank was discovered by the then Principal Accountant of the NPF. The case was referred to the ICAC on 15 February 2003 by the Financial Intelligence Unit.

Regarding part (a) of the PNQ, I am informed by the Commissioner of Police that two cases of alleged misappropriation of fund at the Mauritius Commercial Bank were reported to the Police as follows -

(i) On 26 September 2003, Mr Mousa Mohamed, Chief Auditor at the MCB reported a case of misappropriation of funds in the amount of Rs632,613,615.00 by Parties to the prejudice of the MCB. An enquiry was initiated in the matter. Simultaneously, ICAC was also conducting an enquiry into the matter. The
Police, therefore, referred the case to ICAC in order to avoid duplication of enquiry.

On 14 April 2004, ICAC, however, referred back the case for investigation by the Police on ground that they were not empowered to investigate corruption offences which dated before the coming into force of the Prevention of Corruption Act 2002. The Police resumed the enquiry. However, the enquiry stalled because of the reluctance of the Bank’s representatives to produce banking documents unless and until a Judge’s Order was obtained. Applications were accordingly made on two occasions, on 19 February 2008 and 12 December 2008 for a Judge’s Order, but both applications were unsuccessful. The enquiry, therefore, could not progress and the case was referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions’ Office for advice on 30 December 2009.

(ii) On 21 January 2004, Mr Clifford Allet, Fraud Investigator at the MCB reported that there had been fraudulent misappropriation of a sum of Rs586,244.45 by Mr Robert Lesage to the prejudice of the MCB. In that respect, I am informed by the Police that the enquiry had been completed and the case referred to DPP’s Office on 30 December 2009 suggesting prosecution against Mr Robert Lesage for the offence of embezzlement.

I am also informed by the Director of ICAC, who investigated the same sets of fact in the MCB/NPF case post 2002, that the enquiry was completed and prosecution has been instituted against MCB before the Intermediate Court for the offence of money laundering. The case is coming for trial on 17 September 2010.

As regards part (b) of the question, I am informed by the Director of ICAC that according to an official correspondence from Mrs Anna Tamba, Extradition Section of the Home Office and Mrs Kundert Anne-Marie of the Crown Prosecution Service of the United Kingdom, it is stated that there is no written ruling from the Court concerned in the UK and the case has been discharged by the Court due to Mr Teeren Appassamy physical and mental condition. I am further informed that the Court felt that while Mr Teeren Appassamy showed the symptoms, that had been identified by the doctors treating him and which were confirmed by the doctors
instructed independently by the Crown Prosecution Service, that it would be unjust and oppressive to extradite him. I am also informed that the Court in the UK had previously adjourned the proceedings so that treatment could be given to Mr Teeren Appassamy in order to assess whether there had been any improvement in his health.

The Court felt that it was not in the interest of justice to adjourn further and the Crown Prosecution Service informed the Court and Mr Teeren Appassamy that if ever his health improved, there would be a resubmission of his extradition case to the Court. As regards the request for tabling a copy of the judgement from the UK Court, there is no written ruling, but I am tabling the relevant correspondence from the Crown Prosecution Service.

Regarding part (c) of the question, I should like to inform the House that -

(a) there still are a number of Court cases as I have just mentioned pending in relation to the MCB/NPF affair;
(b) the judgement delivered by the Supreme Court last Wednesday is still subject to the possibility of being appealed against within a period of 21 days from the date of the judgement;
(c) insofar as the manner in which the cases of Messrs Teeren Appassamy and Robert Lesage have been handled by ICAC, it is the Parliamentary Committee which has been vested with statutory powers under sections 59 – 61 of the Prevention of Corruption Act to monitor and review the manner in which ICAC generally carries out its functions and additionally has the power to examine any member of the Board or Officer of ICAC and may even summon any public officer to answer questions, and
(d) matter relating to the institution or not of criminal proceedings against Mr Teeren Appassamy or Mr Robert Lesage or any other suspect ultimately falls within the prerogatives of the DDP whose acts and decisions as the House know, are not reviewable or questionable otherwise than by the Supreme Court.

Therefore, it would be inappropriate to set up a Select Committee of the House.
Mr Speaker, Sir, when I was the Leader of the Opposition, I had asked a series of Private Notice Questions to express my concerns about possible cover ups and the way in which concerned Authorities were handling the whole affair.

I am sure the whole country shares my prevailing concern to know the whole truth about the biggest financial scandal this country has ever known. I have therefore decided that, at the earliest opportune time, a full-fledged Commission of Inquiry presided by a person having the status of a Judge should be set up with a comprehensive Terms of Reference.

(Interruptions)

This, I think, should also help to dissipate doubts that have been created in the mind of people by the campaign of false allegations and innuendos that is being nurtured in certain quarters.

I should add, Mr Speaker, Sir, that there should be no impediments to a Commission of Inquiry. Should there be any need to amend the law to allow the Commission of Inquiry to enquire fully, I will not hesitate to do so.

Mr Bérenger: In the first part of my question, Mr Speaker, Sir, I tried to listen as carefully as possible to the hon. Prime Minister. On Tuesday 22 June, that is, two weeks ago, he stated, I am quoting - “I am informed that the number of cases, both civil and criminal, are still before the courts”. If I am not mistaken, I heard him mention only one criminal case. Is that correct?

The Prime Minister: No, Mr Speaker, Sir, there are a series of cases, I understand, that are in front of the courts, I think I mentioned...

(Interruptions)

But I did say: “I would like to inform the House that there are still a number of court cases pending in relation with the MCB/NPF affair, including the Police enquiry that is going on”.

Mr Bérenger: Yes, but I asked details of the other cases and we are not provided with the details because, from what I understand, there was only one case. Does not the hon. Prime Minister find it extraordinary that the MCB comes forward, makes complaints of fraudulent
behaviour against Mr Robert Lesage and, at the end of the day, it is the ICAC which decides to bring the MCB before the court? Does not he find that extraordinary?

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: No, I am sorry, hon. Leader of the Opposition, you are asking the opinion of the hon. Prime Minister, which he cannot give.

Mr Bérenger: He has given the information; this is what has taken place.

(Interruptions)

It is quite extraordinary. The MCB complains against somebody, ICAC grants him immunity, and following last Wednesday’s judgement from our Supreme Court which found Messrs Teeren Appassamy and Robert Lesage guilty, and blanchi - that is the word – the MCB, does ICAC still intend to go forward and, if yes, will Robert Lesage be their star witness?

Mr Speaker: Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the law which has been passed in this House prevents any Member of the House to put questions and prevents the Executive to answer. There are certain things that can take place, but not question the procedure of the inquiry which has been carried out by ICAC. I gave a ruling in this House. The hon. Leader of the Opposition was the Prime Minister and he, himself, stated in the House that we have limited powers. I hope that the hon. Leader of the Opposition will understand my position.

Mr Bérenger: I said about what has already taken place, that is, the judgement from our Supreme Court, last Wednesday…

(Interruptions)

Yes, a civil case which found guilty Messrs Lesage and Appassamy et a blanchi the MCB. Now, my question is: with that judgement, does ICAC still intend to go forward? If the hon. Prime Minister does not know, he can tell us he does not know.

The Prime Minister: Perhaps I would just add one clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir, with your permission. The immunity given to Mr Lesage actually took place in 2004. Mr Beekarry was the Commissioner of ICAC at that time. I must also say that the MCB at that time did not
contest in writing about the immunity given by ICAC to Mr Teeren Appassamy or Mr Robert Lesage.

Mr Bérenger: Whether it was Mr Beekarry or somebody else, ICAC took a line of action which has been proved completely wrong by the Supreme Court judgement last Wednesday. So, my question is simple: does ICAC intend to carry on and call Mr Lesage as its star witness?

The Prime Minister: As I said, Mr Speaker, Sir, the immunity given to Mr Lesage, I again repeat, was in 2004. The hon. Leader of Opposition himself was Prime Minister at that time. That is what happened at that time.

Mr Bérenger: Yes, but the Prime Minister in 2004 or today does not dictate to ICAC.

(Interruptions)

Not to interfere either today or in 2004! That is the law, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Mr Speaker: Yes, fair enough! We agree.

Mr Bérenger: So, the hon. Prime Minister will not reply to my question as to whether ICAC has decided not to move forward with that case.

Mr Speaker: The Prime Minister cannot decide on that.

Mr Bérenger: On the second part of my question, Mr Speaker, Sir, we are told that there is no judgement as such by the UK Court. Can I ask the hon. Prime Minister who represented us, the State of Mauritius, in that case?

The Prime Minister: I would take it that it must be somebody from the State Law Office.

Mr Bérenger: We are not provided with the names of those who presented us before the UK Court. Did we bring in medical advice against the advice which Mr Appassamy brought in?
The Prime Minister: The Crown Prosecution Service themselves decided to adjourn the case to get independent advice separate from Mr Appassamy’s medical doctors who gave the advice that they gave.

Mr Bérenger: Can we know from the hon. Prime Minister whether due consideration was given by the State Law Office here and by whoever represented us in London – we are not provided with names – on appealing against the decision of the UK Court?

The Prime Minister: In fact, when you see the correspondence, the UK Court has said that we can resubmit the application. There is a condition attached to it and that is what we will look forward, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Mr Bérenger: My question was: whether consideration was given to appealing against the decision? Again, we are not provided with information. I heard, I think, the hon. Prime Minister say, that the Court concerned - by whatever name is called – with time going by, consideration will be given to whether the health of Mr Appassamy allows for his extradition. Can I know from the hon. Prime Minister how closely have we been following that and have we made any move in that direction?

The Prime Minister: We are following it closely, Mr Speaker, Sir, because we also want to have all the truth uncovered in this case. I should add - I have just been given the information as to who represented us – that it was ICAC which was in charge of the extradition procedures in collaboration with the Crown Prosecution Service.

Mr Bérenger: Since we have reached the last part of my question, can I know from the hon. Prime Minister why, until I raised this issue and proposed a Select Committee of the House - in a Select Committee, as we know, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government would have the majority – to look into the way ICAC, the State Law Office, authorities in London - authorities on our side, I mean, not on the UK side – have handled this case, only then that he comes forward with a proposal of a Commission of Inquiry?

(Interruptions)

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am surprised that the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked this question, in fact. I explained that it would be inappropriate at this point to
have a Select Committee. There are cases in front of the courts, including a serious case of money laundering. But, once it is appropriate, there is no impediment for a Commission of Inquiry, we will go forward with a Commission of Inquiry. As I said earlier on, there are criminal and civil cases pending in front of the court. I should say, Mr Speaker, Sir - perhaps I should refresh the memory of the House - the event happened on 06 February 2003. Even then, as the then Prime Minister, I asked a PNQ on 18 March 2003. The then Prime Minister said that he was informed by Mrs Rojooa that she was worried, something was amiss, that the money of the NPF and the national savings at the MCB might have disappeared. We are talking of a lot of money. But, nobody was informed, except the then Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance who was the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Social Security. They were informed the next day, that is, on 07 February 2003. Only eight days later, on 14 February 2003, was the Central Bank informed. Even then, the Central Bank – believe it or not – Mr Speaker, Sir, took three days to send inspectors to MCB to investigate.

(Interruptions)

That is something that we want to have the truth found out, Mr Speaker, Sir.

(Interruptions)

**Mr Speaker:** Order!

**Mr Bérenger:** All these are facts! The point is that ICAC started an inquiry to be carried out in its full independence. My question was simple: why, until today, …

(Interruptions)

**Mr Speaker:** Order! I said, order!

**Mr Bérenger:** … when through a PNQ, I asked for a Select Committee to be set up, it is only then that the hon. Prime Minister comes forward with a request for a Commission of Inquiry? He chooses not to reply. C’est éloquent, Mr Speaker, Sir! Can I know what will be the terms of reference of that Commission of Inquiry? Because the whole point is that we are not satisfied at all the way ICAC has handled this, right going back to 2003. Now with this judgement from the Supreme Court last Wednesday, it is a completely new picture. I am not
satisfied at all with ICAC, the way the State Law Office advised here and the way we handled the extradition processes in London. Will the terms of reference of the Commission of Inquiry to be set up allow to reply to those questions, including what we all know, the political links between Messrs Appassamy and Lesage, and certain politicians now on the other side there?

(Interruptions)

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, I find it amazing again that the hon. Leader of the Opposition makes these remarks. Why do I say that? He was Prime Minister in 2004, why did not he then allow things to happen as it is? Why was there not a Select Committee or whatever done? It is not the fact that he asked for a Select Committee that we say we will have a Commission of Inquiry. The Select Committee would be inappropriate and I gave the reasons why. In fact, I am saying that it would be better if we have a Commission of Inquiry, not within the four walls of Parliament, but outside, with full powers in a person of a Judge, and then, we can have a look and see whether this is possible. I added, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the judgement of the Supreme Court to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition is making reference, is still subject to appeal.

I understand - I saw in the papers - that Mr Lesage has said that he will appeal the decision. He has 21 days, I think, to appeal the decision. We have to wait for that. I cannot put a Commission of Inquiry, if there is going to be an appeal, it would be *sub judice*, as you know.

Mr Bérenger: It applies also to the setting up of a Select Committee. The hon. Prime Minister, therefore, announces today that if there is no appeal, there will be a Commission of Inquiry. My question, again, relates to the terms of reference, whether it will cover the way different authorities, starting with ICAC, handled that issue, Lesage and Appassamy case, and whether political links between Messrs Appassamy and Lesage and certain politicians now sitting in Government, will be included in the terms of reference.

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, my wish is that the terms of reference of the Commission of Inquiry – I should add one thing just to correct the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Not only there is no appeal, but there are
cases also, there is the case of money laundering, we will have to look at whether there are any impediments. That’s why I said I would even be prepared to amend the law for the Commission of Inquiry. I believe there would be no such impediments because most of the cases have already been discussed in courts. There are always people who raise the question of banking secrecy, but most of the accounts have already been discussed in court. It is in the open court. Therefore, I would have the terms of reference as wide as possible, including I would like to know why it took so long from 06 February 2003 to 14 February...

(Interjections)

I would also like to know why the hon. Leader of the Opposition advised the then Prime Minister not to say anything to Cabinet at that time.

(Interjections)

Mr Bérenger: We know who was the Prime Minister then. I hope the hon. present Prime Minister remembers who was the Prime Minister then. The affair broke out in 2003 and ICAC started its inquiry; now, five years since the elections of 2005, ICAC goes in the same direction and we have last Wednesday’s judgement. Now, the hon. Prime Minister tells us that he is going to wait also what happens to the other cases, including the case of alleged money laundering. Can I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether he is being serious to throw full light on what took place in that affair or is he playing for time, the appeal till 21 days, then, cases are before the courts?

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am still amazed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Let us look at what he said in 2003 when the then Prime Minister was answering a question because he is saying that we know who was the Prime Minister. Look at what the former Prime Minister then said –

“The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance suggested to me that I should not raise it in Cabinet and that we should find out because of the importance of this bank, that is, the MCB, in the economic life of this country.”
I could ask the same question: what is the link between the Opposition and the MCB?

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order! Order! Order, now! Order!

(Interruptions)

Order! Order, now! Order, please! Order!

Mr Bérenger: There is absolutely no link...

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order, I said!

Mr Bérenger: ... between the present Opposition and the MCB and the hon. Prime Minister knows that. He did not quote all that I said. I am sure the hon. Prime Minister is aware that if that had not been handled carefully, danger of a run on the main bank in the island was very real and that is why we had to take every precaution. Will he agree with me?

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order!

The Prime Minister: I am glad that the hon. Leader of the Opposition thinks that the MCB is untouchable.

(Interruptions)

I am glad that he is saying that.

(Interruptions)

Mr Bérenger: I said that the danger of the run on the bank, being given that he, himself, said le trou du scandale était nearly R 900 millions. I wish he wants to be fair. He must know that with that kind of situation, a run on that bank then was a real danger.

The Prime Minister: Does that mean, therefore, that if a bank does whatever....

(Interruptions)

It is not above the law. That is what I am saying. The MCB should not be above the law.
Mr Bérenger: ICAC was informed, the inquiry started. There was no hiding of anything. Will the hon. Prime Minister agree with me also that there were nearly Rs900 m. of workers’ money, their pensions, that were in danger and that, therefore, the first urgency was to prevent a run on the bank, the second urgency was to obtain from the bank that there will be complete refund of that nearly Rs900 m. and that was obtained? Will the hon. Prime Minister agree with me that these were the two most urgent considerations at the same time that ICAC and others started their inquiry?

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, in fact, the refund has been made, as far as I remember. But the point is that, concerning the biggest financial scandal that happened in this country, on the 6th Government is aware of the problem. They do not mention it and nobody knows. The MCB is allowed to look at the books, do its own inquiry on itself; only on the 14th is the Governor of the Bank of Mauritius apparently – God knows, if he was informed before – from what we see, was informed. Then he takes three days, only on the 17th, they sent independent inquirers from the Central Bank. What has happened ...

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Hon. Patrick Assirvaden, can I ask you to keep quiet when the hon. Prime Minister is answering the question? This is the National Assembly here.

The Prime Minister: And I know, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the then Governor of the Bank went to see the then Director of the MCB; they sat together for three days, God knows what happened during those conversations. I hope all this will be uncovered because, as I said, a Commission of Inquiry will take place. That’s why I am saying, if we need to amend the law, as far as Commissions of Inquiry are concerned - I don’t see much impediment in that - we will do it, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Mr Bérenger: I have a last question, Mr Speaker, Sir. This was the biggest fraud in the history of Mauritius. We all agree on that. Will the hon. Prime Minister agree with me that he targeted certain quarters all through, but, in fact, last Wednesday’s judgement of the Supreme Court - it is a civil case, but they inquired fully before finding people guilty - found the guilty parties, Mr Lesage and Mr Appasamy. This is already on record. This is the Court’s judgement.
Therefore, will he agree with me that after this turning point, this Supreme Court judgement, which has identified the guilty parties, we should have either a Select Committee or a Commission of Inquiry, but with the correct terms of reference pour faire toute la lumière sur toute cette affaire une fois pour toutes?

Mr Speaker: I am not answering in the place of the hon. Prime Minister. As far as I understand, the hon. Prime Minister has said that he will give a full-fledged Commission of Inquiry with the largest terms of reference and I think that we cannot pre-empt the issue now and I will ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition if the terms of reference are published - it will have to be published - then he can come back to this House for any amendment which he thinks fit to the terms of reference.

Mr Uteem: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether there has been any prosecution envisaged against any person who has directly or indirectly benefited from the alleged embezzlement by Mr Lesage?

The Prime Minister: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, Sir, I did not quite understand the question.

Mr Uteem: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am asking the hon. Prime Minister whether he is aware if there is any prosecution against any person who has directly or indirectly benefited from the alleged embezzlement carried out by Mr Lesage?

The Prime Minister: In fact, in the ruling of the court, this is not mentioned, but, as I said, Mr Speaker, Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned about links between Messrs Teeren Appasamy, Robert Lesage and people in the Government. I am not aware of this. But everything will come out in the Commission of Inquiry starting from the very beginning.

Mr Speaker: I will allow two more questions and I will come back to the Leader of the Opposition. Hon. Ganoo!

Mr Ganoo: Mr Speaker, Sir, since the recent judgement has made mention of conspiracy between Mr Lesage and Mr Teeren Appassamy, would the hon. Prime Minister – since conspiracy is a criminal offence in our law – envisage new procedures to extradite Mr Appasamy? In view of the averment made in the judgement about the offence of conspiracy,
would therefore new extradition procedures be envisaged or is Mr Appassamy, in fact, the untouchable one?

**The Prime Minister:** No! In fact, I said - and the hon. Member knows, but he wants to make innuendoes and allegations - that we will want the whole truth from the very beginning, that is, from 06 February. Let me say, from what I understand, the fraud took place even earlier than 06 February 2003. To answer the hon. Member’s question directly, we will re-submit an application eventually for Mr Teeren Appasamy to be extradited.

**Mr Speaker:** Mrs Labelle!

**Mrs Labelle:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, Sir. Regarding the extradition of Mr Appassamy, since years there are many questions which have been put regarding the lawyer who represented the Government of Mauritius, but, up to now, we have never received the name of the person, be it through ICAC, more so that the request for extradition went through the Minister of Foreign Affairs as per the reply that we received in the House. May I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether he can give the name of the lawyer, even through ICAC, who represented the Republic of Mauritius in this case?

**The Prime Minister:** We will certainly be able to give the name if the hon. Member wants. But let me say, Mr Speaker, Sir, that, in fact, it was on 13 April 2005 that a request for extradition of Mr Teeren Appasamy was officially referred to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs who forwarded it to the Home Office of the United Kingdom. Only on 13 April 2005 was there such a request and I can go through the whole procedure as to how, eventually, Mr Appasamy was arrested in 2007.

**Mr Speaker:** Yes, hon. Leader of the Opposition, do you have a question?

**Mr Bérenger:** Whenever we propose a Commission of Inquiry - it has happened half a dozen times recently - every time the Prime Minister says: no, because we cannot act criminally - no one can be sued criminally on the basis - it would not be right to set up a Commission of Inquiry because the Police would have to restart the whole inquiry and so on and so forth. But, in this case, *comme par magie*, we are going to have, in due course, a Commission of Inquiry when
the Supreme Court last Wednesday has already found the guilty parties. Will not the hon. Prime Minister agree with me, therefore, that the way forward is not a Commission of Inquiry …

(Interruptions)

**Mr Speaker:** Order!

**Mr Bérenger:** … it is either a Select Committee which works and the Police can carry on or the Police restart the Police inquiry after the judgement of the Supreme Court last Wednesday, but *la meilleure façon de noyer le poisson venimeux dans l’eau* is through a Commission of Inquiry after all that the Prime Minister has said concerning Commissions of Inquiry.

**The Prime Minister:** Mr Speaker, Sir, I am again surprised with the Leader of the Opposition. Every time he asks for Commission of Inquiry, why is it by *magie* this time, he does not want a Commission of Inquiry? He should want a Commission of Inquiry.

**Mr Bérenger:** In fact, the reason is simple.

(Interruptions)

**Mr Speaker:** Order now! Order!

**Mr Bérenger:** Last Wednesday, there was a judgment from the Supreme Court of 200 pages. This is why we are now in a situation where the guilty had been identified by the Supreme Court. There is no need to waste time unless there is some other purpose. Why not, on the basis of that judgement, ask the Commissioner of Police to reopen inquiries?

**The Prime Minister:** Let me be clear on this, Mr Speaker, Sir. Who is saying that the Police are not inquiring? I did say the Police are inquiring. We are going to resubmit an application for the extradition of Mr Teeren Appassamy, but, in the meantime, instead of a Select Committee in the closed walls of the National Assembly, we want a full-fledged Commission of Inquiry with whatever terms we can agree with, as open as it can be, and we will know the result. But to add to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is also saying that there has been judgement, as I explained, Mr Speaker, Sir - and that is why I don’t want to put a Commission of
Inquiry at this point - there are 21 days where the person can appeal and I understand that he is going to appeal. That is what I read in the papers. There are also some other cases. But we will have to see when it will be appropriate to put the Commission of Inquiry, but I would want to put it during the term of this Government. That is why I say that I want the terms of reference, the law amended if need be.

**Mr Speaker**: Time is over! May I make an announcement? The Table has been advised that P.Q. No. 1B/226 has been withdrawn and that the Table has been further advised that PQ No. 1B/228 addressed to the hon. Prime Minister will now be replied by the hon. Minister of Labour and Industrial Relations. Questions addressed to the Prime Minister! Hon. Dr. Sorefan! I want peace and quietness in this House now.