

MAURITIUS

Fifth National Assembly

FIRST SESSION

Debate No. 22 of 2011

Sitting of Wednesday 09 November 2011

The Assembly met in the Assembly House, Port Louis,

At 11.30 a.m

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MED POINT CLINIC - PURCHASE

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr P. Bérenger) (*by Private Notice*) asked the vice-Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Development whether, in regard to the purchase by Government of the Medpoint Clinic, he will, for the benefit of the House, obtain information as to the name of the -

- (a) bank in Mauritius in which the cheque of Rs145 m. was deposited and the bank in Mauritius into which money was transferred, and
- (b) bank in London in which money has been transferred, indicating, in each case, the sums transferred and the date of the transfers.

The vice-Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Development (Mr X. L. Duval): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am informed as follows -

On 22 December 2010 the Ministry of Finance was requested by the Ministry of Health to send a Departmental Warrant for the amount of Rs144,701,300 representing the cost of acquisition of Land and Buildings, known as the Medpoint Clinic, as funds were earmarked under the proceeds from the National Lottery.

On 23 December, the then Minister of Finance gave his approval for the Ministry of Health to re-allocate the sum of Rs144,701,300 from its savings under capital projects to enable the acquisition of a Geriatric Hospital.

On 24 December, that is, Christmas eve, the decision of the then Minister of Finance was conveyed to the Ministry of Health.

The 25 being Christmas Day and 26 December being a Sunday, the Departmental Warrant was issued on Monday 27 December.

On Tuesday 28 December the Ministry of Health made the required reallocation. On that very same day a cheque was issued by the Ministry of Health to Medpoint Ltd for an amount of Rs144,701,300.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the whole transaction, took just six days, which included Christmas Eve and the Christmas week-end.

The bank statement of the Ministry of Health, which I am tabling, indicates that the cheque was cleared on the very next day, that is, on Wednesday 29 December 2010. Mr Speaker, Sir, I am also tabling a copy of the cheque.

In regard to the issues of movement of funds in the banking system, Government can only be aware of the withdrawals from its own bank account. Beyond this, Government is not in a position to know which bank account the payment was made into nor if money would then subsequently be transferred outside Mauritius.

However, Mr Speaker, Sir, I am informed by SIC that as a shareholder of Medpoint Ltd that it has been active to protect its interests in ensuring that its investment in Medpoint is secured. In this respect, SIC wrote to -

- To Medpoint Ltd. on 01 August 2011, that is, five days after the resignation of the then Minister of Finance, to protect its position by requesting the Distribution of Surplus arising from sale of assets to all shareholders.
- To Bank of Baroda on 03 August 2011, to request that no transfers be made from the account without Board or Shareholder's decision.
- To Medpoint Ltd on 23 August 2011 to reiterate the request in the letter of 01 August.
- To the legal adviser of Medpoint and its accountant to ask them to finalise pending matters including distribution of surplus to shareholders.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am also informed by SIC, as a shareholder of Medpoint, that out of the proceeds of Rs144,701,300 paid to Medpoint's account at SBM, Rs5.2 m. have been deducted in order to clear the company's debt to SBM. I am further informed that the following requests for transfers were made by Medpoint Ltd -

- Rs15.5 m. to Mrs Shalini Devi Malhotra to repay a shareholder's advance, and
- Rs120 m. to be deposited in the Bank of Baroda.

Mr Speaker, Sir, having given these details, as provided to me by SIC Ltd., I wish to stress that Medpoint Ltd. being a private company, like any other private company, I would not, in normal circumstances, have released such details. I have exceptionally given these details in the light of the fact that such details have been widely publicised in the local press for quite some time and have remained unchallenged, whether by way of a press communiqué or otherwise by any concerned party. I again stress, therefore, that it is in these exceptional circumstances that these details are being provided.

Mr Bérenger: Mr Speaker, Sir, on 25 October here, in the House, the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. vice-Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Development made certain statements in reference to Med Point and the hon. Prime Minister was categorical. He made a statement of fact to the effect that the money was deposited in a local bank, transferred to another local bank and to London. Has the hon. vice-Prime Minister, Minister of

Finance and Economic Development checked with the hon. Prime Minister and with SIC whether, in fact, money has been transferred to London?

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the first thing is to get the record straight. In this case it is quite easy, because we have Hansard, and this is what exactly the words of the hon. Prime Minister were -

“It seems...”

So, it is not fact.

“It seems that part of the cheque has been sent abroad.”

And, I read the full sentence -

“So, even before ICAC has started its inquiry, the very next day, all of this was done, so what can they do?”

So, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not a statement of fact. It says -

“It seems that part of the cheque has been sent abroad.”

Mr Bérenger: Let me quote another paragraph. From the verbatim, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not...

Mr Speaker: No, I am sorry.

(Interruptions)

I am on my feet.

Mr Bérenger: Mr Speaker, Sir, you are allowing the hon. Minister to talk and not me!

Mr Speaker: I am going just to say that according to Standing Orders 22 (1) (b) -

‘Any debate taken place in the House cannot be subject matter of any question.’

So, I am asking now both parties have to rephrase their question. Rephrase it instead of quoting what the hon. Prime Minister said.

(Interruptions)

But, this is the Standing Order.

(Interruptions)

Mr Bérenger: You allow the hon. Minister to use one paragraph and I cannot use another paragraph!

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Being given that the hon. vice-Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Development has quoted, I will allow. But, that will be the end of quoting paragraphs from the debate.

Mr Bérenger: Well, then, I think it is not of good faith for the hon. Minister to quote one paragraph and not to quote another paragraph which, I quote, the hon. Prime Minister speaking and saying -

“SIC said...”

In fact, the text says, “They said...”, but it is SIC.

“SIC said that they tried, but the money is gone, already cashed and transferred to London.”

It was a categorical statement made in good faith probably, unlike the quote. So, has the hon. vice-Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Development checked with the hon. Prime Minister on the basis of what information did he say that the money has been transferred to London?

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, the best advice I can give to the hon. Leader of the Opposition is to turn over the page and to see that on the very next quote from the hon. Prime Minister he qualifies that by saying – “part of the money” and “it seems”. So, it is quite...

(Interruptions)

Let me finish. I am answering. The previous Minister of Finance did not even answer questions on Med Point. I am giving the information. So, give me the credit.

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order!

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I am saying, if you turn over the page, the hon. Prime Minister qualifies his statement by using the word “seems” - such as just quoted - and by saying “part of”. The matter is crystal clear.

Mr Bérenger: No. It is not crystal clear. The hon. Prime Minister said at one point that the money has been transferred to London. In other parts he says -“it seems that part...”. I am asking which part of the money, how much has been transferred to London, if any? My information is that no money has been transferred to London.

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I must say this. That information we have given is in good faith. We are not privy to the personal bank accounts of people. I cannot say who has what money in the House. It is not my right to obtain this amount. But, what I can say, Mr Speaker, Sir, is from the information that we have, as a shareholder of Med Point Ltd, that an amount was paid to Mrs Malhotra. It’s her decision to take the money outside or not - we don’t know. But, what we do know...

(Interruptions)

Let me answer. What we do know is that the balance of Rs120 m., the bulk of the money, is still in Mauritius in Baroda Bank, as I am speaking now, unless this morning it has been taken out.

Mr Bérenger: There is nothing wrong in the hon. Prime Minister agreeing to the fact that his information was wrong. No money has been transferred to London, Mr Speaker, Sir. Now, today we have information which I could not obtain although I pointed at the SIC to request information. Is it not a fact today that reference is made to the SIC to provide information? Is it not a fact that SIC holds 14% of the shares and that the representative of the SIC, Mr Golam, in fact, chaired the Board of Directors until July 2011?

Mr Duval: That is absolutely true, Mr Speaker, Sir, and I will further inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition that until the resignation of my predecessor, the Minister of Finance, also in charge of SIC, not a little finger was lifted by SIC to recover this money. Not a little finger!

(Interruptions)

I don’t know, Mr Speaker, Sir, if there is...

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order!

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I don't know what is behind this question, whether there is some sort of masochism or something. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, until his departure, on 26 July, SIC did absolutely nothing to protect its shares. It is only a few days later, on 01 August - I think before I started, even - that SIC started to write to Baroda, started to write to legal advisors, and ask for the money to be blocked. So, I cannot answer for until July. That is not for me to answer.

Mr Bérenger: Has the hon. vice-Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Development checked, through SIC, whether it is not a fact that all the money paid was transferred to a current account at State Bank first; then, *in toto*, transferred to a fixed deposit account at Baroda?

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I don't know whether it is current or fixed, but I understand that the cheque from the Ministry of Health - the famous cheque - went, if my memory serves me right, to SBM. Then, the next day that Rs120 m. - everything was done so quickly, you know, at times you get lost - went to Baroda and also, to the lady and you see, Mr Speaker, Sir, I have the decency not to reveal where the bank account of the lady is.

Mr Bérenger: Will the hon. vice-Prime Minister, Minister of Finance and Economic Development tell us whether it is not the fact that it is in January 2001, under the chairmanship of the representative of SIC, Mr Golam, that a special resolution was voted unanimously by the Board to reimburse the two loans to Mrs Malhotra, which the hon. Minister referred to earlier?

Mr Duval: It may well be so, Mr Speaker, Sir. I haven't checked, but I will also remind ...

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: You want to answer! Let him answer!

(Interruptions)

You cannot interrupt the House. Let the hon. Minister answer!

(Interruptions)

Don't Challenge me! I am telling you!

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I presume the hon. Leader of the Opposition means 2011, but not 2001. I haven't checked, but I wouldn't be surprised. As I mentioned, SIC does fall under the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development and you would assume what you can assume.

Mr Bérenger: I meant 2011. But, I was thinking I was ten years younger than I am, Mr Speaker, Sir.

So, the hon. Minister of Finance and Economic Development is trying to give the impression that the SIC did nothing to prevent all this until the former Minister of Finance left. Well, is it not a fact - that under the present Minister - what the SIC did was to whitewash the whole thing. They did not try to stop anything. They write to Med Point to request for the distribution of proceeds of sale. That is whitewashing everything, asking that all the shareholders get their money. If that is not whitewashing, what is it? Why did not the hon. Minister give directives to SIC to freeze all this, instead of asking for distribution of proceeds of sale?

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I will do better in a moment, but I wish to inform the Leader of the Opposition and the House that SIC has legal advice that it cannot proceed by way of the court to have an attachment made on the account. Otherwise, he could have done so. It has also, after the departure of my predecessor, sought legal advice whether he could do so. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, as I mentioned - and all these correspondences exist - the SIC wrote to Baroda Bank asking for the money to be frozen. What is left of this poor taxpayer's money be frozen in the Bank of Baroda before it flies off to wherever other greener pastures. So, that is there. Mr Speaker, Sir, I was also a little bit busy these few days. I have also spoken to SIC and SICOM and this is what these two organisations which together, I think, own, little bit more than 20% of the shares so not sufficient to force a resolution that these two organisations are proposing that the remaining amount in the Bank of Baroda - the other one has gone, I don't know where - be placed in an escrow account until the resolution of this court case and this is what SIC ...

(Interruptions)

... and what SICOM will suggest. They will try to obtain a shareholder's meeting to pass its resolution, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Mr Bérenger: Can I ask the hon. Minister which is which? We are told that SIC sought legal advice. We are told that SIC wrote to Med Point. At the same time we are told that SIC wrote to Med Point also to request a distribution of the proceeds of sales. Which is which?

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not on the same day that all this is being done...

(Interruptions)

The hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to say all this is done on the same say.

On 01 August, they tried that, then they went directly to the Bank of Baroda because they had no joy coming from Med Point as to what was going to happen, so they proceeded by steps. That was before. What is being suggested now is not at all in contradiction with what we were trying to do before, that is, we cannot obtain an attachment order. Med Point does not want to distribute it either. So, what we are trying to do now is to have the whole amount placed in an escrow account. What is wrong in that? Why is the hon. Leader of the Opposition not agreeable to that? Let it be placed in an escrow account, stays in an escrow account a few months until the whole matter is sorted out, everybody takes its share or perhaps, more thankfully, Government gets its money back and gives the clinic back.

Mr Bérenger: Can I ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether he is aware that the legal adviser of Dr. Malhotra, yesterday and this morning, on the radio, has said that all the money is still in Mauritius and Rs129 m. apart from the sum paid to Mrs Malhotra, are still at Baroda? According to my information there has been a leak and Dr. Malhotra has confirmed that to ICAC also?

Mr Duval: In that case, it is very simple that we agree on the escrow account and we place it, that's it.

Mr Bérenger: I can't say this for Med Point or for Dr. Malhotra. The SIC has made the proposal. They do their business. But, my point is the following, Mr Speaker, Sir. The hon. Minister of Finance is now track going through SIC trying for an escrow account. But, in the past we have seen, in the case of Suzanne, for example. The courts have acted. The hon. Minister of Finance tells us that SIC cannot, through the courts, freeze them. But, of course,

either ICAC or the Police or the Bank of Mauritius can start the legal procedures to freeze that. We can't just hope that an escrow account will be agreed to. Why doesn't Government act to freeze that account at Baroda and elsewhere?

(Interruptions)

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I don't understand where the Bank of Mauritius will get the power to do that.

Mr Speaker: Order! Hon. Peetumber, please! You cannot from where you are speak to somebody on the other side of the House across the floor!

Mr Duval: I am not a lawyer, so I cannot say, but obviously, ICAC works in total independence, not because we allow it. But, it is under the law. I will, in fact, quote from the law relating to ICAC. I quote –

“The Commission shall act independently, impartially, fairly and in the public interest. Subject to this Act, the Director General shall not be under the control, direction of any person or authority”

So, I am unable, Mr Speaker, Sir, to deal with the questions on ICAC, neither am I able to give them any instructions.

Mr Bérenger: I am not talking about an escrow account, but the possibility that we are dealing with proceeds of crime, is there and will remain there until ICAC, if it ever concludes its inquiry, refers it to the DPP and the DPP takes the decision. That is why I am asking why isn't Government prepared to find the legal channel required to freeze those accounts?

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I understand, ICAC may be able to do so, but that is not my purview. I can say, Mr Speaker, Sir, that all since *les claquements de cette affaire*, all since that, the Prime Minister and the Government of Mauritius has not wished to interfere at all in the ICAC inquiry and it is still going on and we have been transparent and providing the information today to the House. Not only that, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is only when my predecessor left office that we have any correspondence of any sort through SIC representing the Government in this issue to try as a shareholder of Med Point to act and protect the interest of the other, ultimately, the tax payer. I think we have shown our goodwill all the way and it would have been in our interest. Public opinion would have been so happy if tomorrow we were able to block this

account. So, why wouldn't we do it? Except for the fact that we respect the independence of ICAC and it is up to them to do it. Otherwise, Mr Speaker, Sir, the whole nation would have carried us up, *sur un piédestal* because we have been able. So, we would love to do that because everything that we have done so far has shown that we want to see these things sorted out and to see that the culprits are taken to court. Thank you.

(Interruptions)

Mr Bérenger: The hon. Minister of Finance says ...

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order now! Order now!

Mr Bérenger: ..that he through SIC or otherwise has done all that they can, I have heard him just before to say, to recuperate tax payers' money. Then, has the hon. Minister directed the SIC to withdraw its request that the proceeds of the sale be distributed to all the shareholders including SIC? Has this been withdrawn?

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, the question is so easy to answer. On 01 August, we write to say distribute. On 03 August, we write directly to the Bank, to freeze the account. So, how come the account be frozen and at the same time be distributed? It does not make sense. So, we did rescind that demand, not even two or three working days later, that was rescinded and we asked the Bank of Baroda to freeze everything.

Mr Bérenger: The hon. Minister says that the Bank of Mauritius cannot come in. It is a serious situation, where on 25 October, the hon. Prime Minister categorically stated: that the Med Point money had been deposited in a local bank and transferred to another local bank and to London. I repeat my information ...

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. To be fair, I quoted - whether rightly or wrongly - the words "it seems" that that cannot be categorically stated. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has not the right in saying so, and I should correct him.

Mr Bérenger: Again I am referring to the Bank of Mauritius. My information is that no Med Point money left Mauritius. It is here in Baroda Bank, in the account of Mrs Malhotra, the Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank. Has or will the hon. Minister check through the Bank of Mauritius..

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order!

Mr Bérenger: ...whether that money has been transferred to London or not? That the Bank of Mauritius can do.

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, deliberately I did not wish to reveal the bank details of this private citizen, Mrs Malhotra. I cannot say whether it is in HSBC. I do not think it is in HSBC. Unless the Leader of the Opposition has more information than me, it was not transferred to HSBC. Now, whether the Leader of the Opposition has privilege information as to what Mrs Malhotra has done with the money from whichever bank it was to HSBC, I can say that no transfer was made to any account in HSBC. So, the Leader of the Opposition again should be a little bit careful. He may be right, but that is not the information that I have as ultimately a shareholder of SIC Ltd, Mr Speaker, Sir. That is not what I have.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we are in good faith. We have no reason not to attach this. If the Leader of the Opposition seems categoric that there must be some way that the Bank of Mauritius can act, the hon. Prime Minister and I will be more than happy to consider the way it can be done. It is in our interest, Mr Speaker, Sir. We are here to protect the interest of the taxpayers. It is in the interest of the taxpayers. If he does not want to talk to me, there is no problem; the Prime Minister is here. Let's have the solution, and we will act on it.

Mr Bérenger: The hon. Minister of Finance is saying that he has information to the effect that the money has not been transferred to the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation. This is also Med Point money. We have been informed of what *démarche* supposedly, belatedly SIC is taking to freeze, to stop that Baroda account. Now, whether it is at Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation or elsewhere, if money has been transferred - and my information is that money has been transferred from the Baroda deposit account to another account Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation or whatever. But, this is taxpayers' money also. So, why does not the Minister of Finance find where that money is and go ahead with the same *démarche* to freeze that also?

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I must explain where I got the information. I am not getting the information from any bank. In fact, if it was a cheque that was drawn, I wouldn't know where

it has been cashed or deposited. The fact is that transfers were made. Transfer is a letter to say to transfer so much to the Bank of Baroda, transfer so much to Mrs Malhotra at this bank. This is why I know where the money has been transferred. What has happened to it afterwards, I don't know. I really don't know, truthfully. So, that is what happened to the money. We are interested to freeze the money. Of course, we are! The Leader of the Opposition - whatever his partner may be saying - is interested. Let us get together. We are saying that the easiest way, if everybody is agreeable, is the Escrow account and we do it. Let's do it! What can be any reason why we do not want to freeze the account? There is no reason! Today itself, if the Leader of the Opposition comes up with how the Bank of Mauritius can act, we will do so. But, I pray for your indulgence, Mr Speaker, Sir. As for the ICAC, I cannot act.

Mr Bérenger: The way hon. Minister of Finance is speaking is as if I decide whether there will be an Escrow account or not! This is out of this world.

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr Bérenger: Can I know from the hon. Minister of Finance...

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order! Order please!

Mr Bérenger: What happens...

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order please!

Mr Bérenger: ...if Medpoint or Dr. Malhotra refuses to agree to that Escrow account? Will action be taken to freeze the funds both at Baroda and at Mrs Malhotra's account, wherever it be?

Mr Duval: With great pleasure, Mr Speaker, Sir. With great pleasure, we would like to do so. We are in the hands of ICAC and, from the beginning - even to protect our own people at the time - we did not put pressure on ICAC. It is not now that we will do so. We have to trust our institutions and to trust that ICAC will find a way - whatever way - to do so, and I hope so. If there is any other way to block the account, I am the first guy to accept that. This is why, Mr

Speaker, Sir, I make an appeal to the hon. Leader of Opposition, to his partner: let's have it, let's do it, and then the public will be happy. Because everybody now is a little bit on tenterhooks as to whether the money will suddenly disappear from these accounts again. I said that SIC, on 03 August, about a week after the departure of my predecessor, did act to ask Baroda Bank to freeze the account.

Mr Ganoo: With regard to this question of freezing of assets, may I ask the hon. vice-Prime Minister to liaise with the Attorney General? Section 62 of the Act provides specifically for this question of freezing of assets, that is, the DPP may apply to the Supreme Court when somebody is charged or about to be charged under the POCA legislation for the attachment or the prohibition of any person to transfer or to pledge or to dispose of any money or other property so attached. So, the law is very clear. The DPP may apply to the Supreme Court and apply for this freezing order, and the money shall not be disposed in any way!

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would not wish to argue with such an esteemed lawyer. But, I understand that there must be a suspect. I presume that's why the confusion arose about London, because ICAC actually went to London to meet the Malhotra's, and that is why we assumed that the money had flown there as well. But, that is not the case.

Mr Ganoo: There are several provisional charges already!

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I cannot argue on this issue. If the hon. Member wants to ask the hon. Attorney General, it's with pleasure. But this has been addressed to me, and I am answering. I understand that this is not possible. But I can give the guarantee of the whole Government that we will do everything possible; and we have done everything possible to recover taxpayers' money.

Mr Bérenger: My last question would be the following. From what I have heard the hon. Minister of Finance say on behalf of Government and what I have said in my capacity as Leader of the Opposition, it is clear that both sides would wish to see ICAC take legal action. My point is that we are not putting pressure on ICAC. But today's proceedings should be sent to ICAC, so that they are aware that there is unanimity on both Government side and Opposition side for ICAC to take legal action under the law.

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order! Order I said! Order! Order now!

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I cannot say whether ICAC already has an attachment order or does not have an attachment order. It may already have an attachment order; I don't know, Mr Speaker, Sir. The solution is two-pronged, Mr Speaker, Sir. If this side of the House agrees with Government, we can have an Escrow account - finish *là même*. Otherwise, Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Government agrees and the Opposition agrees, then we

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order!

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am reiterating ...

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order!

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am reiterating our offer for an Escrow account. Not to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, because he does not have anything to do with it, but to our friends next-door to him. That is the first thing. The second thing Mr Speaker, Sir...

(Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: Order! Order, I said!

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, obviously, with pleasure, I will send the whole proceedings to ICAC ...

(Interruptions)

Mr Bérenger: He keeps on going as if we decide here; this side or this side; we decide on an Escrow account! He is out of his mind! He is out of his mind to say things like that! My point is that the will of the House has expressed itself today unanimously, and that, therefore, with due respect to ICAC, the necessary must be made to inform ICAC of the will of the House on this matter.

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am happy that the Leader of the Opposition has dissociated himself from the whole thing, and is...

(Interruptions)

Mr Bérenger: This is rubbish!

(Interruptions)

Mr Duval: Mr Speaker, Sir, this is what I understand!

Mr Speaker: That is the end of question time. There is a consensus that today's proceedings of the House be sent to the ICAC, and that's the end of the matter!

(Interruptions)