

हो और आगे चलकर प्रत्येक जिले में तीन-तीन कृषि विज्ञान केन्द्र हों जिनका नाम कृषि उद्योग विज्ञान केन्द्र होना चाहिए, प्रस्थापित किए जाएं तो सब प्रकार के ग्रामीण संबंधित मंत्रालय उसके द्वारा अपनी-अपनी योजनाएं कार्यान्वित करा सकते हैं और देश की आर्थिक स्थिति सुदृढ़ हो सकती है। इस समय हम नया बजट लाने जा रहे हैं। मेरा आग्रह है कि जो ग्रामीण विकास का काम किया जा सकता है, नए बजट में उसका विशेष ध्यान रखना चाहिए। ग्रामीण विकास न करने के कारण शहरों में गंदी बस्तियां बढ़ रही हैं। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने भी उसके प्रति चिंता प्रकट की है। मैं समझता हूं इन सब बातों को ध्यान में रखकर सरकार इस ओर ध्यान देगी, "कृषि विज्ञान केन्द्र" को "कृषि उद्योग विज्ञान केन्द्र" का नाम देगी और ग्रामीण इलाकों से संबंधित सभी मंत्रालयों को मिलाकर एक बोर्ड या काउंसिल बनाएगी जिसमें स्वयंसेवी संस्थाओं को भी प्रतिनिधित्व प्राप्त होगा। मुझे लगता है कि तभी गांधी जी का गांव के विकास का सपना निश्चित तौर पर पूरा हो सकता है, धन्यवाद।

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Sir, Shri Nanaji has raised a very important issue regarding the importance of the Krishi Vigyan Kendra and the points that he has made, I think, deserve the utmost serious consideration of the Government. I would like to associate myself with the view of Shri Nana Deshmukh.

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत (राजस्थान) : महोदय, मैं अपने आप को इस विषय से सम्बद्ध करता हूं।

DR. L.M. SINGHVI (Rajasthan): I also associate myself with the points raised by Shri Nana Deshmukh.

**Withdrawal of two volumes of the "Towards Freedom" series by
Indian Institute of Historical Research**

SHRIMATI SHABANA AZMI (Nominated): Sir, I rise to express my deep anguish at the manner in which the Indian Council of Historical Research has chosen to withdraw two volumes of the prestigious "Towards Freedom" series by Prof. Sumit Sarkar and Prof. K. N. Panikkar, directly from the Oxford University Press bypassing the General Editor, Prof. S. Gopal. Such blatant interference in the editorial sanctity of a major academic project cannot augur well for this nation. The I.C.H.R. did not observe even the minimum propriety of informing the authors about its decision. Both, Prof. Panikkar and Prof. Sumit Sarkar, are distinguished historians, who have consistently upheld secular and progressive values in their approach to history. By this action of withdrawal, the I.C.H.R. has

shown utter disregard for the autonomy of an academic institution and it has shown contempt for independent research. When Prof. Sarkar and Prof. Panikkar were entrusted with this project in 1989, thereby, nailing the lie that it has taken 27 years to complete this project, it was under a specific understanding that they would be answerable only to the general editor, Professor S. Gopal, both in form and in content and that is why they took up this project. Now, by imposition of an External Review Committee, the fact that their independence and their autonomy has been violated is clearly established. It is a great pity that the I.C.H.R. is now manned by people who are insensitive to the academic implications of autonomy being violated. It is a real pity. It has also to be seen as a part of the larger scenario that is happening in the country. It is an attempt by the Sangh Pariwar to impose its own ideology in matters of social, cultural and academic issues. It is becoming completely clear that it is the writ of the *Sangh Pariwar* rather than any institutional norms that are at play. Coupled with these are a whole series of allegations that are also being made and are confusing the subject. It is being said that crores of rupees have been spent; it has taken 27 years to complete the project, etc. But, the fact is, the editors are to receive an Honourarium of Rs.25,000/- after completion of the project. Any money that has spent so far, has been directly spent by the Council for its research, assistants and it has got nothing to do with the editors. I have already stated that the editors came into picture only in 1989 and so, it has not taken these many years that they are talking about.

It is also being said that what is done now has a precedent. It is said that Shri P.N. Chopra's volume was similarly reviewed by the then Chairman of the I.C.H.R. and the volumes edited by him were withdrawn. The fact is, the present proposal review has no similarity with that of the past. Shri P.N. Chopra was direct employee of the I.C.H.R. and conditions were that he was answerable to the Chairman. Whereas, in the present case, the two people were answerable only to Professor Gopal and his autonomy has been violated. The *mala fide* intention is obvious from the very constitution of the Review Committee. Volumes documenting the history of the freedom movement require not only a general expertise on modern Indian history, but also a deep understanding of archival and non-official matters. The Review Committee does not have people of this expertise. It has a retired bureaucrat, a historian of ancient India, and an archaeologist.

In the light of the above, we demand that severe action be taken against the ICHR Chairman for violating all academic norms. The alliance partners of the NDA, committed, as they are, to the principles of secularism, must stand up and be counted. They need to defeat the designs of the Sangh Parivar and the BJP and its hidden agenda and insist that educational institutions should not be allowed to fall a prey to any given particular dispensation, or be allowed to adulterate history, or suppress genuine historical writings.

There is a general impression in the *hindutava* camp that the volumes under discussion, being documented history, might contain incontrovertible evidence about the collaboration of Hindu communal forces with colonialism. That is likely to damage for ever the possible projection of the RSS leaders as freedom fighters. Discrediting the authors of these volumes and preventing their publication is rooted in this political logic. What is happening to "Towards Freedom" is not an isolated instance. It is part of a larger design of the Sangh Parivar to transform India into a Hindu nation. The disruption of the shooting of 'Water', the blackening of the face of a school teacher in Goa, and the intimidation of citizens in Lucknow and Kanpur are unmistakable forebodings of India's plurality under fire. The withdrawal of these volumes has to be located in the larger context.

श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, हम एसोसिएट करते हैं लेकिन एक बात मैं इसमें कहना चाहता हूँ ...(व्यवधान) ।

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): Sir, the "Towards Freedom"

Project was a rebuttal and meant to give the Indian point of view *vis-a-vis* the British point of view which was contained in the 'Transfer of Power' documents and series. So, this was a rebuttal to the Transfer of Power series. According to the British, the independence of India was not really the result of any revolution or struggle by the Indians. It was just the transfer of power very, very peacefully and very normally. So, this was obviously inaccurate and because it was inaccurate, the Indian Council for Historical Research decided at that point of time that the true facts should be brought out by producing all the records under the series 'Towards Freedom'. 'Towards Freedom' was to cover the last ten years of the freedom struggle. Now, it has been said that it took a long time to prepare these documents, prepare these books. Now, the House must appreciate what were the dimensions of this project. ...(Interruptions)...

[29th February, 2000] RAJYA SABHA

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL (Uttar Pradesh): Is this a debate or a Special Mention?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: No, no; it is a Special Mention. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: If it is a matter of debate, let us know.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am putting the facts, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am putting the facts, Sir ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are only to associate yourself.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Yes, Sir. I will just put the facts, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): Mere association will not do.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Yes. This has been a major debate. I will put the facts. Sir, I have brought here a book of Dr. Parthasarthy Gupta, a part of the series.

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत (राजस्थान) : संघ परिवार को ..(व्यवधान) हमारा निवेदन है कि यह सर्वसम्मति से होना चाहिए ।

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Why are you trying to stop me? Please don't do this. You should not stop me. Don't try to stop. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The main person, whose Special Mention it was, has spoken earlier. Others have only to associate, not make speeches.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Alright, Sir. Then, let me make just this point. The "Towards Freedom" Project is....*(Interruptions)* No, you permit me to say something. Don't stop the debate in Parliament. ...*(Interruptions)* ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will give chance....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: The "Towards Freedom" Project is an independent research. It is mentioned that it gives the Leftist point of view. But, Sir, it attacks the Communist Party. It says harsh things about the Community Party during the Quit India Movement. It says harsh things

about the Congress saying, how it scaled down its demands. It also says that the crucial issues then--and, in fact, I would say now--are, maintaining the unity of India for which social harmony is required. Therefore, the main challenge to freedom, as it is today, was the challenge of the divisive forces whether it was the Jamaat-e-Islami, or the Muslim League which at that point of time were criticized very strongly, or whether it was the Hindu Mahasabha which was also criticized along with the other movements. Now, the point I am making is this. This is part of a larger plan? For instance, what is happening in relation to text books? ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत : सभापति महोदय, मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है।

...(व्यवधान)

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Why are you afraid? Why are you frightened? ...*(Interruptions)*... This is Parliament. Don't do that. Don't stop Parliament and freedom. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ओंकार सिंह लखावत : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर यह है कि स्पेशल मेशन में मुख्य वक्ता तीन मिनट ले सकता है और उसके बाद माननीय सदस्य केवल एस्सोसियेट कर सकते हैं। ...*(व्यवधान)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Eduardo Faleiro, please wind up.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Sir, this is part of a larger activity to re-write history and in the process of re-writing history, you glorify some communities. I have no problem in their being glorified, but demonising the other communities, like the Christians and Muslims, and calling them foreigners in text books, is not justified. It is part of this conspiracy. Sir, since you have been so kind, I would go along with you, but I will make only two demands. Let these books of Professor Sarkar and Professor Panikkar be sent back to the publisher, and these books should be published as they are. This is my first demand. The other demand is to stop these demonising campaign and hatred in the minds of children, as is being done in the books that I have referred to. There are certain communities which are being called foreigners. My demand is, stop calling communities such as Christians, Muslims, Parsis, etc. as "foreigners". You claim to be patriots. Let us work together for the unity of India. Let us work together for social harmony. Let us inculcate these values in our children, in your children, and in the children of this nation.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, our friends in the B.J.P. should try to understand as to why there is so much of disquiet in the country, and also in the House. We are really to ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, if they go on like this, then there will be no Government business. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री ओंकारसिंह लखावत : स्पेशल मेशन तीन मिनट के लिए होता है।

..*(व्यवधान)* नहीं तो आप डिबेट करा लीजिये । ...*(व्यवधान)*

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Sir, who will run the House? They will run the House or you will run the House?

श्री सभापति : चतुर्वेदी जी भी बोलेंगे । ...*(व्यवधान)*

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम : बनारस में वाटर शूटिंग को रोका...*(व्यवधान)*

आई०सी०एच०आर० की किताब को रोका...*(व्यवधान)* उसकी शकल यहां देखने को मिल रही है ।...*(व्यवधान)*

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Sir, I will never sit down until they stop and listen to me. I am standing here, and I will complete my speech. Sir, unless you instruct me, I will continue to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please keep quiet.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Sir, there is so much of disquiet in the country and in the House regarding this issue, for a number of reasons. The number one fear is that the B.J.P. is trying to impose on this nation a unilateral monolithic view about Indian culture through manufactured history. The number two fear is that such monolithic view of Indian culture is contrary to the diverse character of the Indian population, but still they are promoting it....*(Interruptions)*...Sir, what is happening. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Sir, if they go like this, then there will be no Government business. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): This action of theirs only justifies what they are saying.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA : Sir, if they do not listen to me, how can we have a discussion here? The second point is that they are trying to impose a monolithic view which is contrary to the diverse nature of Indian society. The third point is that it is very dangerous for India's integrity. It is striking at the roots of professionalism, professional ethics. The people who are writing history should have a sense of pride in what they are doing.

Unfortunately, the ICHR's composition has been changed recently. We discussed this issue last year. The earlier ICHR consisted of high grade historians. They have been removed. The persons who now have taken the place of historians are not qualified to take these positions. They are not qualified to write history. The fourth point is that history is a professional work. It requires meticulously collecting together material from all kinds of sources, and then applying one's own methodology to test what is right and what is wrong. There can be diverse views. For example, whether the Aryans had come from outside the country or not, whether the R.S.S. had played any role in the freedom movement or not. One can have different views on these points.

But the point is that historians follow a methodology to reach their own views. Now they are striking at the root of professionalism by denying the historians their job to write history. Now they have their own people who have been put in the ICHR to write history that will be doctored by them, that will be prepared by them. On this issue, the BJP is very sensitive because the volumes, which have been brought out by the ICHR until the BJP take-over of the ICHR, do expose that the RSS had no role to play in India's freedom movement. That is the only reason why they are sensitive about it. Therefore, they want to suppress the fact. Despite their tall talk about nationalism, patriotism and all that, they have nothing to do with the freedom movement. Even the great revolutionary, Veer Savarkar, did not belong to the RSS. He belonged to the Hindu Mahasabha. Whatever be my reservations on his later views, I am not going into them.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us not go into that. Confine yourself to the present issue.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I have two remedies.

...(Interruptions)...

SHRI B. P. SINGHAL: Establish it here. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI DINA NATH MISHRA (Uttar Pradesh) : Let there be a debate.(Interruptions)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Sir, I have two remedies, short-term and long-term.

SHRI LALITBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): He should establish here that
*... (Interruptions) ...

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: The short-term remedy is that this order should be withdrawn.(Interruptions)...

AN HON. MEMBER: That is correct. The RSS participated in the British Government.(Interruptions)....

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): Let there be a commission on the role of the RSS.(Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you want to say? You make your point. What can I do? It happens both ways.(Interruptions) ...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I cannot compete with them. My voice would not allow that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right.(Interruptions)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Definitely, I cannot compete with them. What can I do? My voice would not be heard.
...(Interruptions)...

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल (राजस्थान): * वे इस देश के महान राष्ट्रभक्त थे। इस देश के अंदर लाखों करोड़ों लोग उनके अनुयायी हैं आज भी। हम यह बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते,* इस देश के राष्ट्रभक्त थे। एक महान व्यक्ति थे और उनके खिलाफ इस प्रकार का चार्ज लगाया जाए सदन में बैठकर हम इसको बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकते ...(व्यवधान)

श्री लक्ष्मीराम अग्रवाल (मध्य प्रदेश): 1942 में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने गांधीजी के प्रति क्या कहा था, सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के बारे में क्या कहा था? भूल गए...(व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.....(Interruptions)...Let him finish.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka): Of all the people, at least the Communists should not speak about the independence movement. They have opposed everything regarding independence.(Interruptions).... It is very unfortunate that these people now want to give us a certificate.(Interruptions)....* They opposed the 'Quit India Movement'. They criticised Subhash Chandra Bose. They criticised Mahatma Gandhi.(Interruptions).... They should understand they should not provoke a racist atmosphere. They have been reduced to such a position that they are not having even a national status.(Interruptions).... They should not try to challenge the national forces. Everybody knows the history of the Communist Party during the freedom movement.(Interruptions)....

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI JIBON ROY: You are following the same policy to divide the nation.. You are maintaining the same policy. You divided the nation. You boost up the communal fundamentalism..*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Divide and rule is your policy, not our policy. They never allow others to speak. *(Interruptions)*... Please expunge the remarks about Golwiler.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: आप एक भी भा.ज.पा. ...*(व्यवधान)*... एक भी नाम बताइये, एक भी नेता का नाम बताइये, 70 साल से ऊपर एक भी नेता का नाम बताइये ..*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: बिल क्लिंटन आ रहे हैं आपके लिए ..*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडू : यह कम्युनिस्ट मैनिफेस्टो नहीं है ..*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री भारतेन्दु प्रकाश सिंहल : आप अपोलोजाइज करें। ..*(व्यवधान)*..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Members, *(Interruptions)*... Please, please, please, please. Please sit down. There are two differing views. I would like them to speak, but limited. I will ask Mr. T.N. Chaturvedi, as a special case, to intervene and say something; and then we will close it. If you agree *(Interruptions)*... if you agree *(Interruptions)*... if you agree *(Interruptions)*... Your name is there. I will ask all of them. But the point is, nobody should interrupt anybody. When Mr. Chaturvedi is speaking, you should not interrupt him. They should not interrupt you, when you are speaking. But the question is, you should speak only facts, whatever you believe are facts, in a most sophisticated language so that nobody is hurt. You can give an objective view of history. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU : Sir, they are opposed to the ruling. They can't speak anything in a democratic manner. They are so intolerant. They are not abiding by your ruling. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JIBON ROY : You can say that, earlier, we were aligned with the Soviet Union. You can say that.

What is the problem in it? *(Interruptions)*..

[29th February, 2000] RAJYA SABHA

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल : सर, उन्होंने जो बोला, उस के बारे में आप की रुलिंग नहीं मिली । ... (व्यवधान) ...

*मौलाना अबुदुल्ला खान आज़मी (बिहार) : चैयर की रुलिंग के बाद क्या परेशानी है ? ... (व्यवधान) ...

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House is adjourned till 4 o'clock.

The House then adjourned at thirty-seven minutes past twelve of the clock.

The House re-assembled at three minutes past four of the clock,

The Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA):
Madam, I beg to lay on the Table. ... (Interruption)...

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JASWANT SINGH):
Madam Deputy Chairman, I wish to make a request to you. Earlier, there were some references during the Zero Hour today about which we have serious reservations. I would appeal to you. This has been brought to the Chairman's notice too. This should be taken note of. Anything that is not in accordance with parliamentary rules or parliamentary norms must not find place in parliamentary records.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sure. I will see the record.
... (Interruptions) ... I do not know. ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, I am on a point of order. The only business listed at 4 o'clock is the laying, on the Table, of the Budget. Prior to that, no question, no statement, no remarks of any hon. Member of the House is expected. ... (Interruptions) ... Madam, I want a ruling. Under what rule Jaswantji has spoken? ... (Interruptions) ... I want a ruling. I want your ruling. Under what rule has Jashwant Singhji spoken? ... (Interruptions) ... The only listed business of the House is the laying of the Budget. (Interruptions) ... The Hon. Leader of the house has broken the rule, violated the rule. He cannot be allowed to do it. ... (Interruptions) ...

*Transliteration of the speech in Persian script is available in the Hindi version of the Debate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, please take your seat. We know that you are in the House. *(Interruptions)*... We know that you are there. The only listed business is not the Budget. I have not adjourned the House as yet. I had no idea as to what he was referring to. *...(Interruptions)...* Just a minute. He is the Leader of the House. If he wants to say something, I have to allow him to speak. He has asked me to see the record. So, I will see the record. He is not making any statement, he is not asking for any discussion and we have no statement by him. If he wants that I should see the record, I will see the record. He is requesting the Chair to see the record and I will see the record. You cannot object to any Member when he is making a request to the Chair. He is not asking you to do anything. He is only asking me to see the record and I do not find anything objectionable in it. So, there is nothing which you can raise in the form of a point of order. There is no point of order. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, is it appropriate? This is not a matter between you and the Leader of the House. *(Interruptions)...* He is only taking the time of the House. *...(Interruptions)...*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, are you questioning the ruling. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam there is no urgency. The record of the House can be amended by the order of the Chair any time. *(Interruptions)...* No, no. This is absolutely wrong.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, I have been presiding over this House for the last thirteen years, not for one day or two days. I have gone through all kinds of proceedings in the House. There is nothing in it which is out of order. If the Leader of House or the Leader of the Opposition or any Member requests the Chair to look into the record, there is nothing objectionable in it. I was not in the House in the morning and I have no idea as to what he is saying. If he wants me to look into the record, I will look into the record. Now, what is objectionable in it?

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Is it the time for saying that?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. The only time for a Member to request the Chair is when the House is in order and the House just now is in order. He cannot come and make this request in my Chamber. That will be out of order. When I am in the Chair, he can make a request regarding anything relating to the proceedings of the House. *...(Interruptions)...* I am only correcting him.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, I agree with you. But this matter could have been raised tomorrow, after the Question Hour. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam, I am on a point of order. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI MD. SALIM: Madam, just now you have stated that the laying of the Budget is not the only agenda. When the House was adjourned in the morning, Dr. Biplab Dasgupta was on his legs. He was making a submission on the ICHR. *...(Interruptions)...* At first, the hon. Member, Shrimati Shabana Azmi, had spoken. She was followed by Shri Eduardo Faleiro. Then came the turn of Dr. Biplab Dasgupta. At the same time, some hangama was there. Some objections were raised from both sides. Now, the hon. Leader of the House has pointed out that some objectionable words are there. He is very right in saying so. In response to his request, you have stated that the laying of the Budget is not the only listed business. So, you should start from where we stopped. Then only you should go through the record. Why was Dr. Biplab Dasgupta not allowed to speak in the morning?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Madam, I am on a point of order. Madam, what the Leader of the House has just now mentioned is very unfortunate. At that time, you were not in the Chair. I feel it sets a wrong precedent. *...(Interruptions)* Madam, an issue was discussed in the morning which had generated a great deal of controversy and agitation among all the Members. Something had happened and then the hon. Chairman adjourned the House. All of us have not had our say yet. The matter is still pending. Madam, now the Leader of the House has said something. As regards the Business listed for afternoon, you said, "it is not only the Budget". We are now waiting for the Finance Minister to lay the Budget on the Table of the House. The Leader of the House has just now got up and said, "Something should be taken away from the record. You look into the record." Fair enough. "And this is being brought to the notice of the Chairman also." We do not know what is being brought to the notice of the Chairman. He should say what it is. In the House he cannot just say, "Something has been brought to the notice of the Chairman." This is not proper. What is it? We also want to see what he has brought to the notice of the hon. Chairman in his chamber, and which he did not bring to our notice here. *...(Interruptions) ...* Why didn't he say that openly in the

House? Madam, this is a wrong precedent; what happened inside the Chairman's chamber, the Leader of the House can't say that here! We do not know what they told the Chairman. ... (*Interruptions*) ... We also want to say in the House this is a wrong precedent. ... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mukherjee wants to say something.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Madam, this is a wrong precedent. Don't allow him to do this.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : Madam, I would like to draw your attention to this particular aspect, which Mr. Salim has also referred to, that when the House was adjourned, I was present. I did not hear the Chairman when he was disposing of the business which was going on at that point of time. There were a couple of Special Mentions. For number two Special Mention, there were three Members who received permission from the Chairman to speak on that subject. Two of them had completed their speeches. The third was on his legs. Thereafter, some disturbances took place. There was an exchange of words. The Chair adjourned the House. Therefore, it is for us to know from the Chair whether the remaining Special Mentions will be taken up or whether those have been disposed of, and at what point of time you are going to take up the next item, i.e. laying the Annual Financial Statement of the year...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Budget.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : That is Budget. Therefore, the Leader of the House is perfectly in order in bringing any matter to the notice of the Chairman or the Chairperson because he is the Leader of the House; he has this privilege. We are not denying that. But the fact of the matter is that the old business is still continuing. The business is not disposed of. It is for the Chair to decide whether it is disposed of.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, I was on my legs when the business was stopped in the House. I was on my legs. I was standing; I could not complete even five or six sentences. I was severely interrupted. May I be allowed now to complete my speech?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Biplab Dasgupta, if I go by what Mr. Gurudasji said, to which I did not agree,--he says, "This House is convened at 4 o' clock just to lay the Budget on the Table of the House." ... (Interruptions) ... No, no; it is not "either" or "or". It has to be one. There should have been some business and it could have been taken up. There should have been some legislative business and it could have been taken up. Anything can be taken up until I take the sense of the House and adjourn the House. We do not adjourn it at 4 o' clock or 4.15. So, I have to take, later,--I mean, after the laying of the Budget--the sense of the House whether the House would like to discuss some matter. Now, you are pre-empting it. Let me first allow the Finance Minister to lay the Budget. Then, that matter would be taken up. This is not the time. ... (Interruptions) ... Mr. Faleiro, after the Budget is laid, you can make your point. The Finance Minister. वहां तो बड़े आराम से अपना बजट ले हो गया, यहां तो खाली रखने में इतना हंगामा हो रहा है।

एक सम्मानित सदस्य : वहां भी शुरुआत में हुआ था।

उपसभापति : हंगामा हुआ था...(व्यवधान)...

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 2000-2001

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA):
Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India for the year 2000-2001.[Placed in Library. See No. LT. 1326/00]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Thank you.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : किनारे पर जाना या डूब कर जाना, वह शेर सुना दीजिए।...(व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : हां, वह शेर सुना दीजिए।....(व्यवधान) Before we go back into any other controversy, you can keep everybody happy. सुना दीजिए, आपने क्या शेर सुनाया था लोक सभा को?

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : वहां तो सुना कर आ रहा हूं।

उपसभापति : हमने नहीं सुना।...(व्यवधान) याद नहीं रहा आपको।