

hon. Members protested against the Chairman's ruling and said that the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Rajya Sabha say...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Who said it?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Shri Sanatan Bisi. Afterwards Shri Md. Salim also...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I gave a ruling on that. Now, that question is closed.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: It is there on the record, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not on the record. I made it very clear that the Chairman's ruling stands. The Chairman's ruling was limited to a private Member laying a Government document. The Member was asking the Government to lay it. The Chairman's ruling does not stop a Member to ask the Government to lay papers. I hope you follow this. These are two different aspects.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: But, he threatened to withdraw from the House in protest.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But, he did not withdraw. Many Members do a lot of things. Let us not be so sensitive about it. Some day you may do that. So, let us be prepared for such eventualities. He never did it. I asked him to sit down and he sat down.

Now, we take up the Short Duration Discussion. Dr. Manmohan Singh.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Issues raised by former advisor to the Finance Minister and the alleged improprieties arising therefrom

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH (Assam): Madam, with your permission I beg to raise a discussion under Rule 176 on the issues raised by the former Advisor to the Finance Minister and the alleged improprieties arising thereof.

Madam, the Government has been swearing day in and day out about its commitment to the National Agenda for Governance. In paragraph 1 on Governance, that National Agenda stated:

"Our commitment to the people is to give a stable, honest, transparent and efficient Government capable of accomplishing all-round development."

Madam, I say with sorrow—that the former Advisor—or Consultant or what ever one chooses to call him—to the Finance Minister—has opened a can of worms. That raises serious questions about the Government's integrity. As the weekly magazine *India Today* has put it in its latest issue, "He has hit the Government on the one attribute it treasures most, that is, its integrity."

Madam, in substance, I wish to make three or four important points and, right in the beginning, I would like to summarise the issues as I see them. Later on, in my speech, I will try to develop some of these points at some length.

What are these issues that emerge out of the three articles that have appeared and signed by the former Advisor to the hon. Finance Minister? These are, basically, three or four issues; and I can summarise them. The first is that the BJP's top two leaders do not pull along and the resultant factionalism has hamstrung this Government. The second is there is a coterie around the Prime Minister which meddles with matters involving governance. Third, the BJP has reduced the governance of this large country to a spoils system in which each player picks a big business client and pushes his or her interest. Factional rivalry between major players, especially the PM and HM and their respective camp followers, fosters competitive ethical impropriety. As a result, the country's governance is a casualty. The Government seems to have said good bye to canons of good governance. The unstable and incoherent governance provides a fertile ground for power

brokers, providing us many cases of what has come to be known all over the world as the phenomenon of crony capitalism.

Madam, these ethical improprieties have been brought into the public domain by an individual who has had a ring-side seat within the innercouncils of the Government. There is enough evidence now in the public domain to establish a *prime facie* cases of an indepth investigation by a Joint Parliamentary Committee. That alone can help to restore confidence in this Government's *bona fides*.

Madam, the Government's spokesmen have sought to erode the credibility of the former Advisor. But if he is so untrustworthy or considered to be so untrustworthy now, a question arises, as has been said in today's article in *The Statesman*, as to why such a questionable appointment was made in the first place. The suspicion remains that the real reason for the unprecedented appointment was probably unmentionable.

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair.)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, Mr. Guruswamy also disclosed that the Finance Minister's private secretary was handpicked by the RSS chief himself. If this is so, it is yet another evidence of extra-Constitutional authority being exercised by the Sangh Parivar in the affairs of this Government.

Sir, these are four or five basic issues to which I wish to draw your attention and, through you, the attention of the House.

To substantiate my point, I shall discuss the case of the referral prices of certain categories of imported steel. Our steel industry is passing through difficulties. It is not my case that our steel industry does not need help to tide over these difficulties. If that industry needs extra assistance, it should be provided that assistance. If that industry can be helped by additional doses of reasonable protection, taking all facts into account, that protection should also be provided. But there are norms, there

are principles, there are procedures, which ought to be followed in the interest of fair governance, in the interest of transparency to ensure that what is being done is fair and above-board, that it is being done taking into account all the interests, of both the producers of steel and the users of steel; and that what is being done is in the larger national interests. As I said, we are not against the steel industry being helped to tide over these difficulties. The Government, in its wisdom, came to the conclusion that one mechanism that needs to be explored for this purpose is the fixing of a referral price for imported steel of certain varieties. Questions have been raised about the GATT-compatibility of the path that was chosen. I am not going to dwell into that. The question is how the referral prices for certain categories of imported steel belonging to hot-rolled coils were fixed. The former adviser to the hon. Finance Minister has alleged that this matter was referred to an Inter-Ministerial Committee and that Ministerial Committee, after a careful consideration of all factors, came to the conclusion that this price should be fixed at 247 dollars a tonne. He further goes on to allege that when the final orders were passed, the price that was notified was not 247 dollars a tonne, but 302 dollars a tonne, thereby conferring an extra benefit on certain producers of steel to the extent of nearly 50 dollars. And the figures that he has used is that in the process, these people have derived an undeserved benefit, probably, to the extent of Rs. 5000 crores. Sir, this is a serious charge and in all fairness, it is necessary that the country should be satisfied that what was done was the right course of action and that no ulterior considerations weighed with the Government in raising the price, the referral price, from, 247 dollars to 320 dollars a tonne. I quote from an interview that the adviser gave to the 'Indian Express' on 23rd February, 1999, in which he has stated, "The Inter-Ministerial Meeting recommended a price

of 247 dollars a tonne. How that became 302 dollars a tonne is a mystery to me. Only the three Minister concerned—Finance, Commerce and Steel—and the Prime Minister know what happened. They should answer. Mind You, I was not in the Administrative Group. So I do not know what was on the file. The talk was that the Ministers all had something to do with it. There were State elections also coming up at that time." To put it mildly, this does raise suspicions about this particular deal and we feel that this matter needs to be probed and only a Joint Parliamentary Committee can probe it effectively to find out where the truth lies. This is one reason why we feel this matter should be referred to a Joint Parliamentary Committee.(Interruptions)....

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Sir, I don't want to interrupt the Leader of the Opposition. But I would just like to know one thing from him. Where has the former advisor to the Finance Minister said that this involved a sum of Rs. 5,000 crores?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: It is in one of the three articles that I have mentioned just now. I can make it available to you.

I next come to certain other issues. I was saying that our steel industry is facing difficulties. The steel industry people have taken some loans. Some projects are under implementation. Because of the difficulties that the steel industry is facing because of the recession, the financial institutions, probably, have become more reluctant to advance additional sums of money to the steel industry where the projects are under implementation. I have also learnt that some steel producers had raised some money abroad, and after the imposition of sanctions by the U.S. Government, there were difficulties in raising fresh money to repay old loans. In all these matters, if the Government

comes to the help of Indian industry, there is nothing wrong with that. We are not challenging the right of the Government to take a view and devise appropriate mechanism to help an industry which is facing difficulty. The question is, how this thing should be done, and what has been alleged by the former advisor to the Finance Minister, raises in my mind serious doubts about the current style and manner of managing the financial institutions which happen to be in the public sector. It is entirely appropriate for the Finance Minister, if he feels that, in national interest, certain things have to be done by the financial institutions. But this should be a transparent mechanism. We cannot have a situation where the Finance Minister supersedes or superimposes his own judgement on what loan should be given to a particular individual. A policy having been devised by the Government, having been communicated to the financial institutions, the financial institutions should be asked to do their work on the basis of their normal commercial judgement. Sir, this transparent method of doing business has been a casualty. This becomes clear from the three articles that the former advisor to the Finance Minister has published. Two are articles, and one is an interview that he gave to the *Indian Express*, which I have already quoted. I say it with all sense of responsibility. It is not my intention to hurt any of the business interests. These are all Indian firms, Indian industries. Therefore, I will not say anything which casts aspersion or which will create difficulty for them in doing their normal business, nor am I casting aspersion on anybody. But it appears to me that this method of doing business, with the Finance Minister deciding who will get what loan, does raise a question about the management of our financial institutions. We have been told that a particular producer was called, terms were negotiated in his presence, and these were communicated to him. We are also told that another wing of the

Government in this case, it is alleged the 'Prime Minister's office' objected as to why special favours were shown to a particular producer. We are also told that the Prime Minister's office was interested in another producer being helped. We are also told that yet another important.(Interruptions)....

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am on a point of order. Sir, I quote from 'Kaul and Shakdher' (page 818). Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is very senior.

Normally, we don't want to interrupt him and we have the highest regard for him. But when he was drawing the name of the office of the Prime Minister and making a sweeping remark on the officer of the Prime Minister saying "the Prime Minister's office is interested in a particular company", it is an allegation. It is a serious allegation. If any Member wants to make an allegation, such a serious allegation, in the House, 'Kaul and Shakdher' (page 818) says:—

"A Member has to be careful while making an allegations. He has to satisfy himself that the source is reliable and the allegation is based on facts. In effect, he is required to make *prima facie* investigation into the matter before he writes to the Speaker or the Minister, and more so, before he speaks in the House."

Sir, a notice relating to an allegation based on newspaper reports is not allowed.

"A notice relating to an allegation based on newspaper reports is not allowed unless the Member tabling it gives the speaker substantial proof that the allegation has some factual basis." Sir, I quote further(Interruptions)....

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, if you look at the text of the Motion, you will find that all these issues are arising out of the issues raised by Mr. Guruswamy. The Motion itself is on the issues raised by Mr. Guruswamy. The

hon. Leader of the Opposition started his observation saying that the discussion is on the issues raised by the former Adviser to the Finance Minister. Therefore, the sources of all the allegation are the three articles written by Shri Guruswamy and the issues raised by Shri Guruswamy. The moment you admitted this Motion, all these issues arising out of the observations of Mr. Guruswamy were covered by that. Therefore, there is no question of raising any issue individually. All these issues are arising out of the observations made and the issues raised by Mr. Guruswamy.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Mr. Chairman Sir, I have to complete my submission. I can yield for him, but after that, you allow me to complete my submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has completed. Please continue.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I have a lot of respect for him. Sir, the questions is that we are discussing certain issues raised by Shri Guruswamy, that is the issue. I do agree with that, but, at the same time, he says that he was Adviser to the Government. Now, he is not the Adviser, he has been removed.(Interruptions).... Listen to me. We were hearing you(interruptions).... We are for a debate, we are willing to face the debate, we are ready to answer the debate. We also want to take part in the debate. Please do have some patience.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, my point is this. Somebody wrote an article and then somebody else, who is not a Member of the House, and who is not taking the responsibility for the charges made and the articles written by him, raised the issue, outside the House. If somebody here in the House quotes extensively from that and goes on making sweeping allegations, then where are we leading to? Sir, my submission is(Interruptions)....

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: That is the subject under discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One minute. Let him complete.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, I further quote:—

"A notice relating to an allegation based on newspaper reports is not allowed unless the Member tabling it gives the Spaker substantial proof that the allegation has some factual basis."

I stress "some factual basis."

to give brief details about the allegation

—'brief details about the allegation'—

"which he proposes to make against a person or another Member, so that the Speaker could judge the matter before hand."

I can understand if the issues pertaining to a particular subject, like sugar and all that, are raised through a bland motion. But by bringing in the Prime Minister's office, the names of some companies which are not here, the name of somebody else who is not here, and going on the premises of the allegations that were made outside the House and that appeared in the newspapers, were are we leading to? I request the Chairman to go through this and, then, give us a ruling.
....(Interruptions)....

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): It is not a point of order. It is a speech you are making.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: It is a point of order. You don't take the Chairman's post.(Interruptions)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, let his point of order be over, then, I will hear you. Please let me hear.
....(Interruptions).... Please let me here.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, I would like to honourably submit that whenever they raise some issue, we have to bow down, we have to be quiet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please complete it.(Interruptions)

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, it really pains me. There is a limit to our patience also.(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him complete. (Interruptions) I will look into it; why are you worried?

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, on certain issues, questions were raised by Mr. Guruswamy. He had made certain sweeping remarks on so many issues. We are discussing the substance of some of the issues that he had raised. That is one point. In this point of order, I am confining myself to the fact that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is bringing in the Office of the Prime Minister. And bringing in the Office of the Prime Minister means making on accusation on the Prime Minister's Office and coming to a conclusion, a sweeping conclusion that the Prime Minister's office is interested in a particular group. It amounts to an allegation. I request you to disallow this submission because it is simply based on what appeared in one of the newspapers. If the Leader of the Opposition takes the responsibility and makes allegations, then I have no objection. It will form part of the debate. This is my submission. (Interruptions).

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: My respectful submission to you in this. The point of order raised by the hon. Member is regarding the admissibility of the Motion. (Interruptions) The Motion has been admitted. The motion has been admitted and we have used the phrase 'Issues raised by Mr. Mohan Guruswamy. It is not one issue. It is true that the issues have not been specified. But once the Motion is adopted by the Chair, in its wisdom, under article rule 176, then it is a substantive Motion. And the discussion being raised on this point of order is absolutely infructuous. The issues raised by Mr. Mohan Guruswamy are in the public domain. I repeat, the issues raised by Mr. Mohan Guruswamy are in the

public domain. And on the basis of that, notice was given to the Members. The Chairman, in his own wisdom, as per the rules had admitted that Motion. I can quote umpteen issues which had been raised under Rule 170, or, 176, or, under 180, mainly based on the statement issued in the newspapers or articles written in the newspapers. And the parliament exercised its authority on the basis of the information available from the newspapers. Therefore, this is nothing new. To my mind, this is nothing but an infructuous point of order. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Issue is different from allegation. The Chairman has allowed to raise issues. But the Chairman has not allowed the hon. Member to raise allegations. May I submit to the House, and through the Chairman to Mr. Pranab Mukherjee also, to please read page 818. It is not about notice. Even before he speaks; even before he speaks—it is in the last para of page 818. It says : “The Member is required to make a *prima facie* investigation into the matter before he writes, and also, more so, before he speaks in the House.” That is, after admission only. He will speak only if it is admitted. It has been admitted by the Chairman. I am not questioning his wisdom or his ruling. The Chairman has allowed the issue to be raised. The Chairman did not give permission to make an allegation, or, to quote an allegation. (*Interruptions*). Allegation is different from issue. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear Mr. Vayalar Ravi. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): While proposing this rule, the Rules Committee observed, in the second para, that it would not be right to place an absolute ban on the Members from making such allegations, as that may stand in the way of discharging their duty as responsible Members.

A Member should be given an absolute right to bring to the notice of the House any matter which on proper investigation he feels should be ventilated, even though it involves the character or reputation of any person. Even the Rules Committee...(*Interruptions*). Yes. The only thing is that the Chairman must know, and the Chairman must be informed. By this Resolution itself the public document was submitted to the Chairman which involves all the allegations in the document itself. He requires...(*Interruptions*). It is already there. We only repeated that, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Bhardwaj.

SHRI HANSRAJ BHARDWAJ (Madhya Pradesh): I am sorry, this matter which the hon. Member has quoted does not apply to the instant case. There is not remark which shows that the learned Leader of the Opposition is levelling any allegation against anybody. This is implied that if I as a Member start levelling charges against a Minister, or, any other hon. Member, I have to give notice. This is a motion which you have accepted and this is what Mr. Guruswamy, the former Financial Adviser to the Finance Minister, has alleged. I have heard the speech of the Leader of the Opposition word by word. He has said that these are the things which Mr. Guruswamy had said. He has not referred to the Prime Minister individually. He has only mentioned about the prime Minister's Office. So, there is no character assassination of the prime Minister, nor has there been any reference to any Minister. We have only mentioned about the procedure adopted and all that. I think if such objections are raised, there will be no meaning. Therefore, we want your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was a little late in coming. The points which he is making are those points which were mentioned in Guruswamy's article. Have you said anything more than that?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, the fact is that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not making any allegations against the Prime Minister or the Prime Minister's Office. He is only referring to the article written by the former Adviser to the Finance Minister and that is the basic issue of discussion in the House. He is not certifying the article and the allegations made by Guruswamy. That is why this method has been found to have a discussion to decide as to whether we should go further or not. This is the decision. There is nothing wrong up till now in what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, I was on the point that we were not against the steel industry being helped or the Government taking a view about what needs to be done to help the steel industry in a transparent manner. But what has been alleged in this article is this. The way in which the steel industry was sought to be helped was something where there was a gross departure from the canon of transparency. Here is a case, which is alleged in this article, that individual producers and the members of the Civil Service in the presence of the hon. Finance Minister sat together and devised a package. It is further alleged that the package was objected to by the Prime Minister's Office and that there was pressure to get a similar package for another group. It is further alleged that an important politician belonging to the ruling party, who is now a Minister, walked into his office and insisted that a particular group should be helped. (Interruptions).

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND THE MINISTER OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN): Sir, I totally deny this allegation. (Interruptions)... The Chairman is allowing me. (Interruptions)... What is your problem?

(Interruptions)... What is your problem? (Interruptions)...

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): Do they want to dispose of each and everything here itself. (Interruptions)...

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Sir, you are there. He has yielded for a minute. I would not take more than a minute. I am not interrupting him. (Interruptions)... I am not interrupting him. (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Leader of the Opposition, are you yielding? (Interruptions)... Are you yielding?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Let him say, Sir. (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the Leader of the Opposition whether he is yielding to hear him. He is yielding. (Interruptions)...

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra): Sir, let the Leader of the Opposition speak. (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I asked him. he said that he was yielding. (Interruptions)... I asked him and he told me.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Sir, I will be the last person to disturb Mr. Manmohan Singh not just because he is the Leader of the Opposition here. Even if he speaks outside the House, as an ordinary citizen, I will be the last person to disturb him. So, there is no disrespect to him. I only want to say that since he is making an allegation... (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not making any allegations.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Sir, please listen to me. He is making allegations based on Guruswamy's article.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. He is not making any allegations. He is only repeating what Guruswamy has stated. (Interruptions)... No, no. He is not making any allegations. He is personally not making any allegations against the

Prime Minister or the Prime Minister's Office. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: I am ready to correct my poor English. He is not making an allegation. He is referring to an allegation made by Guruswamy. *(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is under discussion. *(Interruptions)*... It is under discussion.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Sir, my only point is this. Let me clarify in this august House with full responsibility that Mr. Guruswamy's allegation regarding me is totally baseless. Chairman is here...*(Interruptions)* Sir, he has referred to a Cabinet Minister...*(Interruptions)*. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has said that "who has recently become a Minister". He said it...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. *(Interruptions)*. Please sit down. Let me tell you. *(Interruptions)*. Please. I think, the hon. Minister was in a hurry to respond. Let me say. He has mentioned 'a Minister'; it can be any Minister of the Cabinet...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: It is more dangerous. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like the Leader of the Opposition to clarify as to which Minister he was referring to. Otherwise, it is more dangerous...*(Interruptions)*.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why should he clarify? ...*(interruptions)*. It is more dangerous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is this. If it is referred to, then certainly you will have the right to reply when there is a debate. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition was not naming anybody, why should you assume that you are the person?...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: I tell you, Sir, I very respectfully submit, Sir, that you are doing injustice to me for two things. Number one, my name is mentioned in the article.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not seen it.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: That is not my problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has not named you.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Sir, he has referred to a Cabinet Minister. Would you ask him who is that Minister? He cannot make a general statement. He must specify.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Basically, the question is...*(Interruptions)*.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is not my intention to level any allegations against anybody. All I am saying is that all these things have appeared in the Press. There has been widespread discussion of these issues and that the Government owes it to our people to satisfy the country that nothing wrong is being done. So, if we care about good governance...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: You referred to a Minister.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: I have not named any Minister. There are so many Ministers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, please...*(Interruptions)*. Let me say, The hon. Minister can have certainly hurt feelings, if he is not concerned. I think we shall give him a chance to reply...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, the only question is this. Which Minister is going to be present as the responsible Minister to reply to this discussion. Then other Ministers can also intervene. But who is piloting this?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: that is very clear.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: I am a Member of this House...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. He is an hon. Member of the House. He has a right to protect his reputation and we should all help him to clarify his position. That should be so. Certainly. He will be given

all the opportunities to clarify if here are any misunderstandings ... (Interruptions). Please don't speak now.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: अगर उन्होंने कहा है तो मैं क्या उनका जवाब नहीं दे सकता? ... (व्यवधान)...

सदन के नेता (श्री सिकन्दर बख्त): सर, मैं अजें कर रहा था यह कि अगर हम सिर्फ एक मिनिस्टर की बात कहें, एल्यूजन तो है और इसलिए इसे एक्सप्लेन करना है। चाहे वह आर्टिकल में बात कही गई हो, चाहे न कही गई हो, लेकिन अगर उसमें एल्यूट किया गया है, मैं यह कहूंगा, मैं यह दरखास्त करूंगा कि मेहरबानी से उस आर्टिकल में अगर मिनिस्टर का नाम भी लिखा है तो यह कहिए और अगर कहिए तो फिर वह जो एतराज कर रहे हैं, उसे सुनिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

الابتها سبون "شري سكوندر بخت"؛ سر-
میں عرض کر رہا تھا یہ کہ ہم صرف ایک منسٹر
کی بات کہیں۔ ایلیو جن تو ہے اور اسٹیل
اسے ایکسپلین کرنا ہے۔ چاہے وہ آرٹیکل
میں بات کہیں لکھا ہو۔ چاہے نہ لکھی ہو
ہو۔ لیکن اگر اس میں ایلیوٹ کیا گیا ہے۔
میں یہ کہوں گا۔ میں یہ درخواست کروں گا کہ
مہربانی سے اس آرٹیکل میں اگر منسٹر کا
نام بھی لکھا ہے تو یہ کہیے اور کہیے تو پھر
وہ جو اعتراض کر رہا ہے اسے سنئے۔

MR. CHAIRMAN: What the Leader of the House is saying is the correct thing. If you are referring to something and if they want it, you should give them proper information.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think I have said enough. This whole issue of bail-out package which has been under discussion in the Government, has given rise to a large

number of suspicions in the minds of the people. Therefore, the country is entitled to know the mechanisms that this Government has evolved or is in the process of evolving to help the steel industry. The steel industry is in difficulty. As a result of these controversies that have appeared in the Press, several steel producers have approached us saying that because of this political controversy, the financial institutions are not taking a decision they ought to have taken. It is not my intention to hurt our industry in any way. If the Government has any plan to help the steel industry, they should implement the plan in a transparent manner consistent with their own profession. What has appeared in these three articles, certainly gives rise to a large number of suspicions. We care for the fair name of governance processes in our country. I believe this is a fit case to be looked into by a Joint Parliamentary Committee. Now I come to another issue.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Who is the 'a Cabinet Minister'? (Interruptions).

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Who is the Minister? The whole House would like to know it. (Interruptions).

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, I now come to yet another ... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: He does not want to say it. (Interruptions).

श्री संजय निरूपम (महाराष्ट्र): चेयरमैन सर, ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI O. RAJGOPAL (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, your question should be answered. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already asked him. (Interruptions). If he has ... (Interruptions).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: After the JPC is constituted, we will summon Shri Pramod Mahajan and then put this question. (Interruptions).

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: आप दिन में सपने देख रहे हो साहब। मैं जेन्टील्सी को बहुत नाम दे चुका हूँ वो आप सबको बुला लेंगे। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री संजय निरूपम: वह मंत्री कौन है, उसका नाम बताएं। ... (व्यवधान)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manmohan Singh, are you yielding?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, I am not yielding. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding. (Interruptions). He is not yielding.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: How can you allow him to make an allegation against a Cabinet Minister; (Interruptions). The whole House would like to know who the Minister is. (Interruptions).

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, unprecedented things are happening in this House. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it there in the newspaper? Is the name there in the newspaper?

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, I have no.... (Interruptions)...

SHRI MD. SALIM: When I speak, I will give the names.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I would like to say that.... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Manmohan Singh, are you yielding?

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Sir, no names have come so far. (Interruptions).

श्री संजय निरूपम: चेयरमैन सर, सब सदस्यों को जानने की इच्छा है कि उस मंत्री का नाम क्या है, वे बताएं अदरबाइज़ अपनी लाइन वापिस लें। ... (व्यवधान) ... नहीं तो अपने सेंटिस को वापिस लें ... (व्यवधान) ... विपक्ष के नेता अपने उस सेंटिस को वापिस लें। ... (व्यवधान) ... चेयरमैन साहब, आपने थोड़ा पूछा है। ... (व्यवधान) ... अपनी बात को वापिस लें। ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, unprecedented things are happening. (Interruptions). The Ministers are intervening. The Members of the ruling party are interrupting. (Interruptions). Actually, they don't want this discussion.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, the Government did not accept our demand for the discussion readily. Once they have been forced to discuss it, they have come well-equipped and well planned to scuttle the discussion. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. (Interruptions).

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I would like to refer to page 818 of Kaul and Shakdher. What are the conditionalities?

4.00 P.M.

It says: "While a Member should be given absolute right to bring to the notice of the House any matter which, on proper investigation, he feels should be ventilated even though it involves the character or reputation of any person, he should, in the interest of the public morality and high parliamentary decorum, inform the Speaker beforehand of his intention to do so and also the Minister concerned. The Minister will then have an opportunity to look into the matter beforehand and to come prepared with a reply also." Sir, this Motion was Tabled and it was brought to the attention of the Government of the day. The notice is implicit, and it was brought to the attention of the Government of the day. What is the text of the Motion? It is to raise a discussion on the issues raised by the former advisor to the Finance Minister and the alleged improprieties arising thereof. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Minister, who is going to reply on behalf of the Government, to go through the alleged improprieties made by the former advisor to the Finance Minister, and to come prepared. And it cannot be raised through piecemeal objections and the speaker cannot be denied of the right to speak about it.

When the Motion was Tabled, it was brought to the notice of the Government. And it is a substantive motion. The Motion is regarding issues raised by Mr. Guruswamy. We are not talking of any matter other than the issues raised by him. He has raised the issues through newspapers. Therefore, the moment the Motion is admitted, all the comments that he has made in the newspapers are approved to be a subject for discussion. And this is within the knowledge of the Government because the Minister got the notice, and the Minister should have come prepared and this type of piecemeal objections cannot be there.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, as he has rightly quoted from page 818, I would request you and also the hon. member, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, to go through page 821. It is very important. let us have patience. We are here to have a thorough debate. In page 821, it is said: "It is not enough for a member merely to give notice to the Speaker in general terms before making allegations in the House. For this, purpose, it is necessary that the member gives adequate advance notice to the Speaker and the Minister concerned..." (Interruptions).

SHRI HANSRAJ BHARDWAJ: No Minister has been named... (Interruptions).

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Please go through the second point. It says: "the details of the charges sought to be levelled are spelt out in precise terms..." (Interruptions).

SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL: That is why you have to name the Minister... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear him... (Interruptions)

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): What is 'a Minister'?

SHRI HANSRAJ BHARDWAJ: 'A Minister' is not a name; it is an adjective... (Interruptions)

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: 'A Minister' is not a name; it is a noun.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, the Government has repeatedly made it clear that it has no objection to having this debate. We have, absolutely, no hesitation even today in discussing this issue threadbare. With great respect to all the Members of the House and, especially, to hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I would just make one point. Sir, you have given your ruling and we are discussing these issues and the allegations raised by Mr. Mohan Guruswamy. This is the starting point. Let them refer to the newspaper articles that he has written or the interviews which he has given. When I reply on behalf of the Government, I will make my point. My only limited request is, let us then not go beyond what he has said, and make innuendoes unless we have the truth. Also, with great respect to the Leader of the Opposition, when he talked about a figure of Rs. 5,000 crores in the steel floor price issue, I ask him, "Does Mr. Guruswamy say this?" (Interruptions) I have the *Indian Express* here. A question was put and the questioner asked: Does it mean a total give-away of close to Rs. 5,000 crores? Mr. Guruswamy, in his reply, has not said a word about this. Now, it is to my mind, an insinuation and innuendo, saying that he has said it. Let us discuss whatever he has said.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Mr. Minister, see the last sentence. ... (Interruptions)... In the last sentence... The Minister has something to do with the State elections also coming at that time. He said that Rs. 5,000 crores were given for State elections.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Mr. Ravi, where does he say about Rs. 5,000 crores? ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I want to make a submission. We are witnessing in this House that submissions are being made by the Leader of the Opposition, and simultaneously stating that he is making no allegations against anyone. If that is the case, when

no allegations are being made, then who is going to answer it? The question is, you very kindly admitted Mohan Guruswamy's publications, whether interview or by records. If that is the only thing that you have admitted, I don't think there is need for any further statement, and the Government must be asked to only comment on what he has said in the papers. Unless they are investigated or prior verification of those things that have come up with their own is done, they have no right to make any innuendo or any allegation whatsoever. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please let me say something. When this issue was raised, I specifically asked the Leader of the Opposition, "Has he gone beyond what Mohan Guruswamy has said?" and he clarified, "I have no allegations to make against any Prime Minister or PMO or any Minister. I am only limiting myself to Mohan Guruswamy's article." So, there are no personal allegations, and the discussion is on his articles which they have made. That is the whole thing. If he goes beyond what he said, then, certainly, he will answer. If there is nothing, then he should be allowed to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, there should be no moral lectures.

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Sir, there should be no more interruptions. He is not yielding. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: आप भी बोलेगे तो हम भी बोलेगे। ...*(व्यवधान)*

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: Sir, ... *(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now it is all right. It is all over now. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is all over now. I have answered the point. I have answered the point that he is not making any allegation on anybody by himself, and he is limiting. If he goes beyond what the article says, then you can question him.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, I was on the subject... ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी: आगे-आगे देखिए होता है क्या। ...*(व्यवधान)*

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: Mr. Chairman, Sir, ... *(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: The police investigated... ...*(Interruptions)*... in the House. This has been referred like this. I would like to make a point on this because this is not proper. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No hon. Member should be referred by any other name in whatever profession he was.

SHRI SHARIEF-UD-DIN SHARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): That is correct, Sir. गलत बोलते हैं, किसी ने शक्तिमान बोला किसी ने कुछ बोला। ...*(व्यवधान)*

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Sir, I was on the subject of the relationship between the Ministry of Finance and the financial institutions. And, it is in that context, I believe that what has appeared in the newspapers needs clarification so that the country can rest assured that our financial institutions are being properly managed. I said in my intervention on the Motion of thanks to the President's Address that our financial system being largely in the nationalised sector, there are immense powers vested in the Finance Ministry. An unscrupulous Finance Minister can convert this economy overnight into a collectivist economy even without passage of any Bill in this Parliament by changing the management, by instructing through the financial institutions in bringing about a change in management of assisted enterprises and other practices. Therefore, for proper governance of our country, it is essential that proper norms should be laid down for the functioning of the financial institutions, the responsibility of the boards of management of those institutions, and the manner and the cases

in which the Finance Minister can intervene in individual cases. Policy guidance is unexceptional, if the Finance Minister feels that in the national interest any policy directive has to be given, the Government is within its right. But, even then, it should be transparent because that is what we all want that the process of governance in this country should be improved. It is in this context that I wish to draw the attention of this House to yet another matter which has been referred to in the articles of the former Advisor to the hon. Finance Minister. It is with regard to the activities of the Unit Trust of India. The Unit Trust of India is a great national institution. Nothing should be said or done which undermines our people's confidence in the integrity and the efficient functioning of this great national institution. Sir, therefore, when I read that the issues of whether a particular entity should buy the shares of the UTI or not, or the prices at which those shares ought to be purchased are discussed in the rooms of the Finance Minister, I smell something is wrong in the Garden of Eden. I feel that the financial institutions must be given the fullest possible functional autonomy. The decision as to what shares the Unit Trust of India is to buy, what shares the other financial institutions trade in and at what prices, these are the decisions which should be taken by the financial institutions on the basis of their own judgement. If the Government, for some reasons known to them in the national interest, wants to intervene, this, once again, should be done in a transparent manner which, I think, in due course of time should be made public. But what has appeared in this article is something which is a total negation of the principles which I believe should guide the conduct of our financial institutions and the relationship between the Finance Minister and the Financial institutions — in this case the Unit Trust of India. I do not wish to indulge in witch-hunting. There was a case; a reference has been made to a particular entity wanting to purchase the shares of another

entity in order to acquire a controlling interest. There were differences of opinion within the Government and the former Advisor had placed some material, some notes, on the file, which have also appeared in the newspapers on this subject matter of discussion of prices of shares, as to what share should be bought and at what prices. That itself, I think, raises doubts in our minds about the style of management of the financial institutions of our country. I do believe that the good name of the Unit Trust of India and the integrity of our financial institutions is beyond doubt. The House has a right to be reassured on this account. This also happens to be a case which I feel is a fit case to be investigated by a Joint Parliamentary Committee.

Sir, in this article references have also been made to certain deals to provide financial assistance to certain other companies which have foreign investment. I do not wish to say anything which would hurt the climate for foreign investment in our country. When the Ruling Party was in Opposition, it raised a lot of bogus issues accusing our Government of doing wrong things. When they came into power in Maharashtra, they gave an affidavit to the High Court that all these things were hearsay. And when the High Court looked into that matter, those allegations were found totally baseless. Now in this article, it has been alleged that a particular foreign investor has been given loans by the financial institutions far above the norms which are applicable to such cases. I must confess that I have not looked into these cases in great detail. But, it is obligatory for the Government to satisfy this House that in this matter too the norms that are applicable are being applied and that nothing wrong has been done or it is being contemplated to be done in this particular case.

In one of the articles, the former Advisor has once again brought out the case of the Tata airlines. He has referred to the suspicious way in which the Tata airlines case was handled in the Ministry

of Civil Aviation. He has mentioned about the different points of view of various wings of the Government; how different wings of the Government combined to scuttle this proposal; and I think, here too, it is necessary that the House ought to know as to what is the truth; we are all interested in knowing nothing but the truth.

Therefore, I conclude by saying that these cases give rise to serious doubts in our minds about the functioning of this Government. They also raise concerns amounting to ethical impropriety and I feel it is proper that all these cases should be looked into by a Joint Parliamentary Committee so that we can, at the end of the day, find out the truth and nothing but the truth. Thank You.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE (Uttar Pradesh) Sir, I am entirely with Dr. Manmohan Singh when he says and makes a good case for a complete transparency. Simply because the issues have been raised in the public domain, it is very necessary, as he rightly said, that all facts should be disclosed in these matters. There is no point ever, for any Government, to take recourse to legalisms or to the Official Secrets Act or anything. With his great knowledge and experience of financial institutions and markets, he has spoken in a restrained way. But, Sir, I was a bit surprised at the circumlocutory manner in which things were said without being said. I will address some of the points that arisen. I will also deal with the question whether Mr. Venkajiah Naidu and others were concerned about. On the one side they are saying, "We are not alleging anything at all." And, on the other side, we are citing rulings that allegations made in newspapers, unless substantiated, should not be the basis of discussion in this House. Both the things have been said simultaneously! I will just take...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Or, in radio broadcast...(Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him speak...(Interruptions)...

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Sir, you have well defined the scope of the debate and there is no point in bringing the issue again and again.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I am not raising the same issue. As you will just see, Mr. Salve, you would not expect me to merely repeat the same issue. The hon. Chairman told us just now that when the motion was brought before him, he asked the hon. Leader of the Opposition, "Are you making any allegations on your own?" And the hon. Chairman reported to the House that he was informed, "No; we are confining ourselves only to what Mr. Mohan Guruswamy has said." Therefore, Sir, let us see what Mohan Guruswamy has said. Sir, Mohan Guruswamy has written two articles—one on February, 22 and the other on March, 11—and has given one interview on February, 23. Just see what he says...

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the paper?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, it is *The Asian Age*. Both articles appeared in *The Asian Age*. The only interview he had given appeared in the *Indian Express* on February, 23. He says, "I have never levelled any charges of corruption."—it is in the second line of the first paragraph. Secondly, a question was raised. It was, "Look here, 'May be, not corruption, but...'—as the Motion says—"...alleged impropriety." The Leader of the Opposition just now used the words 'ethical impropriety'. Just see, what Guruswamy says on that very matter. He says, "If at all there was a suggestion of ethical impropriety" in what he has written..." It was in relation to one matter. "If at all there was a suggestion"—he is himself not sure he has made any suggestion even of impropriety. And to that one matter to which Dr. Manmohan Singh just now alluded, I will come. But first, that is what he is saying. Sir, you look at his interview to the *Indian Express*. He is asked a specific question, "Are you saying Sinha was on the take?" A specific question was put to him. What did he say? said, "Someone else may have been."

I am not charging him with anything."
...(Interruptions)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: What is the next sentence? The next sentence is, "But it was the changing point in our relationship." ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: No, no, excuse me. Not an allegation of corruption. Not an allegation of impropriety. He is on a particular decision, to which I shall just come, which Dr. Manmohan Singh just mentioned—about the BAT and ITC business. Guruswamy is on that decision. The allegation could be, his impression could be, that the Minister was not competent. His inference could be that the Minister was being guided by somebody. He is not saying that. I have recalled for you these three sentences because of the Chairman's observation, because of his reporting to the House that Dr. Manmohan Singh had personally told him that they were not going beyond anything than what Mr. Mohan Guruswamy has said. Well, this is what he had said
...(Interruptions)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: What is this, Sir? ...(Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you yielding?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: No, Sir. He did not yield to me; so, I will not yield to him. It is for the first time that I have done this to Dr. *Sahib* because there are a few persons whom I respect as much I do in his case. He did not yield to me when I wanted to say just one sentence. I will come to that matter later on. Now the first point that Dr. *Sahib* raised was that the first issue that Mohan Guruswamy had raised was that the two leaders of this Government do not pull along. The first issue, he said, is that the BJP's top two don't pull along, and the resultant factionalism has hamstrung the Government. This is the first point which Guruswamy makes, and which was repeated by Dr. Manmohan Singh. Now, just see, what Guruswamy says about this and what kind of evidence he adduces for illustrating this matter, and what is the

consequence of the House going in for these fine distinctions that "I am not making any allegation; I am only repeating what Guruswamy has said. I have not studied the matter it is said in the Press, I am not going beyond that." Now, Mr. Guruswamy says, "We have seen what happened" he is illustrating the discord between Advani and Vajpayee" and the result we have seen in what happened to the abortive attempt to put Bihar under President's rule. The Vajpayee camp is now gleefully citing this as yet another example of Advani's incompetence." Not a word about where this "Vajpayee—Camp" is citing it. Not a word to whom. Not a word on who in the so-called Vajpayee camp is citing it. But on that basis, the man makes a statement and we are told by our friends here, "I must be allowed to discuss it because I am not making the allegation; it is what the former advisor has said." If this is the new norm of evidence for the House, then certainly many of us would like to be informed on that matter.

Secondly, Sir, I will give you one instance, my personal instance. I think it is proper for me to disclose that I have known Mohan for many years. It so happened that on this very matter, he was abroad when this controversy broke. The Government announced that he has been sacked. His letter was faxed from a particular office to all newspapers. Many newspapers will tell you from whose office it was faxed. That apart, it so happened that the moment Guruswamy landed in India he telephoned me and came to see me for two hours, going over much of this. He told me that I was one of the two persons to whom he wanted to disclose the complete facts. Now, I will confine myself to what he has said in print, not what he told in private. Anyhow, Sir, he spent two hours talking with me. Let us assume that, tomorrow, he writes an article in which he says that I concurred, by my silence, on some particular point or that I said this or that. That may not be true. But somebody

here in the House says we are not going beyond the newspapers. How unfair it would be, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: There have been precedents in both the Houses; for example, merely on the basis of a broadcast, an enquiry was conducted by C.B.I. Where was your wisdom those days? Where has your wisdom gone now? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you yielding, Mr. Shourie?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you are not yielding, then, he cannot speak. Nothing will go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am least bothered whether it will go on record or not. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: But, that is not. You have a right to reply. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: When Chairman said that nothing will go on record, he is saying that he is least bothered about it. They do not respect anybody, neither the Chairman, nor the rules. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Please listen to the Chair. Both of us are bound by what the Chair says. We should hear what the Chair says. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री संजय निरूपमः चेयर का अपमान किया गया है। ...*(व्यवधान)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand what you are saying. You are hurt by his remarks on the Chair. But the Chair should be gracious enough to forgive him.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA (West Bengal): Mr. Arun Shourie, can I speak for two minutes?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: No, Sir, please excuse me today. All of you have been saying that you are anxious to hear the facts on this particular matter. So, I

am going to deal with them. Please do not interrupt. Since you beseech others often, I beseech you. Sir, I was saying, see the unfairness of the matter, when an edifice is built up saying, "I am not going beyond the papers". Actually they are going beyond the papers. In the papers, Guruswamy names one Minister, by name. That is generalised to "a Minister"—that may pertain to any Minister. Is that not a generalisation and going beyond what Guruswamy has said? ...*(Interruptions)*... Please listen to what Guruswamy has said. "The Mittal Salvage operation has begun. Soon enough, another favourite of the Prime Minister—Pramod Mahajan—arrives in my office a few days later, with P.K. Mittal, in tow." That is what Guruswamy wrote. I am bringing it on record because, taking shelter under the Chairman's remarks that 'I have not seen the article', Dr. Manmohan Singh used that as an opportunity to generalise the allegation, and when the Minister tries to say something specific, they rule it out of court. That is not quite the way it should be done. ...*(Interruptions)*

I have no hesitation in mentioning the names. Look at the third issue which has arisen and see how dangerous these things are. You always talk about civil servants. Dr. Saheb has dealt with them. He has protected them. But see what he is relying on today. He talks about the appointment of a new Finance Secretary. It so happens in this matter also that I have known the previous Finance Secretary for 30 years. I have known the present finance secretary for 25 years. They are men of the highest competence of unimpeachable integrity. But, see what allegation is made, what evidence is provided and what is sought to be done to the veracity and confidence of the financial institutions about which Dr. Manmohan Singh was so ostentatiously so concerned. Guruswamy says:

"He does not deny ..."

That means Yashwant Sinha does not deny.

"... that it was this coterie ..."

It is an unnamed coterie around the Prime Minister.

"He does not deny that it was this coterie that reversed the decision to appoint the choice of bureaucrats as Finance Secretary. I would like to add here that contrary to the general perception that it was a leading Mumbai industrial house that was behind this, it was a prominent Mumbai banker who played a pivotal role in this."

Now, how many prominent bankers are there in Bombay? Guruswamy names no one. He makes the new Finance Secretary a creature of unnamed prominence.

SHRI MD. SALIM: With proper connections in Delhi.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: By relying on such stuff you have sullied the office of the Finance Secretary. Not only that. It is this kind of allegation, on the basis of which all these issues are being raised, that will destroy the confidence of those institutions in the very instrument through which the Government must deal with them—that is, the Finance Secretary. Having done that, you suddenly say, "No, no, no, I do not want to hurt the confidence of the financial institutions. I am not going beyond the paper." But just see what the paper is saying. Let me also tell you how Guruswamy goes on in this matter. Is this the issue with which you are so concerned? He says:

"This Mumbai banker has close ties to the adopted son-in-law. Not just that. He has equally close ties with the previous regime and today's main Opposition party. After all, he picks up rent for a prominent Congress official's house in an up-market South Delhi locality."

Is this the issue with which you are so concerned? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI JITENDRA PRASADA (Uttar Pradesh): We support you on what you

are saying. The only thing we are demanding is that there should be a JPC, and we can go into all these things. Why don't you all agree to it?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, just see the next point he makes, the next grave issue he raises. ...*(Interruptions)*

The next point he raises is:

"The major point I had made in my resignation letter was that I felt that there was little difference between a BJP-led Government and a Congress Government in the way that they conducted themselves." Is this the issue? Is this the impropriety?

SHRI HANSRAJ BHARDWAJ: He must be a Communist.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Look at the third issue that he raises. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, let him complete. Kindly hear him.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The third issue he raises—and it was touched upon by the Leader of the Opposition—is that, because of the coterie around the Prime Minister, decisions are being interfered with. And what is the example that he gives? He says that now the PMO and the new Minister of Finance no longer care a whit about the concerns voiced by the BJP on the plight of the domestic non-banking finance companies. In this very House,—Mr. Sinha will remember,—many Members were agitated, not about the plight of the non-banking finance companies, but about the plight these companies had inflicted upon the depositors. Now, he wants the Prime Minister to be concerned about the plight of the non-banking finance companies! As you know, Sir, it has been brought on record that 30,000 non-banking finance companies have disappeared with over Rs. 40,000 crores of 25 lakh small depositors. Now, what is Guruswamy's allegation, beyond which the leader of the Opposition is not going? It is that, because of the coterie around the Prime Minister and crony capitalism, the Prime

Minister is no longer concerned about protecting those looters. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The next issue which Dr. Sahib mentioned by name was the manner—I am using the exact words—in which the Tata-Singapore Airlines project, as he put it,—was scuttled. Just see the sequence Mr. Guruswamy narrates. He says how necessary the Tata-Singapore Airlines project would have been to India.

Sir, I was a new Member of this House in last July-August. On August 11 last year,—it was the last day of that session—I was really puzzled. We sat in the House till 8 p.m. or 9 p.m. because some voting was going on. Some innocuous question came up on the Civil Aviation Ministry. The Minister replied to that. One Member after the other—if you want me to recall some names, I can—Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan, Mr. Amar Singh, Mr. Balwant Singh Ramoowalia, Mr. C.M. Ibrahim, a former Aviation Minister, Mr. Ghulam Nabi Azad, a former Aviation Minister and many others—started saying that if Tatas are allowed to come in, then the Indian Airlines will be hurt. I was really puzzled why they were saying so. Would it not be hurt by Jet Airways' expansion plans being approved?

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA (Uttar Pradesh): These are half truths.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I was surprised. Now that is exactly what Mr. Guruswamy says. How is it that the expansion of Jet Airways will not hurt Indian Airlines, but Tatas' coming in will hurt Indian Airlines? This particular thing was in my mind then. Everybody was pleading for Jet Airways, but you know, Sir, that particular Airlines ownership is unknown. It is registered in the Isle of Man. It is owned...

SHRI MD. SALIM: They had a proper connection with the people in the Ministry and the PMO. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Now the interesting point is: Does that mean that everybody who was speaking in this House, every Member who was speaking in this House against the Tata Airlines project was doing so for a collateral reason? On that reasoning. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Please sit down.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: What was Mr. Guruswamy's explanation for that? Actually, I know a little bit more on this matter. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will disclose it. This proposal was first mooted when Mr. Narasimha Rao was on a visit to Singapore. At that time, Dr. Manmohan Singh was with him and the project came up.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): I never accompanied Mr. Narasimha Rao on any visit. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The fact of the matter is that it came up, at that time. I have heard it. In any case where the meeting took place is immaterial to my argument. I withdraw that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has withdrawn it.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Now, I come to Mr. Guruswamy. That project came up during Mr. Narasimha Rao's time and since that time it was not allowed to proceed. If you want to see what is behind it, if you really want the explanation, in fact, is why Tata's proposal has got nowhere, you have to go back to 1995 and trace things from thereon. To put this thing to some scuttling now is to mislead the inquiry because the scuttling has been going for a much longer time. From 1995, this thing has been going on. "We are not going beyond Mr. Guruswamy's allegations." He narrates the history and says, "it has been scuttled. The Prime Minister played a duplicitious role all through." That as usual, with no proof.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar): Are you arguing for us? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I will be coming to what Mr. Kapil Sibal said regarding allegations just in the last session. I will come to that. Guruswamy says, "The Prime Minister played a duplicitous role all through. He would tell his colleagues who were in favour of the Tata proposal that he too was in favour of it. On the other hand, his closest advisors would do everything in their power to stall it." No proof. What is the proof he offers? One sentence: "Who did what, and at whose behest, is well known." That is the one-line proof! And You say, you don't want to go beyond these allegations.

The fourth point which was raised was ...*(Interruptions)*... There is a proverb that the hardest mystery to solve is one which is not there.

श्री खान गुफ्रान जाहिदी (उत्तर प्रदेश): महान साहब की तरफ आप मत देखिए।

श्री अरूण शौरी: एक-अली मैं यह चश्मा उतार लूँ तो शायद दिख भी जाए। मैं तो आगे देख रहा था सोमपाल जी की तरफ।

Now, on this matter, as you see, on the one side, Guruswamy says, "The Prime Minister is clever enough to play a very duplicitous role throughout. Who did what and at whose behest is well known." That is the only proof.

After that he says, in the very next paragraph, "Who puts these words in his mouth is not clear." He says, "whether the Prime Minister knows what he is talking about on substantive issues like this."

You are saying that you are relying only on him. I am telling you how solid is that authority, I am giving illustrations how solid is the authority on which you are relying! The next sentence is—he has a particular affection for the Prime Minister, as you will see—"We recently saw the fiery consequences in Orissa"—in the murder of Staines—"of another great Vajpayee initiative." Is there a casual

connection which has been established between some statement of Vajpayee and the murder of Staines? But that is what you are relying on! That is your great authority!

SHRI HANS RAJ BHARDWAJ: Sir, I am on a point of order. What Mr. Naidu has made is a very serious allegation. Mr. Shourie is now levelling the charge. *(Interruptions)*. None was referred to by the Leader of the Opposition on this item. This is a very serious allegation and he is making it. Either he should withdraw it....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not at all. They are referring to the paper. He is also referring to the paper. That is all.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: All the allegation can be removed from the records. Finished. Okay? *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Let him speak.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Just see this great authority they are relying on, and the causal connection he establishes just by putting three words together. Next sentence. "His bus drive from Amritsar to Lahore is another typical instance to illustrate the aptitude of this Prime Minister for grand standing rather than for serious hard work." Is that the assessment of the House of the initiative in regard to Pakistan? I do not think that was the assessment of anyone in this House. Just the other day, members from all sides were complimenting him for the initiative he has taken. But this is the authority on which you rely! And you say, "I am not going beyond this." Next sentence. "Meanwhile, it is business as usual in Kashmir for Pakistan's ISI." Is it "business as usual"—when the number of killings has come down, with all the indices which have been given in the House? As I told you, Guruswamy has not made any allegation of corruption, of ethical impropriety, which the Leader of the Opposition was pleased to mention. "If at all, there was a suggestion..." not even a charge; not even that "there was";

Guruswamy's words are, "if at all there was any suggestion of an ethical impropriety in his writing. I had referred to the curious manner in which the steel prices, etc. were fixed...(Interruptions).

PROF. (SHRIMATI) BHARATI RAY (West Bengal): Sir, the hon. Member is plying with the words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding. Please let him speak.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: It just so happened on this very matter to which Dr. Saheb just now drew attention—hot-rolled steel coils—just three days ago, there was a lengthy discussion during the Question Hour. Sir, you were presiding, Mr. Naveen Patnaik, the Minister concerned, was faced with questions, on this very point—price fixation of hot-rolled steel coils. It had gone on for 25 minutes. Everyone seemed fully satisfied. (Interruptions). That is the impression I got. Nobody after that expressed any reservation on any particular point Mr. Patnaik had made. Yet, "5000 crores loss", we are told by the leader of the opposition. As was just now pointed out by Mr. Yashwant Sinha, I really did not expect this. I sincerely tell you, I was pained that the allegation which Guruswamy had not made, was put in his mouth. While they are saying, while the claim is, that nothing has been said beyond what Guruswamy has alleged a figure of Rs. 5000 crores having been lost to the country was put in his mouth when that is clearly in bold type, a part of the question addressed to him by the 'Indian Express'. Not only that, Sir, consider what has been made of the next allegation—in the matter of this BAT and ITC. The Minister, I am sure, should and will, and he must, disclose the full details in this matter, whether foreign investment is hurt or not. Allegations which are not refuted will hurt foreign investment much more. So, I am sure that he will disclose the details. But Sir, I just want to say one thing. I would like to

refer to the letter to which Mr. Guruswamy has referred and which should be of some shock to this House. He has not just said that Ministers and so on were doing something on ITC. He has said: "Since a large group of M.Ps were reported to have signed a petition, addressed to the PM, demanding that the Unit Trust of India be allowed to sell its holding in ITC to BAT—I do not know now many MPs have signed the petition—(Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Can you read out the letter? (Interruptions)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: When they are saying that they are not going beyond Guruswamy's articles, I am also not going beyond the articles. He has said: "Since a large group of MPs were reported to have signed a petition, addressed to the PM, demanding that the Unit Trust of India be allowed to sell its holding in ITC to the foreign company, BAT." Does it mean that all those MPs were on the take and that they put forward that proposed for collateral purposes? That is exactly the implication. If somebody takes a different view on this selling or buying of any particular thing, how can we infer a collateral reason from that? Now, this is compounded in the matter. He has further said: "I recommended that the price at which the UTI should sell the shares, should be 30 per cent or 40 per cent higher than the prevailing market price." Since this recommendation was not accepted—it has actually been brought on record that there was no such proposal. But supposing, there was a proposal, and on Guruswamy's saying, a price which was 30 to 40 per cent more than the prevailing price should have been asked from BAT. What would have happened? The Higher price was not sought because there was no proposal. But because it was not sought, Guruswamy alleges that the country has lost Rs. 8,000 crores. Supposing, he had given a recommendation that it should be sold not at 30 to 40 per cent higher than the prevailing price, but at 50 to 60 per cent more than the

prevailing price, the country would have lost Rs. 10,000 crores.

"आप ही पीवे, अच पिलावे, आप फिरे मतवाला"। ऐसे ऐविडेंस पर आप चलोगे? इसलिए मेरे 3 सुझाव हैं आपके लिए।

First, I want to remind the House of what happened in the last session. Mr. Swaraj Kaushal is also present. In the *Asian Age* sometime ago there was a seven-column story in exactly the same position as Mr. Guruswamy's article was. It appeared on page one, stating as a fact that that man, who has been arrested, Romesh Sharma, had named his connections with several Members, including Members of this House. Mr. Kaushal was very agitated on that day. I think, Mr. Ghulam Nabi Azad and Mr. Jitendra Prasad were also very agitated on that day. What did Mr. Kapil Sibal say and do? He filed a privilege motion against that paper, and he made a very persuasive point. Whether the thing was true or not, no document had been produced. Maybe, the paper was right. May be it was wrong. But speaking on behalf of other Members, Mr. Kapil Sibal said: "We cannot go by unsupported allegations like this." But, what is being done now? Not only that. I would strongly say that what is happening is a curious phenomenon. During the bank scam, Mr. Harshad Mehta, Mr. Hiten Dalal and a large number of other people, who had defrauded the country...*(Interruptions)*.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: आर्टिकल में नहीं है ये।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Md. Salim, you will also get a chance to speak. Let him complete his speech.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, that is why I am pointing it out. This will help me in expanding my arguments.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: What was happening at that time? Anything Mehta, Dalal etc. said would then become the basis for caluminising others. You are mortgaging Indian public life to persons who actually are the ones who have been

caught, and they make allegations as in Romesh Sharma's case. Even in that case, it is not clear that he had made the allegations. That is Mr. Kapil's point. But, the newspaper alleges that he has alleged, "I know Arun Shourie." Guruswamy is at least my acquaintance, he comes and says, "Arun Shourie, on such and such day, when I came back from America, he told me that 'X' is making money." And you insist on a JPC on that basis. Every allegation made by somebody who is in the dock becomes the basis for taking the time of the House and caluminising others. In fact, Dr. Manmohan Singh did go beyond what Guruswamy says, giving the figures of 5,000 crores, and so on. I think that is a very dangerous thing that we are doing, and, as I have shown you, there is not an iota of evidence. In fact, the allegations are so sweeping, so wild, so full of literary flourishes. They are not the basis on which to build a case. They are the writings of, if I may say so, a budding columnist!...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: You are not a budding columnist.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I am more than a budding columnist.

Sir, my earnest request is this. If you have good evidence, please bring it forward and, then, put forward the demand for a JPC or a Court of Inquiry or a Commission of Inquiry. In every case, please put the persons who make the allegation and the calumners to strict proof. That will be good for the Press—we must introduce some discipline in the Press also. It will certainly be good for the dignity of the House, and it is an invaluable pre-requisite for saving our public life. Therefore, Sir, I strongly oppose this Motion—based, as it is, on nothing but this kind of allegation and innuendo. I strongly hope that the House will not proceed with it. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, I think there could not have been another opportunity

to discuss these happenings—and according to Mr. Guruswamy, why what has been happening is happening during the last few months or a year—on the eve of the first anniversary of this eventful Government.

अरुण शौरी जी ने ट्रांसपिरेसी की बात कही और उन्होंने इस मामले के बारे में ऐसा कहा जैसे ऐटरनल टुथ। दिकत की बात यह है कि अभी तक इस मुल्क को पता नहीं चला कि जो फॉर्मर एडवाइजर थे—मोहन गुरुस्वामी जिनके उठाए गए मुद्दों के बारे में हम यहां बहस कर रहे हैं तो वे रिजाइन किए या बर्खास्त हुए। अब ट्रांसपिरेसी की जो लोग बात कर रहे हैं मैं पहले उनके लिए कह रहा हूँ अपनी बात तो मैं बाद में कहूंगा। मेरे पास उस रेजिग्रेशन लैटर की कॉपी है जिसे उन्होंने 27 तारीख को अपने मंत्री महोदय के पास भेजा। वह टर्मिनेशन लैटर भी है जिसमें 3 फरवरी की तारीख है। सबसे बड़ा मुद्दा तो पहले यह है कि इन्हें एपोइंट किया ही क्यों गया था। पूरे देश के लोग और हम सदस्य भी यह पूछ रहे हैं। आज आप उन्हें डिनाउंस कर रहे हैं। आपका अधिकार है क्योंकि अब ये आपके काम में नहीं आ रहे हैं। आपके साथ कुछ सवालता हुए हैं। लेकिन आपने जब अपोइंट किया था—इट वाज ए पॉलिटिकल अपोइंटमेंट। यू हैव टू ओन हिम अप। उन्होंने अगर अच्छा भी किया तो आप जाने बुरा भी किया तो यह आपकी जिम्मेदारी है क्योंकि पार्लियामेन्ट्री फॉर्म आफ डेमोक्रेसी है। यह गड़बड़ी तो एकदम इस सरकार की शुरुआत से है। आप एडवाइजर को तो छोड़ ही दीजिए जब पहले फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर अपोइंट हुए। 5.00 P.M.

साल की शुरुआत इस तरह से हुई। लोगों ने टेलीविजन पर देखा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने ओथ लेकर यह कहा। सब लोग यह पूछ रहे थे कि वित्त मंत्री कौन होगा? नागपुर से होगा, बम्बई से होगा, जयपुर से होगा या दिल्ली से होगा? वित्त मंत्री कौन होगा? पहला शब्द प्रधान मंत्री जी ने पूरे राष्ट्र को यह कहा, कि मैं खुद, क्योंकि उनकी जो फर्स्ट चाइस थी, उनको कोई एपाइंट वे नहीं कर सकते थे और फिर उस रोज बाद में यह मालूम हुआ कि जसवंत सिंह नहीं यशवन्त सिन्हा वित्त मंत्री होंगे। आज गुरुस्वामी कहते हैं कि इस देश को एक साल के लिए..... मेरी पूरी सिमैथी है, यशवन्त सिन्हा जी हमारे पुण्ये बुजुर्ग साथी हैं।(व्यवधान).... सवाल यह है कि अभी गुरुस्वामी, उनके एडवाइजर यह कह रहे हैं कि हमें थर्ड चाइंस मिली इस देश का वित्त मंत्रालय संभालने के लिए(व्यवधान)....

श्री यशवन्त सिन्हा: थर्ड ग्रेड।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: मैं वह नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मैं आर्टिकल के अंदर से बोल रहा हूँ।थर्ड ग्रेड, मैं कहना नहीं चाह रहा था। मैं मानता हूँ आप थर्ड ग्रेड नहीं हैं। उनके पास और खराब ग्रेड वाले लोग भी हैं। खैर, यह हंसी-मजाक की बात नहीं है लेकिन मेरी पूरी सिमैथी है आपके साथ। तो पहला सवाल आया कि आपने एपाइंटमेंट क्यों किया? और आज जब आप कह रहे हैं कि...

He went beyond the brief. What was the brief?

आपने जब एपाइंटमेंट किया तो आप कैसे-कैसे एपाइंटमेंट करते हैं? उनके आर्टिकल से मैं कह रहा हूँ। आपका प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी कौन होगा? पिछले वाला? आपने नहीं, उन्हें आर० एस० एस० चीफ ने सलेक्ट किया था। I am quoting from the article. हम आर्टिकल के बाहर नहीं जाएंगे। पिछले वाला प्राइवेट सेक्रेटरी आर० एस० एस० चीफ....(व्यवधान)...

श्रीमती मालती शर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): माननीय सभापति जी, मैं एक बात कहना चाहती हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you yielding?

SHRI MD. SALIM: No, I am not yielding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding. (Interruptions). He is not yielding. (Interruptions).

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: इस आर्टिकल में जो भी है, हम कह सकते हैं।(व्यवधान).... आपको थोड़ा समय मिले तो पढ़ लीजिएगा। अभी आप ट्रांसपिरेसी की बात कर रहे थे। तो 27 तारीख को उन्होंने खत दिया। 3 तारीख को पूरे देश के लोगों को मालूम हुआ, वे सैक हुए। 22 तारीख को पार्लियामेंट बैठी और 23 तारीख को उनका आर्टिकल निकला पहला। उससे पहले तो आपको ट्रांसपिरेसी की कोई बात याद नहीं आई। वित्त मंत्रालय, प्रधान मंत्री के दफ्तर रोजाना प्रेस कॉन्फ्रेंस करके देश की जनता को बताते हैं हर ईश्वर के बारे में तो एक फॉर्मर एडवाइजर ने अगर कुछ प्वाइंटस उठाए हैं, इतने महत्वपूर्ण हैं अरुण शौरी जी कह रहे हैं तो एक भी शब्द आपने नहीं कहा जब तक कि यह मामला पार्लियामेंट में नहीं आया? जब तक कि हमने आपको बाध्य नहीं किया कि ट्रांसपिरेसी क्या होती है और फिर आप यह कह कर वकालत कर रहे हैं कि ट्रांसपिरेसी इसे कहते हैं? फिर हम यह सब किसलिए कह रहे हैं? यह

इसलिए नहीं कि जो आर्टिकल लिखे गए हैं फिर, से उनका पटन हो, सामूहिक पाठ हो बल्कि इसलिए कि उन्होंने जो प्वाइंट उठाए हैं, ईश्यूज उठाए हैं.... that is concerning the whole nation; our interest, our economy and our future. उनके लैटर और आर्टिकल में "Who's who of the MNCs" is in the Swadeshi cupboard. सबके नाम हैं, मैं पढ़ दूँ? सेकेंड पैरा में ही है लेकिन उससे पहले मैं सवाल के बारे में कह रहा हूँ। वे क्या कहते हैं? क्यों रिज़ाइन किया? मैं बी० जे० पी० के अपने दोस्तों के लिए कह रहा हूँ।

"I have been very perturbed by the distressing sequence of events of the last few weeks. These together make me feel that we are no longer to advance our agenda as stated in the election manifesto." अक्सर अपोज़िशन यह चार्ज करती है। इलेक्शन मैनिफेस्टो... वह तो आप खो चुके हैं। "We seem to have allowed the system and the process to overwhelm our concerns."

ओपनिंग पैराग्राफ है। सर, अगर आप इजाज़त दें तो "बिज़नेस स्टैंडर्ड" में पिछले साल 30 जुलाई को जब उन्हें एपाइंट किया गया था, उन्होंने कहा। मैं सरकार से पूछ रहा हूँ कि आपने क्यों एपाइंट किया? लेकिन उनसे यह सवाल पूछा गया था कि आप क्यों एपाइंट हुए? आपने जिम्मेदारी क्यों संभाली? तो उनका कहना था कि "I am a Member of the party and worked for developing the party's agenda which has been spelt-out in the manifesto. Since I was one of the original authors of the programme, I repeat, original authors of the programme, the Leader said that I should get involved in the implementation of the agenda also. Hence, I was asked to assist the Finance Minister in implementing the agenda."

"The chief agent for implementing the agenda is going to be the Finance Minister. I am only going to assist on a day-to-day basis."

जो वे कहते हैं। मैं उनको लेटेस्ट कवर दे रहा हूँ। वे कहते हैं कि:

He was overtaken by others.

मैं अपने कुलीम से कह रहा हूँ। आपने इतना परिवर्तन चाहा, मगर नतीजा क्या हुआ।

"The major point which I have made in my resignation letter was that I felt that there was little difference between a BJP-led Government and a Congress Government in the manner in which they conducted themselves."

आगे है कि:

"A change in regime only meant more of the same. The following cases only illustrate this."

उसके बाद उन्होंने एक लिस्ट दी है। होल आर्ग्यूमेंट्स यह है आपस में कोई झगड़ा नहीं है, बी० जे० पी० के सदस्यों का कोई झगड़ा नहीं है। आप रिज़ाइन का सवाल अपने दिमाग में दूँड रहे हैं लेकिन उसको बता नहीं पा रहे हैं और यह भी आपके फार्मर मेंबर हैं। यह तो टिप्स आप दि आइस वर्ग है। मैं मोहन गुरुस्वामी को गुरु नहीं मानता। मैं स्वामियों पर विश्वास नहीं करता हूँ। लेकिन जिस चीज को आपने दस साल से, बीस साल से प्रीच किया, वह एक साल हुकूमत में आने के बाद इस तरह से खो गया।

सेकेंड पैरा में एनरन, कैपिटल मार्केट रिफार्म, सुजुकी, ब्रिटिश अमेरिकन टुबको कंपनी, आई० टी० सी० और पब्लिक सेक्टर डिस इन्वेस्टमेंट हैं। हमने नोटिस दिया था। कभी-कभी ऐसी बातों पर हाउस एडजर्न हो जाता है कि कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर नहीं है। यह एक लिस्ट है। इस समय इस तमाम मिनिस्ट्री के मंत्री महोदयगण भी बिना नोटिस के आए हुए हैं। इसके लिए मैं उनको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। स्टील, सीमेंट, एग्रीकल्चर, कम्युनिकेशन, पावर, मैं इन्हें यहां देखकर नहीं बोल रहा हूँ, यह मैं उनके लेटर से बोल रहा हूँ जो-जो डिपार्टमेंट इन्वाल्व है। पावर है और फिर डिफेंस सेक्टर है। एग्रीकल्चर है, मैं इसमें सोमपाल जी को नहीं छोड़ सकता। हेल्थ, इरीगेशन, एनर्जेशन यह सेकेंड पैरा में है। शार्ट ड्यूरेशन ले आए इसलिए नहीं कि मैं खड़े होकर कह रहा हूँ, चार्ज लगा रहा हूँ और आप डिस्पोज आफ कर देंगे। यह बहुत पुरानी कहानी है कि मैं या मेरे परिवार का कोई सदस्य कुछ दे दिया इसलिए छोड़ देते हैं। ऐसा नहीं हो सकता, यह इतना आसान नहीं है।

....(व्यवधान)....

पहला सवाल मेरा यह है Shri Mohan Guruswamy, who had been appointed as Adviser to the Finance

Minister...(Interruptions)... मैं पार्लियामेंटरी एफियर्स मिनिस्टर से शुरू करूँ वह नजदीक है। उन्होंने, जिस दिन हंगामा हुआ कि यह डिसकशन होना चाहिए, सरकार की उदारता दिखाते हुए प्रेस कॉन्फ्रेंस में उन्होंने कहा कि यह सब हम लोगों को किस तरह से मिनिमाइज किया जा सकता है उसके लिए किया जा रहा है।....(व्यवधान)

He owes an explanation to the nation.

सिर्फ यह नहीं कि क्यों एप्वाइंट किया, किस हैसियत से अप्वाइंट किया और उनके जाने के बाद शुल्का और भी बढ़ गया। अप्वाइंट किया बहुत उम्मीद के साथ यह कुछ करेंगे और एक ऐसा राष्ट्र बनायेंगे जिसकी मिसाल होगी। बाद में जो सवालात आए ईमानदारी के साथ 4 को, 5 को, 6 को, जैसे ही इस का नोटिस आया तो उसी वक़्त उन्हें पूरे देश को बता देना चाहिए था। अगर यह बकवास थी तो बकवास बताना चाहिए था। बेसलेस है तो बेसलेस, प्वाइंट टु प्वाइंट ऑप्शन भी वह दे सकते थे। लेकिन मैं यशवंत सिन्हा जी से यह एक्सप्लेनेशन नहीं मांग रहा हूँ उन्होंने बहुत से भाषण दिए हैं जिन्हें मैं कट कर सकता हूँ जिसमें है कि हुकूमत की जिम्मेदारी पार्लियामेंट के प्रति क्या है और मंत्री की जिम्मेदारी क्या होती है। मैंने यह पढ़ा है और मैंने आपसे यह सीखा है लेकिन यहां दिक्कत यह आ गई है, उनका पहला चार्ज यह है, अरुण शौरी जी के खिलाफ भी हमारा वही चार्ज है। वह यह कह रहे थे— "He is clearly preparing to skirt the issues and focus on something....." यह यशवंत सिन्हा जी के लिए लिख रहे हैं, फिर सब्सक्रिब्ड आर्टिकल में जो 11 मार्च के "एशियन एज" का है— I have only peripherally touched upon. That is exactly what Shri Arun Shourie has done. लाहौर की बस यात्रा के बारे में भी कहा लेकिन जो बेसिक इश्यू उठाए उन्होंने उन्हें टच नहीं किया। हां, मैं पढ़ रहा हूँ— I have only peripherally touched upon. He is trying to get away from the thrust of my contentions. वह तो पहले आप पढ़ चुके हैं, आप हमारा आधा काम कर चुके हैं, वह पेरिफेरियल था, जो मेन है, वह हम लोग पढ़ते हैं। अगर आप कहें तो उसे भी पीपीट कर सकता हूँ। यहां वैकैया नायडू जी बैठे हुए हैं। अगर मैं कोई चार्ज लगाऊँ तो वे भी खड़े हो जाएंगे। मैंने कोई चार्ज नहीं लगाया है। मैं तो केवल यह कह रहा हूँ ..(व्यवधान) ठीक है। (व्यवधान) गुरुस्वामी, गुरुमूर्ति का कहना है (व्यवधान) पता नहीं कितने गुरु

हैं, उनके आर्टिकल में गुरुमूर्ति का भी नाम आया है, उनके एनॉन वाले आर्टिकल के मामले में ..(व्यवधान)

श्री संजय निरूपम: आप सारे लोग गुरु है ..(व्यवधान)

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: आपको इतने गुरुओं की जरूरत नहीं होती है, आपको एक ही गुरु काफी है मुंबई में। इतने ज्यादा गुरु होने से हालत खराब हो जाती है। The second point is, there is a coterie around Shri Vajpayee headed by his adopted son-in-law which meddles with matters involving governance. इस देश में 50 साल की जम्हूरियत में हमेशा पूरे देश के लोग उठ कर खड़े हो गये हैं जब भी एक्सट्रा कांस्टीट्यूशनल पावर सेंटर खड़ा हुआ। हमारे यहां कांस्टीट्यूशन में प्राइम मिनिस्टर है, प्राइम मिनिस्टर आफिस नहीं है। आज तो पी० एम० ओ० में पी० एम० एच०, प्राइम मिनिस्टर हाऊस है और फिर उनके पीछे इन-लाज़ हैं— I would like to know whether this country will be governed by laws or by in-laws.

कांस्टीट्यूशन में, दस्तर में, किसी कानून में, पार्लियामेंट के एक्ट में यह इजाज़त नहीं है, किसी को भी नहीं है कि The Government will be run and the business will be conducted by in-laws.

इतने स्पाइनलेस लोग हैं, उनकी कथनी और कली में फर्क है। (व्यवधान) आप मानिये इन-लाज़ के बारे में, कोटेरी के बारे में(व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Salim, why are you listening to them. Kindly speak. (Interruptions).

SHRI DIPANKER MUKHERJEE: Sir, what is happening in the House. Even the Ministers are intervening.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: अब तक मैंने जो कुछ कहा है, दोनों के लिए कहा है। (व्यवधान) स्पेसिफिक कहा है। तो इन-लाज़ के बारे में और ज्यादा सुनना है? यह मैं नहीं कहा रहा हूँ, गुरुमूर्ति के कहने के मुताबिक यशवंत सिन्हा जी* है। मोहन गुरु स्वामी कहिये, चलिए मोहन अच्छा है, तो मैं मोहन जी के कहने के मुताबिक बिऑड यू और जो पावरफुल लोग बैठे हुए हैं— Jet set people belonging to this coterie, whether they are Ministers or they are not Ministers, the way they were appointed (Interruptions).

आपने शुरू से ही प्रेसीडेंट चालू किये। सरकार के आने के बाद हमारा यह पहला क्वेश्चन था और यहां पर प्रणव मुखर्जी जी ने सवाल उठाया था कि आपने एडवाइजर को क्यों ओथ दिया है। जवाब यह था कि अगर यह पहले नहीं हुआ था तो ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है, हम नहीं शुरूआत कर रहे हैं।

प्रो० रामदास सिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): आपने उनको अभी* कहा, आपको अनुभव है इनके* होने का?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why are you responding to them. You go on speaking. Don't respond.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, I want them to participate in the Discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It should not be done in this way. You go on speaking.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, I am encouraging them. यही तो शिकायत है फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर के साथ उनके एडवाइजर का कि जिस वक्त उनको बोलना चाहिए था फैसला लेते वक्त हिम्मत करनी चाहिए थी, फोन पर आदेश दे प्राइम मिनिस्टर के ऑफिस से, प्राइम मिनिस्टर हाउस से जब उनके एडवाइजर आते हैं, जब दूसरे लोग आते हैं तो हां और ना में फैसला, जो आपने जिन्दगी भर सीखा जिसके लिए आप बूट करते हैं तो आज यह नौबत में नहीं आना पड़ता। फैसला और कर रहे हैं एकदम 'कंस्टीट्यूशनल बोर्ड' और आपको उनका शिकार होना पड़ रहा है। इसलिए मैं यह कहा रहा हूं कि अब भी वक्त है, बोल कि अब भी सब आजाद है तब... (व्यवधान) पर वह जो आडवाणी जी और वाजपेयी जी के अन्दर झगड़े वाला मामला है उससे मैं किनारा कर रहा हूं। वह पार्टी का इंटर्नल मैटर है, उसे आप इंटर्नली फिक्स कर लेते, यह अच्छा रहेगा... (व्यवधान) वह अनपेक्षित प्रोसेस इन गोइंग आन् (व्यवधान) वह भी है, गुरू खामी जी के ऑर्टिकल में है वह पहला सवाल है, मैं उसे टच नहीं करता। अभी जो यहां पर हमारा सवाल यह है कि एक तो शेयर के मामले में फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर के साथ जो मामला उठाया है... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been brought to my notice that the use of the word* is unparliamentary.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: ओके०। सर, शेयर के मामले में स्वदेशी सरकार आई विदेशी कंपनी वह भी आई०टी०सी० जैसे ही है, लेकिन देश के अंदर एक अच्छी मैनेज कम्पनी थी उसके अंदर बहुत से टूटलन बहुत सी गड़बड़ पहले भी थी, लेकिन उसके ओनरशिप ट्रांसफर को मामला है। बहाना क्या बनाया जाता है कि यू०टी०आई० के हेल्थ को, स्माल इन्वेस्टर्स की हेल्थ को ठीक करना है। फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर क्यों, यह बात मनमोहन सिंह जी भी बोले हैं इसलिए मैं छोटे में कहता हूं फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर के ये काम नहीं हैं कि किसके शेयर खरीदे जाएं, कितनी कीमत में खरीदे जाएं और कितनी एमाउंट में खरीदे जाएं... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Salim, the time allotted to your party is over.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, a major portion of the time was consumed by them. They have taken away my time. I have just started. Let them not interrupt from now onwards.

तो यू०टी०आई० का मामला जो था इतने दिन तक लिबरलाइजेशन के खिलाफ और आप लोगों ने यह कहा कि यह लिबरलाइज इकोनोमी है, मार्केट विल डिटरमाइन एक्विथिंग, ईवन हम जो मिट्टी का तेल खरीदें एक लिटर हमारे गरीब लोग ये भी मार्केट ठीक करेंगे और ब्रिटिश-अमेरिकन टोबैको कंपनी के शेयर खरीदेंगे वह आई०टी०सी० के शेयर उसकी कीमत फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री में बैठ कर ठीक होगी। कौन से लिबरलाइजेशन का पाठ आप पढ़ा रहे हैं? दूसरी बात है इसी तरह से स्टील के प्राइस, ठीक है डंपिंग के खिलाफ हम भी हैं और होना भी चाहिए। सवाल यहां आया, इस बारे में चर्चा भी हुई, मनमोहन सिंह जी ने भी कहा, लेकिन आप अगर डोमेस्टिक इंडस्ट्री को प्रोटेक्ट करना चाहते हैं तो आप ग्रुप ऑफ मिनिस्टर्स की कमेटी बनाएं। नरसिमम कमेटी बनी, उन्होंने रेकमेडेशंस किए। लेकिन वह प्राइस जो है रिजेक्ट हो गया। क्यों हुआ, कैसे हुआ, मैकेनिज्म क्या है, यह तो बोलना पड़ेगा।

Parliament should know as to how you arrive at that.

अभी यह देखिए मैं बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सवाल भूल जाऊंगा, इसलिए पीछे से आना अच्छा है... (व्यवधान) समय तो आपका खत्म हो रहा है। अगर पीछे से आते हैं... (व्यवधान)

श्री एम० वेंकैया नायडु: नहीं, आगे से आये।

भी मोहम्मद सलीम: आप दावत देते हैं....(व्यवधान) सॉरी, आप तो हमारे दोस्त हैं।

It is a serious matter. They should not be joking like this. नाउ डबल के बारे में, एनरन के बारे में हम यह बहुत बहस कर चुके हैं, आपने भी हिस्सा लिया था, लेकिन कैसे इसका फैसला होता है, वह लोग इन्वेस्टमेंट के नाम पर उन्हें बुलाए, हमारे पास इन्वेस्टमेंट फंड नहीं है। आपने इसका पहले विरोध किया फिर उसके बाद फैसला किया। गुरुस्वामी साहब यह कहते हैं कि मुंबई में उनके प्रोपर कनैक्शनस हैं आपको मालूम है और वह सब दिल्ली के साथ कनैक्शन नहीं हो तो वह होता नहीं है।

हमारे देश के फाइनेंशियल इंस्टीट्यूशंस का यह कह रहे हैं कि उनके साथ परसेटिंग फिक्स है एग्जीमेट के मुताबिक। उसके बावजूद भी मैं अगर कोर्ट करना चाहूँ तो कोर्ट कर सकता हूँ लेकिन खुले में, एक तरफ हमारे पास इन्वेस्टमेंट की कमी और दूसरी तरफ मल्टी नेशनल कंपनीज जबकि हमारे यहां एक छोटा-मोटा सा कारोबारी अगर वह कर्ज लेने जाता है तो उसके लिए इतनी दिकत का सामना करना पड़ता है और आप अपने एग्जीमेट के बॉर्ड, उसके कमिटी के बॉर्ड उन्हें जा करके फाइनेंशियल इंस्टीट्यूशंस को यह कह रहे हैं कि इन्वेस्टमेंट करें और वह रुपया ले करके, एनबीएफसी में वह रुपया ले करके बाकी हमारे यहां उसमें यह फिर फायदा निकाले, तो कास्ट इन्टरेस्ट दे और फिर उसे हाई कास्ट इन्टरेस्ट में तब्दील करें।....(व्यवधान) हां, वह इसमें भी लिखा है। पहले भी हम लोगों ने यहां पर कहा था यह एग्जीमेट करते हैं, मल्टी नेशनल कंपनियां पर्टिकुलरली एनरन, गुरुस्वामी खुद कहे हैं,

"We know how they educate. They have educated some people" जो बात हमने कही है वह इलजाम आपके ऊपर नहीं है। यह वही है जो आपके पीछे है। वह शब्द तो मैं इस्तेमाल नहीं कर सकता लेकिन जो आप वहां सामने ढाल की तरह से इस्तेमाल कर रहे थे, ढाल तो मैं इस्तेमाल कर सकता हूँ, लेकिन ढाल के पीछे जो लोग हैं उनके बारे में यह बात कही गई है। सर, इसी तरह से मितल वाला मामला आएगा। मितल नाम पर किसी को एतराज नहीं होना चाहिए। मितल नाम वहां पर है। कई मितल हैं, टैट वाले मितल भी हैं, दफ्तर में बैठे हैं और फिर स्टील वाले मितल भी हैं, फिर डी०टी०एच० में भी हैं। सर, डी०टी०एच० में भी कितना उत्साह। हमारे यहां इस देश

में ब्रांडकास्टिंग बिल लाया गया था। ज्वाइंट सलैक्ट कमेटी बनी थी। चर्चा चल रही थी। बाद में हुकुमत आई ब्रांडकास्टिंग बिल जो है उसे रौलफ में रख दिया और रातों-रात डी०टी०एच० के पक्ष में माहौल बनना शुरू हो गया और अब यह देखा जा रहा है कि वही मितल जिसके बारे में गुरुस्वामी साहब का यह कहना है कि मितल ग्रुप के लोगों को ले जा करके हमारे एक मंत्री जी का उसमें नाम है, उसमें नाम लिखा हुआ भी है, आपका नाम, प्रमोद महाजन जी का नाम लिखा है उनके आर्टिकल में, मैं आर्टिकल में नहीं जा रहा हूँ वह ले करके गए, तो प्रमोद मिनिस्टर के आफिस से आया है, आप अगर इधरा के लिए कर सकते हैं तो मितल के लिए भी कर सकते हैं। This is what the Prime Minister's office is doing.

الغرض محمد سلیم مغربی بلال: اوروں
شعوری جی نے ٹرانسپیرینسی کی بات کہی
اور انھوں نے اس بارے میں کہا کہ ٹرانسپیرینسی
ٹروٹھ ڈھتیک کی بات یہ ہے کہ اس تک اس
ملک کو بہت نہیں چلا کہ جو فارماریز اور ٹرانسپیرینسی
میں گرو سھوای جتنے اٹھائے گئے مدوں
کے بارے میں ہم یہاں بحث کر رہے ہیں
تو وہ دینرائی کے یا سیک ہونے۔ اب
ٹرانسپیرینسی کی جو لوگ بات کر رہے ہیں
میں پہلے اس کے بارے میں اپنی بات
تو میں بعد میں کہوں گا۔ میرے پاس وہ
ریسرچیشن لیٹر کی کاپی ہے جو انھوں نے
۲۷ تاریخ کو اپنے منتری مہودے کے پاس
سجیجا۔ پانچ تاریخ کا وہ ٹرانسپیرینسی لیٹر
میں ہے جس میں ۲۶ فروری کی تاریخ
میں لکھا گیا۔ سب سے بڑا امدا تو پہلے

یہ ہے کہ انہیں اپائنٹمنٹ کیا ہی نہیں
 کیا تھا۔ پورے دیش کے لوگ اور ہم
 ممبران میں یہ پوچھ رہے ہیں۔ آج آپ
 انہیں ڈی انوائس کر رہے ہیں۔ آپ کا
 ادھیکار ہے کیونکہ یہ آپ کے کام میں ہیں
 آ رہے ہیں۔ آپ کے ساتھ کچھ سوالات
 ہو رہے ہیں لیکن آپ نے جب اپائنٹ
 کیے تھے آرٹ وائز پائیکل اپائنٹمنٹ،
 یو پیو ٹو آن ہم آپ "وہ اگر اچھا ہی کیا،
 براہی کیا تو یہ پارلیمنٹ فارم آف ایکو
 کریسی ہے۔ وہ ایک دم اس سرکاری
 شروعات ہے۔ آپ ایڈوائز کو جو
 دیجئے، جب یہ فائنٹس منسٹر اپائنٹ
 ہوئے تو سال کی شروعات اس طرح سے
 ہوئی۔ لوگوں نے نیکی ویژن پر دیکھا کہ
 پردھان منتری جی نے اوقہ لیکر لیا۔
 سب لوگ یہ پوچھ رہے تھے کہ وہ منتری
 کون ہو گا؟ ناٹو رہے ہو گا، بھئی سے
 ہو گا، جے پور سے ہو گا یا دہلی سے ہو گا؟
 وہ منتری کون ہو گا؟ پیلا شہید پردھان
 منتری جی نے پورے راشٹر کو یہ کہا کہ میں
 خود، کیونکہ انکی جو بھی جوائنٹس تھی انکو
 توئی اپائنٹ نہیں کر سکتا اور میرا اس دور
 بعد میں معلوم ہوا کہ جس وقت منسٹر نہیں
 لیشنٹ منسٹر ہوتے منتری ہوتے۔ آج
 گرو سوای لکھتے ہیں کہ اس دیش کو ایک

سال کے لئے.... میری پوری پھوری
 ہے، لیشنٹ منسٹر ہاجی ہمارے پر اسے
 بزرگ سنا رہی ہیں... مداخلت...
 سوال یہ ہے کہ ابھی گرو سوای، ان کے
 ایڈوائز کر رہے ہیں کہ ہمیں تقرڈ
 جوائنٹس ملے اس دیش کا وقت منتری منسٹر
 کے لئے... مداخلت...

منتری لیشنٹ منسٹر: تقرڈ کرڈ۔
 منتری محمد سلیم: میں وہ نہیں کہہ رہا
 ہوں میں آرٹیکل کے اندر سے بول رہا ہوں
 ... تقرڈ کرڈ، میں کہتا نہیں چاہ رہا تھا۔
 میں مانتا ہوں کہ آپ تقرڈ کرڈ نہیں ہیں۔
 ان کے کام میں اور خراب کرڈ ہوئے لوگ بھی
 ہیں۔ خیر، یہ ہماری مذاق کی بات نہیں
 ہے لیکن میری پوری پھوری ہے آپ کے
 ساتھ۔ تو یہ سوال آیا کہ آپ نے اپائنٹمنٹ
 کیوں کیا؟ اور آج جب آپ کہہ رہے ہیں کہ:

He went beyond the brief. What was the brief?

آپ نے جب اپائنٹمنٹ کیا تو آپ کیسے
 کیسے اپائنٹمنٹ کرتے ہیں؟ ان کے آرٹیکل
 سے کہہ رہا ہوں۔ پرائیویٹ سیکرٹری کون
 ہو گا؟ پچھلا والا؟ آپ نے وہ آرا میں
 چیف سلیکٹ کیا تھا آئی ایم کو سلیکٹ فرا
 دی آرٹیکل۔ ہم آرٹیکل کے بارے میں

جائیں گے۔ پچھلے والا پروگرام کو یٹ آر ایس ایس
چیف... مداخلت...

شخصی مالتی خرماء: مانتی سبھا
جو، میں ایک بات کہنا چاہتی ہوں۔

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you yielding?

SHRI MD. SALIM: No, I am not yielding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding.
(Interruptions). He is not yielding. (Interruptions).

|| شری محمد سلیم: اس آرٹیکل میں
جو میں ہم کہہ سکتے ہیں... مداخلت...
آج کو تو وقت ملے تو بڑھ لے گا۔
ابھی آپ ٹرانسپیرینسی کی بات کر رہے
تھے۔ تو ۲۷ تاریخ کو انہوں نے غلط دیا، ۱۳
تاریخ کو پورے دیش کے لوگوں کو معلوم
ہوا وہ سیک ہوئے۔ ۲۲ تاریخ کو
پارلیمنٹ بیٹھی اور ۲۳ تاریخ کو آرٹیکل
نکلا پھلا۔ اس سے پہلے تو آپ کو ٹرانسپیرینسی
کی کوئی یاد یاد نہیں آئی۔ جوت منترا لیا
پر دھان منتری کے دفتر پر پارٹی کے دفتر،
روزانہ پریس کانفرنس کر کے دیش کی جنتا
کو بتاتے ہیں۔ پراسٹو کے بارے میں تو
ایک فارم ایڈوائسز دے کر کچھ پوائنٹ
اٹھاتے ہیں، لکن ہم ہیں انہی ٹھوس

جی کہ وہ ہیں تو ایک بھی شبر آپ
نے نہیں کہا جب تک کہ یہ معاملہ پارلیمنٹ
میں نہیں آیا؟ جب تک کہ ہم نے آپکو
مجبور نہیں کیا کہ ٹرانسپیرینسی کیا ہوتی ہے اور
پھر آپ یہ کہہ کر دلائل کر رہے ہیں کہ ٹرانس
پیرینسی اس کا کتہہ ہے۔ پھر ہم یہ سب کتنے
لے رہے ہیں؟ یہ اس سے نہیں کہ جو
آرٹیکل دیکھ گئے ہیں پھر سسٹن کا پائین
ہو، پانچ ہو بلکہ اس سے کہ انہوں نے جو
پوائنٹ اٹھاتے ہیں، ایشور اٹھاتے ہیں۔

that is concerning the whole nation; our
interest, our economy and our future.
انکے آرٹیکل میں

"Who's who of the MNCs" is in the
Swadeshi cupboard

|| اسب کے نام ہیں میں پڑھ دوں ؟
سیکنڈ پیرامین ہی ہیں لیکن اس سے
پہلے میں سوال کے بارے میں کہہ رہا ہوں۔
وہ کیا کہتے ہیں؟ کیوں ریزریشن کیا؟ میں
بی جے پی کے اپنے دوستوں کے لئے کہہ رہا
ہوں۔

"I have been very perturbed by the
distressing sequence of events of the last
few weeks. These together make me feel
that we are not longer to advance our
agenda as stated in the election man-
ifesto."

|| انکرپوزیشن ریزریشن کرتی ہے۔ الیکشن
مینی فیسٹو... وہ تو آپ کھو چکے ہیں۔

"We seem to have allowed the system
and the process to overwhelm our con-
cerns."

۱۱ اور ہنگ میرا گراف ہے۔ سر، اگر آپ اجازت دیں تو "بزنس اسٹیٹمنٹ" میں پچھلے سال ۳۰ جولائی کو جب انھیں لاسٹ کیا گیا تھا، انھیں نے کہا۔ میں سرکار سے پوچھ رہا ہوں کہ آپ نے کیوں اپنا ٹسٹ کیا؟ لیکن ان سے یہ سوال پوچھا گیا تھا کہ آپ کیوں اپنا ٹسٹ ہوئے؟ آپ نے مذہبی کیوں سنبھالی؟ تو ان کا کہنا تھا کہ ۱۰۰

"I am a Member of the party and worked for developing the party's agenda which has been spelt out in the manifesto. Since I was one of the original authors of the programme, I repeat, original authors of the programmes, the Leader said that I should get involved in the implementation of the agenda also. Hence, I was asked to assist the Finance Minister in implementing the agenda."

"The chief agent for implementing the agenda is going to be the Finance Minister I am only going to assist on a day-to-day basis."

۱۱ جو وہ لکھتے ہیں میں ان کو لیسٹ کر دے رہا ہوں وہ لکھتے ہیں کہ:

He was overtaken by others.

۱۱ میں اپنے ساتھی سے کہہ رہا ہوں۔ آپ نے احتیاطی طور پر کیا نتیجہ کیا ہوا؟

"The major point which I have made in my resignation letter was that I felt that there was little difference between a BJP-led Government and a Congress Government in the manner in which they conducted themselves."

†† [Transliteration in Arabic Script]

۱۱ آگے ہے کہ:

"A change in regime only meant more of the same. The following cases only illustrate this."

۱۱ اس کے لواحقین نے ایک لسٹ دی ہے۔ ہولی اگلیو منٹن، یہ بھی آپس میں کوئی جھگڑا نہیں ہے، جی جے پی کے ممبران کا کوئی جھگڑا نہیں ہے۔ آپ ریزائن کا سوال اپنے دماغ میں ڈھونڈ رہے ہیں لیکن اس کو بتائیں پارٹی میں اور وہ بھی آپ کے فائل ممبر ہیں یہ تو ٹیپس آف دی آئٹس برگ ہے۔ میں مومین گرو سوامی کو گرو نہیں مانتا۔ میں سوامیوں پر دشمنی نہیں کرتا لیکن جس چیز کو آپ نے دس سال سے، بیس سال سے پر ہیچ کیا ہے وہ ایک سال حکومت میں آنے کے بعد اس طرح سے ہو گیا۔

سیکٹر پیرا میں ریزائن، کیپٹل مارکیٹ ریفرم، سونووی، برٹش امریکن ٹوبیکو کمپنی، آئی ٹی سی اور پبلک سیکٹر انڈسٹریز۔ ہم نے نوٹس دیا تھا۔ انھیں کبھی ایس باتوں پر بازو اس ایڈمرن ہو جاتا ہے کہ کیپٹل منسٹر نہیں ہے۔ یہ ایک لسٹ ہے اس وقت اس منسٹری کے منتر ہی ہوتے تھے ہیئر فوشن کے آئے ہوئے ہیں اس کے لئے میں ان کو دعوت دیتا ہوں۔

He owes an explanation to the nation.

اسٹیل، سیمنٹ، ایگریکلچر، کمیونٹی کیشن،
پاور۔ میں انھیں یہاں دیکھ کر نہیں بول رہا
ہوں یہ میں ان کے لیٹر سے بول رہا ہوں
جو ڈپارٹمنٹ انوالو ہیں۔ پاور ہے اور پھر
مختلف سیکٹروں میں۔ ایگریکلچر ہے۔ میں
اس میں سوچ رہا ہوں کہ ان کو نہیں چھوڑ سکتا۔
پہلے تو، آرڈر کیشن، ایجوکیشن، یہ
سیکٹر پیرامیٹر آیا ہے۔ شارٹ ڈیوٹیشن
نے اس سے نہیں میں کھڑے ہو کر
کہہ رہا ہوں، چارج رکھا رہا ہوں اور
آپ ڈسپوز آف کر دیں گے۔ یہ بہت
برائی کہانی ہے کہ میرے برہادر کو کچھ دے
دیا اس سے چھوڑ دیئے ہیں، ایسا نہیں
ہو سکتا، یہ اتنا آسان نہیں ہے۔۔۔۔۔
...مداخلت... پہلا سوال میرا ہے۔

Shri Mohan Guruswamy, who had
been appointed as Adviser to the Finance
Minister....(Interruptions).

آمین پارلیمنٹری افسر منسٹر سے
شروع کروں وہ نزدیک ہیں۔ انھوں نے
جس دن ہنگامہ ہوا کہ یہ ڈسکشن ہونا
چاہیے، سرکاری ادارہ کی نفی کر سکتی
ہونا چاہیے تو ایک برس کا فرس میں
انھوں نے کہا کہ یہ سب ہم لوگوں کو کس
مرحہ سے منی مینجنگ کیا جاسکتا ہے اس کے
لئے کیا جا رہا ہے۔۔۔ مداخلت۔۔۔

صرف یہ نہیں کہ کیوں اپائنٹ کیا، کس
حیثیت سے اپائنٹ کیا اور ان کے جانے
کے بعد مشہدہ اور بھی برعہ گیا۔ اپائنٹ
کیا بہت امید کے ساتھ، یہ کچھ کریں گے،
اور ایک ایسا راسٹر بنائیں جسے جسٹس
ہوگی۔ جو میں جو سوالات آئے ایمانداری
کے ساتھ نہ کوہ کو، آکو جیسے ہی اسکا
نوش آگیا تو اسی وقت انھیں پورے دیش
کو بتادینا چاہیے تھا۔ اگر وہ بکواس تھی تو
بکواس بتانا چاہیے تھا۔ بیس بیس ہے تو
بیس بیس، پوائنٹ ٹو پوائنٹ جواب
ہو دے سکتے تھے۔ لیکن میں

یہ شونٹ سن رہا ہوں یہ ایک سپلیمنٹ
نہیں مانگ رہا ہوں، انھوں نے بہت سے
بجائش دئے ہیں جنہیں میں کوڈ کر سکتا
ہوں۔ جس میں ہے کہ حکومت کی ذمہ داری
پارلیمنٹ کے تین گیارہ اور منری کی
ذمہ داری کیا ہوتی ہے میں سفر پر ہوا
ہے اور میں نے آپ سے یہ سیکھا ہے۔ لیکن
یہاں دقت یہ آگئی ہے ان کا پیلا چارج
یہ ہے، اردن ضروری جس کے خلاف میں
ہمارا وہی چارج ہے وہ یہ کہہ رہے
تھے کہ۔۔۔۔۔

He is clearly preparing to skirt the
issues and focus on something....

یہ پیشرفت سننے کے لئے لکھ رہے ہیں، پھر
بیسویں کیونٹ آرٹیکل میں جو گیارہ لہج
کے آئینہ میں اسچ“ لکھے ہیں۔

I have only peripherally touched upon.
That is exactly what Shri Arun Shourie
has done.

لاہور کی بیس باترا کا بھی کہا لیکن جو
بیسٹ آئینوں کے انہوں نے جج نہیں
کیا۔ ہاں میں ریڈر ہوں۔

I have only peripherally touched upon.
He is trying to get away from the thrust
of my contentions.

وہ تو پہلے آپ پر چڑھ چکے ہیں، آپ ہمارا
آدھا کام کر چکے ہیں، وہ پیری فیدرل تھا،
جو میں ہے وہ ہم لوگ پر چڑھتے ہیں۔ اگر
آپ کہیں تو اسے میں دوہرا دیتے ہیں۔
یہاں وینڈیا نا رائڈ جو جی بیٹھے ہوئے ہیں،
اگر میں کوئی چارج ٹاکوں تو وہ بھی کھڑے
ہو جائیں گے، میں نے کوئی چارج نہیں لگایا
ہے۔ میں تو صرف یہ کہہ رہا ہوں۔ ”مداخلت“
مستیک ہے۔۔۔ ”مداخلت“۔۔۔ گروہی
گروہوں کا کہنا ہے۔۔۔ ”مداخلت“۔۔۔
پتہ نہیں کھٹے گروہیں۔ ان کے آرٹیکل میں
گروہوں کی کا بھی نام آیا ہے۔ لکھ انہیں
وہ آرٹیکل کچھ معاملے میں ”مداخلت“
شری سنجو نرویم: آپ سارے لوگ
گروہیں۔۔۔ ”مداخلت“۔۔۔

۱۱ شری محمد سلیم: آپ کو اپنے گروہوں
کی ضرورت نہیں ہوتی ہے آپ کا ایک ہی
گروہ کافی ہے ممبئی میں، اپنے فیادر
گروہوں سے حالت خراب ہو جاتی ہے۔

The second point is, there is a coterie
around Shri Vajpayee headed by his
adopted son-in-law which meddles with
matters involving governance.

۱۱ اس دیش میں ۵۰ سال کی جمہوریت
میں ہمیشہ بورڈ ملک کے لوگ اٹھکر
کھڑے ہو گئے ہیں۔ جب بھی ایکسٹرا
کانٹی ٹیوشنل یا اور سینٹر کھڑا ہوا۔ ہمارے
یہاں کانٹسٹی ٹیوشن میں پرائم منسٹر ہے،
پرائم منسٹر آفس نہیں ہے۔ آج قومی لم او
میں بی ایم ایچ یعنی پرائم منسٹر ہاؤس
ہے اور پھر ان کے پیچھے ان لاز ہیں۔

I would like to know whether this
country will be governed by laws or by
in-laws.

۱۱ کانٹسٹی ٹیوشن میں، کسی قانون میں،
پارلیمنٹ کے ایکٹ میں یہ اجازت نہیں
ہے، کسی کو بھی نہیں ہے۔

The Government will be run and the
business will be conducted by in-laws.

۱۱ انہی اسپان میں لوگ ہیں، ان کی
مستحق اور کرنی میں فرق ہے۔ ”مداخلت“

آپ ماننے لائے کہ بارے میں، اگر کسی
کے بارے میں، ... مداخلت ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Salim, why are you listening to them. Kindly speak. (Interruptions).

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, what is happening in the House. Even the Ministers are intervening.

آشری محمد سلیم: اب تک میں نے سوچا
کہ آپ دو دنوں کے لئے کہا ہے ... مداخلت ...
اسی وقت کہ آپ تو ان لڑکے بارے میں
اور زیادہ سنتا ہے؟ یہ میں نہیں کہہ سکتا
ہوں۔ اگر مورتی کے کہنے کے مطابق مورتی
سنا رہی ہے۔ مہربان مورتی کہہ
چکے ہیں۔ تو میں مہربان جی
کے کہنے کے مطابق آپ کے پاس اور
جو باور فل نوٹ بیٹھے ہوئے ہیں ...

Let set people belonging to this coterie, whether they are Minister or they are not Ministers, the way they were appointed..... (Interruptions).

آپ نے شروع سے ہی پریسیڈنٹ چاہا ہے
سرکار کے لئے کے بعد ہمارا یہ پہلا سوال
تھا اور یہاں پر پرنسپل مقرر جی نے سوال
اٹھا یا تھا کہ آپ نے ایڈوائزر کو کیوں مقرر
دلائی۔ جواب یہ تھا کہ اگر یہ پہلے نہیں

ہوا تھا تو ایسی کوئی بات نہیں ہے ہم نئی
شروعات کر رہے ہیں۔

پروفیسر میشن سنگھ ورمہ: آپ نے
انکو ایسی * کہا۔ ایک کوئی تجربہ ہے انکو
* ہونے کا۔

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why are you responding to them. You go on speaking. Don't respond.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, I want them to participate in the discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It should not be done in this way. You go on speaking.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, I am encouraging them.

آپ ہی تو شکایت ہے، فائنٹس منسٹر
کے ساتھ ان کے ایڈوائزر کا کہ جس وقت
انکو بولنا چاہئے تھا فیصلہ لینے وقت
تک نہ کرنا چاہئے تھا، فون پر جواب دے
پراٹھ منسٹر کے آفس سے، پراٹھ منسٹر
کاؤس سے جب ان کے ایڈوائزر آتے ہیں
جب دو سوے نوٹ آتے ہیں تو ہاں اور
نہ میں فیصلہ، جو آپ نے زندگی میں لکھا
جسکے لئے آپ بوسٹ کرتے ہیں تو لیجیہ
نوٹ میں نہیں آنا پڑتا۔ فیصلہ کیجئے اور
کر رہے ہیں ایکسٹرا کانسٹیبل شوشنل
باڈیز اور آپ کو اس کا شکریہ ادا کرنا
رہا ہے اس لئے میں کہہ رہا ہوں کہ انکو
کہ اب بھی لب تیرے آزاد ہیں ...
... مداخلت ... پروجیکٹ وائی جی

[1] Transliteration in Arabic Script

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

اور باجمعی جی کے اندر جو جملہ کے والد
محاملہ ہے اس سے میں نکال کر رہا ہوں۔
وہ بلڈی کا انٹر نل میر ہے۔ اسے آپ
انٹر نلی فکس کر لیجئے۔ یہ اچھا ہے
... مدراخلت ... وہ لہ ایزڈنگ
پروسیس از گونینگ این ... مدراخلت ...
وہ بھی ہے گروپ ...
وہ پہلا سوال، میں اسے ٹیج نہیں کرتا۔ ابھی
بھی یہاں یہ ہمارا سوال یہ ہے کہ ایک کوئی
کے معاملے میں فائنٹنس منسٹر کے ساتھ جو
محاملہ اٹھایا ہے ... مدراخلت ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been brought to my notice that the use of the word * is unparliamentary.

الٹری محمد سلیم: سر، شیر کے معاملہ میں
سودیشی سرکار آؤ، وڈیشی کمپنی وہ
بھی آؤ ٹی سی ویسے ہی ہے، لیکن ویش
کے اندر ایک اچھے ویل مینیجمنٹ ہے، اس کے
اندر بہت سے ٹرا بل بہت سی گروپ چلے
جی تھی، لیکن اسکے آؤر شپ ٹرانسفر
ہو گئے۔ بہانا لیا بنا یا جاتا ہے کہ یو ٹی آؤ
کے ہیملپ کو، اسمال انویسٹمنٹ ہیملپ
کو ٹھیک کرنا ہے۔ فائنٹنس منسٹر کو کیوں
یہ بات منہ پر سن گئے تھے بھی پوے
ہیں اس لئے میں چھوٹے میں کہتا ہوں۔

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[] Transliteration in Arabic script.

فائنٹنس منسٹر کے یہ کام نہیں ہیں کہ کھینکے
شیر خریدے جائیں، کتنی قیمت میں خریدے
جائیں اور کتنی اماؤنٹ میں خریدے
جائیں ... مدراخلت ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Salim, the time allotted to your party is over.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Sir, a major portion of the time was consumed by them. They have taken away my time. I have just started. Let them not interrupt from now onwards.

الٹری محمد سلیم: تو یو ٹی آؤ کا معاملہ
جو تھا اتنے دن تک برلڈنگزیشن کے خلاف
اور آپ لوگ یہ کہیں کہ یہ برلڈنگز امانوی
ہے، ٹوڈیٹ حل لہ پرمائنٹ ایوڈیٹنگ
ایڈھن ہم جو مٹی کا تیل خریدیں گے
ایک لیٹر ہمارے غریب لوگ نے بھی مارکیٹ
ٹھیک کریں گے اور برٹش امریکن سویلو
کمپنی کے شیر خریدیں گے وہ آؤ ٹی سی
کے شیر اسکی قیمت فائنٹنس منسٹر میں
بیٹھ کر سو گا۔ کون سے برلڈنگزیشن کا پانچ
آپ پڑھ رہے ہیں؟ دوسری بات ہے اسی
طرح کے اسٹیل کے پرائز، ٹھیک ہے ڈیمنگ
کے خلاف ہم بھی ہیں اور ہونا بھی چاہئے۔
سوال یہاں آیا اس بارے میں چرچہ بھی ہوئی
ہے، منہ پر سن گئے تھے بھی کہا، لیکن
آپ اگر ڈو میٹھک الٹریٹری کو براہ راست
کرنا چاہتے ہیں تو آپ گروپ آؤ فائنٹری

کی کمیٹی بنائیں۔ نر سیمم کمیٹیوں میں انہوں نے دستبردیشنس کی ہیں۔ لیکن وہ پرائز جو وہ لے چیکٹ ہو گیا۔ کیوں ہوا کیسے ہوا یہ تو ہونا چاہیے گا۔

Parliament should know as to how you arrive at that.

اے ایس یہ دیکھتے، میں بہت ہی اہم سوال محول جاؤں گا، اس لئے سچ سے آنا چاہیے۔۔۔ مداخلت۔۔۔ وقت تو آپ کا ختم ہو رہا ہے۔ اگر سچ سے آئے ہیں۔۔۔ مداخلت۔۔۔ شری ام وینکیانا یو: نہیں آئے سے آئیں۔

شری محمد سلیم: آپ دعوت دیتے ہیں۔۔۔ مداخلت۔۔۔ سواری آپ تو ہمارے دوست ہیں۔

It is a serious matter. They should not be joking like this.

اے ناؤ ڈبول کے بلوے میں، ایران کے بلوے میں یہ بہت بحث کر چکے ہیں آپ نے بھی حصہ لیا تھا، لیکن کیسے اسکا فیصلہ ہوتا ہے، وہ لوگ انوسٹمنٹ کے نام پر انہیں بلاتے ہیں، ہمارے پاس انوسٹیل فنڈز نہیں ہیں۔ آجئے اسکا پیو درودھ کیا پھر اس کے بعد فیصلہ کیا۔ اگر سواری صاحب یہ کہتے

ہیں کہ جمہوری میں اس کے پروپر لکشنس ہیں ۴ بجو معلوم ہے اور وہ سب دہلی کے ساتھ لکشنس نہیں ہوں تو وہ ہوتا نہیں ہے۔

ہمارے دیش کے فائنٹیل انسٹی ٹیوٹ یہ کہہ رہے ہیں کہ ان کے ساتھ پرنسپل فکس ہے ایگرگٹ کے مطابق اس کے باوجود جس میں اگر کوئی کرنا چاہیں تو کوئی کر سکتا ہے۔ لیکن کھلے ہیں، ایک طرف ہمارے پاس انسٹیشن کی کمپنی اور دوسری طرف ملٹی نیشنل کمپنیز جبکہ ہمارے یہاں ایک چوٹا موٹا سا کاروباری اگر وہ عرض کیے جاتا ہے تو اس کے لئے اتنی دقت کا سامنا کرنا پڑتا

ہے اور آپ اپنے ایگرگٹ کے بی اوٹ، اس کے مٹمنٹ کے بی اوٹ انہیں جاننے کے فائنٹیل انسٹی ٹیوٹس کو کہہ رہے ہیں کہ انوسٹمنٹ کریں اور یہ لیکر کے این بی ایف سمیں وہ رہیں لیکر کے باقی ہمارے یہاں۔۔۔ اس میں یہ پھر قانون لکالیں، تو کاسٹ انٹرسٹ دیں اور پھر اسے ہائی کاسٹ انٹرسٹ میں تبدیل کریں۔۔۔ مداخلت۔۔۔ ہاں وہ اس میں بھی لکھا ہے۔ پہلے بھی ہم لوگوں نے یہاں پر کہا تھا یہ ایجیٹ کر رہے ہیں، ملٹی نیشنل کمپنیاں پوری کلری ایران، گرو سواری خود کہہ چکے ہیں نا

"We know how they educate. They have educated some people."

اجوابات ہم نے کچھ پہلے وہ الزام آپ کے
 اوپر نہیں ہے یہ وہی ہے جو آپ کے سچے
 ہے، وہ مشہور تو میں استعمال نہیں کر سکتا
 لیکن جو آپ وہاں سامنے ڈھال کر طرح
 سے استعمال کر رہے تھے، ڈھال تو میں
 استعمال کر سکتا ہوں لیکن ڈھال کے
 سچے جو لوگ ہیں ان کے سامنے یہ بات
 نہیں چلی ہے۔ سر، اس طرح سے قتل والا
 معاملہ لے گا۔ قتل نام پر کسی کو اعتراض
 نہیں ہونا چاہیے، قتل نام وہاں پر ہے۔
 نئی قتل ہیں، شیشے والے قتل ہیں، دفتر
 میں بیٹھے ہیں اور پھر اسٹیل والے قتل بھی
 یہاں، پیرڈی ٹی ایچ میں بھی ہیں۔
 سر، ڈی ٹی ایچ میں بھی لکھا افساد...
 ہمارے یہاں راجستھان میں ہراڈ کاسٹنگ
 بل لایا گیا تھا۔ جو اسٹ سلیکٹ کمیٹی بنی
 تھی۔ چرچم چل رہی تھی بعد میں حکومت
 آئی۔ ہراڈ کاسٹنگ بل جو چاہے خلیف
 میں رکھو اور راتوں رات ڈی ٹی ایچ
 کے پیش میں ماحول بننا شروع ہو گیا اور
 اب یہ دیکھا جا رہا ہے کہ وہی قتل جسے ہراڈ
 میں گرو سوسا صاحب لایا کہتا ہے کہ قتل
 گروپ کے لوگوں کو لے جانے کے ہمارے ایک
 شتری جی کا اس میں نام ہے، اس میں نام
 لکھا ہوا بھی ہے، آپ کا نام، پرمود مہاجن

جی کا نام لکھا ہے اگلے آرٹیکل میں۔ میں
 آرٹیکل میں نہیں جا رہا ہوں۔ وہ لیٹر
 کے لئے تو براہ منظر کے افسس سے آیا ہے۔
 آپ اگر روپے کے لئے کر سکتے ہیں تو مثلاً کے
 لئے بھی کر سکتے ہیں ۵۰۰۰

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Sir, I think I can clarify his point. Thank you, Mr. Salim. You are an old friend of mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Grant him an opportunity.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: वैसे तो अच्छा होता डा० साहब ही मुझे इस आपश्चर्य को दे देते, मुझे उनसे यह उम्मीद नहीं थी। सर, मुझे तिथि तो याद नहीं है और मुझे इस समय भी इसका स्मरण नहीं है कि मैं मंत्री था या नहीं था, लेकिन मुझे जितना स्मरण है उसके अनुसार मैं मंत्री था। मैं यशवंत सिन्हा जी को मिलने उनके आफिस में गया था। जब उनसे बात-चीत करके मैं बाहर आया तो मुझे गुरुवामी जी के किसी कर्मचारी को ओर से संदेश मिला कि वह जाते-जाते आपको कमरे में बुला रहे हैं। सीढ़ियों के पास उनका कमरा है। जाते-जाते मैं उनके कमरे में गया। वहां प्रमोद मितल बैठे थे। मैं प्रमोद मितल जी को ले करके उनके कमरे में नहीं गया। यह जरूर है कि वहां बैठे थे। वहां किसी प्रकार की आर्थिक चर्चा नहीं हुई। (व्यवधान) जी, आप कुछ पूछ रहे हैं।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Whether you went first or he went first, both of you were there. It is a fact.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: If being with Mr. Pramod Mittal is a crime

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: It is not a crime.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: If you say so, then, I can proceed on this. ... (Interruptions)

Then, what do you mean?

मैं खुद कह रहा हूँ, मैं तो कोई चीज़ छिपा नहीं रहा हूँ। (व्यवधान)

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद (उत्तर प्रदेश): वह आपसे सवाल पूछ रहे हैं।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: क्या पूछ रहे हैं।

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: वह सवाल पूछे, जवाब दे दिया, अब आगे चलिए।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: क्या जवाब दिया(व्यवधान) क्या पूछा।(व्यवधान)

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: इन्होंने आपसे सवाल पूछा, आपने जवाब दे दिया। अब आप जो बता रहे हैं वह कहिए।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: सर, मैं बहल गया था। उस समय प्रमोद मित्तल वहाँ बैठे थे। ना मैं उनको लेकर गया और न मैं उनको बाहर लेकर आया। न मैंने गुरुस्वामी जी के साथ प्रमोद मित्तल या उनके इस्पात के बारे में कोई बात-चीत की।

Now, this is his word in a newspaper, and this is my word on the floor of this august House. Now, it is for the Members to decide who is right and who is wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Salim. ... (Interruptions)

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: इस्लाम-ए-इस्लाम में रोता है क्या।

आगे आगे देखिए होता है क्या।

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सर, मैं एक पॉइंट कहना चाहता हूँ। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री टी-एन-चतुर्वेदी: सर, क्लेरीफिकेशन का सिस्टम कब से शुरू कर दिया? ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सभापति जी, मंत्री जी ने खड़े होकर जो स्पष्टीकरण दिया, तो इसमें गुरुस्वामी ने बहुतों के नाम लिए हैं, जो सामने बैठे हैं। अब सभी लोग अगर खड़े होकर स्पष्टीकरण दें, तो मेरा ख्याल है, डिबेट में बहुत सी चीजें मालूम हो जाएंगी। आप कहें तो फिर हम लोग उनको कह दें। यह एक अच्छा तरीका अपनाया गया है। इसमें बहुत से नाम हैं, जिनके ऊपर उन्होंने एलोगेशन तो लगाए हैं गुरुस्वामी जी ने, तो यह एक एक खड़े होकर सब अपना स्पष्टीकरण दें। इससे बहुत सी बातें क्लीयर हो जाएंगी।

श्री सभापति: चलिए, हो गया। मोहम्मद सलीम जी, आप बोलिए।

SHRI MD. SALIM: It is a very serious thing. I am thankful to Mantriji that he promptly tried to offer his explanation. He wanted to speak on this point when Manmohan Singhji was speaking. Sir, at different times, we would like to have different explanations from them. It does not end here. Because मंत्री जी को किसी ने बुलाया। मंत्री जी चले गए, इतिफाक से। अजी, इतिफाक से बहुत से मामले हो जाते हैं। मैं कोई कांमेंट नहीं करना चाह रहा हूँ और इसलिए हम इन्क्वायरी मांग रहे हैं, सर। उनके ही हैडपिक, अपने आदमी, एक ही आइडोलोजी के और उन्हें आपने एडवाइजर बनाया। उनके जरिए आपने कुछ कार्यक्रम करवाए। अच्छा भी हो सकता है, बुरा भी हो सकता है और इन तमाम मामलों में पार्लियामेंट का कुछ लेना-देना नहीं है। अब बाद में आकर वह कह रहे हैं कि हमको इनके कहने से यह कर देना पड़ा या इस पर इनका यह प्रेसर था और आप कह रहे हैं कि ऐसा नहीं किया। तो इसके लिए तो प्रोपर इन्क्वायरी होनी चाहिए। हम तो यही मांग कर रहे हैं। हम नहीं कह रहे हैं कि एकदम आपको सजा मिल जाए या उन्हें सजा मिल जाए या हमें सजा मिल जाए। ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: As a Member of this House, I have explained my position. If Mr. Salim has more faith in somebody else, then it is up to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is all right. ... (Interruptions)...

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: हमारा फेथ तो पार्लियामेंट के ऊपर है।

श्री सभापति: चलिए, अब आप अपनी बात पूरी कर लीजिए।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: मैं इस बात को आगे बढ़ाते हुए यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह मित्तल से मुलाकात हो गई, यह बात अलहदा है, लेकिन वह कुछ कह रहे हैं। यह तो एक एपीसोड की तरह है। Something is still in the offing. उसमें यह कहा जाता है—

There the matter lies. P.K. Mittal forayed into Direct to Home broadcasting

and partnership with Rupert Murdoch. ... (Interruptions)... That is the story in the making ... (Interruptions)...

सर, इसके बारे में भी मैं कोई ऐसा चार्ज नहीं लगा सकता और मैंने पहले भी नहीं लगाया, अभी भी नहीं लगा रहा हूँ, लेकिन हमें अगले एपीसोड के लिए भी तैयार रहना चाहिए। जैसा एन्थुजियज्म के बारे में मैंने कहा, डीटीएच के लिए जो स्टार के साथ डील का मामला है, उसके ऊपर मैं जो एन्थुजियज्म है, वह हम सब जानते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, दूसरा सवाल मेरा सीबीआई के बारे में है। इसमें जिस तरह से आड़वाणी जी और वाजपेयी जी का मामला चला जाता है, लेकिन फिर मैं उसे अवायव्य करूँगा। रोमेश शर्मा का मामला, सब जानते हैं, पार्लियामेंट भी एक जगह रुकी रही कि कहीं मामला रुका हुआ है। सीबीआई के रेंड हुए अंबानी के यहां। क्यों हुए? और, गुरुस्वामी कह रहे हैं कि प्राइममिनिस्टर आफिस से डायरेक्ट सीबीआई को यह कहा गया कि रेंड नहीं करना। उसके बावजूद भी वह हुए। मैं कोट कर रहा हूँ वहां से। मैं अपने तरीके से नहीं बोल सकता। यह सब बड़े बड़े मामले हैं। मुझे कहा से मालूम होगा, लेकिन रेंड हुए और इसलिए हुए कि उससे पहले रोमेश शर्मा के यहां रेंड हुए, रोमेश शर्मा के यहां कुछ कागजात निकले, इन्फोरमेशन निकले, फिर बाला सुब्रह्मण्यम के यहां रेंड हुए, इस बार तो मैंने सही नाम कहा, उनके यहां से कुछ कागजात निकले, इन्फोरमेशन निकले तो फिर अंबानी जी के यहां रेंड हुए। फिर मामला सीबीआई के यहां चला गया। एकदम आसान बात है, ऐसा एक्सप्लेनेशन मैं भी दे सकता हूँ, कोई भी मंत्री दे सकते हैं, लेकिन सवाल यह कि रोमेश शर्मा के यहां रेंड करने के बाद जब मालूम हो गया कि बाला सुब्रह्मण्यम रिलायंस इंडस्ट्रीज की तरफ से काम कर रहे हैं तो फिर इसमें गैप क्यों हुआ सात दिन का, आठ दिन का, हफ्ते भर का? जब बाला सुब्रह्मण्यम के यहां से इन्फोरमेशन मिली तो फिर अंबानी के लिए वह गैप क्यों हुआ? फिर सीबीआई को रैफर करने में गैप क्यों हुआ? आप सभी जानते हैं कि गैप बहुत कृसियल होता है इन्वेस्टीगेशन के मामले में। गुरुस्वामी जी ने यह कहा था कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर आफिस से नहीं चाहते थे, जैसे कि भले आदमी चाहते हैं कि कोई गड़बड़-सड़बड़ हो तो रेंड वगैरह न हो। हम इसमें इसलिए इंटरस्टेड हैं क्योंकि रोमेश शर्मा के मामले में यहां पार्लियामेंट में रॉकड हुई, पूरे देश के लोगों का ध्यान इस ओर गया, दिल्ली इलेक्शन में यह एक चुनाव का मुद्दा बना और आज फिर वह मामला

ज्यों का ज्यों रखा हुआ है। यहाँ तक कि सीबीआई डायरेक्टर यह कहते हैं कि इतना पुराना मामला सझाकर के, सब मामलों को गायब करके उसके बाद हमें क्यों रैफर कर रहे हो, गुरुमूर्ति साहब कह रहे हैं। मैं आर-एस-एस के इतने डाम्पूमैड्स पढ़ता हूँ कि गुरु नाम आने से ही मूर्ति साहब का नाम आ जाता है, गुरुमूर्ति साहब हमें माफ करेंगे। तो गुरुस्वामी जी कहते हैं कि यह हमें क्यों रैफर कर रहे हो। तो इस सवाल का जवाब मंत्री जी को देना होगा और मंत्री जी को नहीं, प्राइम मिनिस्टर को जवाब देना पड़ेगा। तो चार्ज यह है एकाडिंग टू गुरुस्वामी :—According to Guruswamy, the CBI Director received a telephone call from the Prime Minister not to raid. और उसके बाद ये डिले होते हैं और केस ह्रा-अप होता है और ये सब जो एजेंसियां हैं ये किस तरह से ऑपरेट करती हैं दिल्ली में कॉरीडोर आफ पावर्स और मैं तो इसके पहले पार्लियामेंट के बारे में भी कह चुका हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट के कॉरीडोर में किस तरह से ये लोग इन्फ्लुयेंस करते हैं। इसलिए यह कहना आसान है कि 40 एम-पी सही कर दिए इसलिए एम-पी-आई को यह कहा गया, 40 एम-पी सही कर दिए इसलिए टाटा एयरलाइंस के बारे में कह दिया गया। डिपार्टमेंट में जो लोग रहते हैं, चाहे सैकड़ों खत एम-पी लिख दें लेकिन अगर सरकार यह नहीं चाहती है तो कोई सुनवाई नहीं होती, कोई काम नहीं होता और दूसरी तरफ अगर वे चाहते हैं कि काम करना है, काम होना है तो फिर वे कहते हैं कि एम-पी के पैड पर, लैटर हैड पर यह ले आओ, हम काम करवा देते हैं। यह मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि हमारे एम-पीज़ को भी चौकन्ना रहना चाहिए क्योंकि ऐसे जब वे ऑपरेट करते हैं तो अक्सर वे ऐसे कुछ स्टेप्स और कुछ लैटर हैड्स का इस्तेमाल करते हैं और बाद में यहां आकर के कहेंगे कि आपने तो यह कहा था। ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI PROMOD MAHAJAN: You said it on the floor of the House.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Yes. I wanted this from. Fortunately that day, after your re-election, you came to the House. We also raised the issue on Tata airlines after your appointment as a Minister. Our party people restrained themselves, in spite of the request made by our colleagues, in respect of our commitment for the public sector, the Indian Airlines. We did not go to the hon. Prime Minister

when a delegation of the Members of Parliament went there. Because, I know, personally, how this coterie is operating and how these jet-set people are getting along. That is why, in this House, I referred, इस हाऊस का मामला है और इस हाऊस में यह बात उठी थी और मैंने यह कहा था इंडियन एयरलाइंस के हित में और उस वक्त वैकैया नायडू जी ने यह कहा था कि आप जब इंडियन एयरलाइंस के बारे में कहते हैं, टाटा एयरलाइंस के विरोध में कह रहे हैं तो क्यों नहीं जेट एयरलाइंस के विरोध में कहते। उस वक्त अफजोस का मामला यह था कि मैं उठा और मेरे साथ दो-चार एम्प्लोयी ने उठकर, खड़े होकर कहा कि जेट एयरलाइंस को भी एक्सपेंशन की जो आपने परमिशन दी है, रद्द करें, हम जेट के पक्ष में नहीं हैं। उस समय महोदय यहां पर थे और यहां रिकार्ड में है कि मंत्री महोदय थे और उन्होंने कोई रिसर्च इस मामले में नहीं दिया।

सर, मैं फिर गुरुस्वामी के मामले में जा रहा हूं। गुरुस्वामी जी का यही तो चार्ज है, इसी बारे में, जब प्राइम मिनिस्टर चाहते हैं, प्राइम मिनिस्टर का आफिस चाहता है तो वे एतों-वतों काम कर देते हैं, जैसे वेजबलूआ के मामले में किया। ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, I am not interrupting him. You pleased decide about the sitting because today is Saturday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. You are right.

श्री एम. वेकैया नायडू: आप टाइम डिसाइड कीजिए, हम उसको एवाइड करेंगे।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Salim, your party was allotted twenty minutes. You have already taken thirty-three minutes, which is more than that. Mr. Shourie took thirty-nine minutes and Dr. Manmohan Singh took thirty-two minutes. You have already taken more than the time taken by Dr. Manmohan Singh. Now, we have taken around two hours. Now, how long shall we continue? The total allotment of time is five hours. It means, if we have to finish it today, we have to sit till 8.00 PM.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: इसीलिए हम जे०पी०सी० की मांग कर रहे हैं। गवर्नमेंट अगर अभी एलान कर दे कि

हम जे०पी०सी० बना रहे हैं तो हम बैठ जायेंगे और यह मामला जे०पी०सी० में डिसकस होगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the House decide... (Interruptions)... No, no. That is not the issue ... (Interruptions)... That is not the issue. That is a different thing. I am asking about today's sitting. Have we to sit? It means, if every Member speaks for more than the time allotted to the party, it means, today, we will have to sit very long. Do we want to finish it today? I want the House to decide what to do. Do you want to sit today till 10 o'clock or 12 o'clock? At what time should we adjourn the House?

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: इब्नूदा-ए-इश्क में रोता है क्या।

आगे आगे देखिए होता है क्या।

آخری محمد سلیم
ابتداء عشق سے روئے کیا
انکار سے دیکھ کر ہوتا ہے کیا

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सर, मैं एक पॉइंट कहना चाहता हूं। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री टी०एन० चतुर्वेदी: सर, क्लैरिफिकेशन का सिस्टम कब से शुरू कर दिया? ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सभापति जी, मंत्री जी ने खड़े होकर जो स्पष्टीकरण दिया, तो इसमें गुरुस्वामी ने बहुतों के नाम लिए हैं, जो सामने बैठे हैं। अब सभी लोग अगर खड़े होकर स्पष्टीकरण दे दें, तो मेरा ख्याल है, डिबेट में बहुत सी चीजें मालूम हो जाएंगी। आप कहें तो फिर हम लोग उनको कह दें। यह एक अच्छा तरीका अपनाया गया है। इसमें बहुत से नाम हैं, जिनके ऊपर उन्होंने एलीगेशन तो लगाए हैं गुरुस्वामी जी ने, तो यह एक-एक खड़े होकर सब अपना स्पष्टीकरण दे दें। इससे बहुत सी बातें क्लियर हो जाएंगी।

श्री सभापति: चलिए, हो गया। मोहम्मद सलीम जी, आप बोलिए।

SHRI MD. SALIM: It is a very serious thing. I am thankful to Mantriji that he promptly tried to offer his explanation. He wanted to speak on this point when Manmohan Singhji was speaking. Sir, at different times, we would like to have different explanations. from them. It does not end here. Because

الاشری محمد سلیم : ہمارا امور مسلمہ تو بار بار بحث کے اور ہے۔
الاشری سبھا بنی : چلے اب آپ اپنی بات پورے کر دیجئے۔
شری محمد سلیم : میں اس بات کو لائے برصغارتے ہوئے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ مسئلہ سے ملاقات ہو گئی، یہ بات غلط ہے، لیکن وہ کچھ کہہ رہے ہیں۔ یہ تو ایک ایسی سوڈی طرح ہے۔۔۔ اس میں یہ کہا جاتا ہے ۵۰۰۰

الاشری محمد سلیم : ہمارا امور مسلمہ تو بار بار بحث کے اور ہے۔
الاشری سبھا بنی : چلے اب آپ اپنی بات پورے کر دیجئے۔
شری محمد سلیم : میں اس بات کو لائے برصغارتے ہوئے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ مسئلہ سے ملاقات ہو گئی، یہ بات غلط ہے، لیکن وہ کچھ کہہ رہے ہیں۔ یہ تو ایک ایسی سوڈی طرح ہے۔۔۔ اس میں یہ کہا جاتا ہے ۵۰۰۰

اور ان تمام معاملوں میں بار بار بحث کا کچھ لینا دینا نہیں ہے، اب جو میں آکروں کہہ رہے ہیں کہ ہم کو اگلے کچھ سے یہ کر دینا پڑا یا اس پر انکار ہے۔ پر ضرورتاً اور آگے، یہ کہہ رہے ہیں کہ ایسا نہیں کیا۔ تو اسکے لئے تو براہر انکو اشری ہونی چاہئے۔ ہم تو یہی مانگ کر رہے ہیں۔ ہم نہیں کہہ رہے ہیں کہ ایک دم آپ کو سزا مل جائے یا انھیں سزا مل جائے۔ ایسا نہیں ہو سکتا۔۔۔ "مداخلت"۔۔۔

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: As a Member of this House, I have explained my position. If Mr. Salim has more faith in somebody else, then it is up to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is all right. ... (Interruptions)...

الاشری محمد سلیم : ہمارا امور مسلمہ تو بار بار بحث کے اور ہے۔
الاشری سبھا بنی : چلے اب آپ اپنی بات پورے کر دیجئے۔
شری محمد سلیم : میں اس بات کو لائے برصغارتے ہوئے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ مسئلہ سے ملاقات ہو گئی، یہ بات غلط ہے، لیکن وہ کچھ کہہ رہے ہیں۔ یہ تو ایک ایسی سوڈی طرح ہے۔۔۔ اس میں یہ کہا جاتا ہے ۵۰۰۰

There the matter lies. P.K. Mittal forayed into Direct to Home broadcasting and partnership with Rupert Murdoch. ... (Interruptions) ... That is the story in the making. ... (Interruptions) ...

الاشری : اسکے بارے میں میں میں کوئی ایسا چارج نہیں لگا سکتا اور میں نے پہلے بھی نہیں لگایا، ابھی بھی نہیں لگا رہا ہوں۔ لیکن ہمیں اگلے ایسی سوڈی کے لئے بھی تیار رہنا چاہئے۔ جیسا انہوں نے جانکر کہے بارے میں میں نے کہا۔ ڈی ٹی ایچ کے لئے جو اسٹار کے ساتھ ڈیل کا معاملہ ہے، اسکے بارے میں جو انہوں نے جانکر ہے وہ ہم سب جانتے ہیں۔

سبجائی مہدیے۔ دوسرا سوال
میرا سی بی اے کے بارے میں ہے۔ اس
میں جس طرح سے آڈیو جی اور ویدیو
جی کا معاملہ چلا رہا ہے، لیکن پھر میں اسے
اوپر لے کر نکلا۔ روٹیشن ختم کرنا معاملہ
سبب جانتے ہیں، پارلیمنٹ میں ایک
جگہ روٹی نہیں کہ کہاں معاملہ رکھا ہوگا
ہے کہ ہمیں یہ کیوں روٹیشن نہ ہو تو اس
سوال کا جواب منتری جی کو دینا ہوگا
اور منتری جی کو نہیں براؤن منسٹر کو جواب
دینا پڑیگا۔ تو چلوچ یہ ہے گرو سوالی
کے بقول ۱۰۰

According to Guruswamy, the CBI Di-
rector received a telephone call from the
Prime Minister not to write.

اور اسکے بعد یہ دے ہوئے ہیں اور کس
پیش اپ ہو تا ہے اور سبب جو اجنسیاں
ہیں یہ کس طرح سے آپریٹ کرتی ہیں یہ
میں کو ریٹورس آف باورس اور میں
تو اس کے بچے پارلیمنٹ کے بارے میں بھی
کہہ چکا ہوں کہ پارلیمنٹ کو ریٹورس میں
کس طرح سے یہ لوگ انڈیوٹس کرتے ہیں۔
اس لئے یہ کہتا ہوں کہ ام ایم بی
صحیح کر دے۔ اس لئے یوٹی آئی کو

یہ کہا گیا، ام ایم بی صحیح کر دے اس لئے
ٹاٹا ایر لائنس کے بارے میں کہہ دیا گیا۔
ڈپارٹمنٹ میں جو لوگ رہتے ہیں چاہے
سیکورس خط ام بی لکھ دیں، لیکن اگر
سرکار یہ نہیں چاہتی ہے، تو کوئی مسووا
نہیں ہوئی اور کوئی کام نہیں ہوتا۔ اور کوئی
عرف وہ چاہتے ہیں کہ کام کرنا ہے، کام کرنا
ہے تو پھر وہ کہتے ہیں کہ ام بی کے پیڑ پر
لیٹر ہینڈ پر لے آؤ، ہم کام کرنا دیتے ہیں۔
یہ میں اس لئے کہہ رہا ہوں کہ ہمارے
ایم بیز کو بھی جو کتنا رہنا چاہئے، کیونکہ
ایسیجی وہ آپریشن کرتے ہیں تو اکثر
وہ ایسے کچھ اسٹیپس اور کچھ لیٹر ہینڈ
کا استعمال کرتے ہیں اور جو میں یہاں اکثر
کے کہتے کہ اپنے تو یہ کہا تھا۔ مہدیہ

SHRI PROMOD MAHAJAN: You
said it on the floor of the House.

SHRI MD. SALIM: Yes. I wanted this
from you. Fortunately, that day, after
your re-election, you came to the House.
We also raised the issue on Tata airlines
after your appointment as a Minister.
Our party people restrained themselves,
in spite of the request made by our
colleagues, in respect of our commitment
for the public sector, the Indian Airlines.
We did not go to the hon. Prime Minister
when a delegation of the Members of
Parliament went there. Because, I know,
personally, how this coterie is operating
and how jet-set people are getting along.
That is why, in this House, I referred,

اس ہاؤس کا معاملہ ہے اور اس ہاؤس
میں یہ بات اٹھائی تھی اور میں نے کہا تھا

کہ انڈین ایئر لائن کے مفاد میں اور اس وقت ونگٹنٹا نا ریڈو جو جی نے یہ کہا تھا کہ آپ جب انڈین ایئر لائن کے مفاد میں کچھ ہیں۔ ٹاٹا ایئر لائن کے مفاد میں کہہ رہے ہیں تو کیوں نہیں جیٹ ایئر لائن کے مفاد میں کچھ اس وقت افسوس کا معاملہ یہ تھا کہ میں اٹھا اور میرے ساتھ دو چار ایم بی نے اسے اشکری کے ساتھ سو کر کہا جیٹ ایئر لائن کو بھی ایکسپیشن کی جو آئیے بیڑمیشن دی ہے اس کو بھی رد کر ائیے، ہم جیٹ کے پکیش میں نہیں ہیں۔ اس وقت منتری مہودے یہاں پہنچے اور یہاں دیکھا کہ میں ہے کہ منتری مہودے تھے اور انھوں نے کوئی ریسپانسی اس معاملہ میں نہیں دیا۔

میں پھر گروسوامی کے معاملہ میں جارہا ہوں۔ گروسوامی جی کا یہی تو چارج ہے، اسی بارے میں جب پرائم منٹر چاہتے ہیں، پرائم منٹر کا آفس چاہتا ہے تو وہ ساتوں رات کام کر دیتے ہیں جیسے بیڑمیرا کے معاملہ میں کیا۔ پورا اخلت [

श्री एम० वेंकैया नायडु: आप टाइम डिस्टाइड कीजिए, हम उसको ऐंटाइड करेंगे।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Salim, your party was allotted twenty minutes. You have already taken thirty-three minutes, which is more than that. Mr. Shourie took thirty-nine minutes and Dr. Manmohan Singh took thirty-two minutes. You have already taken more than the time taken by Dr. Manmohan Singh. Now, we have taken around two hours. Now, how long shall we continue? The total allotment of time is five hours. It means, if we have to finish it today, we have to sit till 8.00 PM.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: इसीलिए हम जे०पी०सी० की मांग कर रहे हैं। गवर्नमेंट अगर अभी एलान कर दे कि जे०पी०सी० बना रहे हैं तो हम बैठ जायेंगे और यह मामला जे०पी०सी० में डिस्कस होगा।

†† اشفري محمد سليم : اس لئے ہم جے پی سی کی مانگ کر رہے ہیں۔ گورنمنٹ اگر اسے اعلان کر دے۔ کہ ہم جے پی سی بنارہے ہیں تو ہم بیٹھ جائیں گے اور یہ معاملہ جے پی سی میں ڈسکس ہو گا۔

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the House decide ... (Interruptions)... No, no. That is not the issue ... (Interruptions)... That is not the issue. That is a different thing. I am asking about today's sitting. Have we to sit? It means, if every Member speaks for more than the time allotted to the party, it means, today, we will have to sit very long. Do we want to finish it today? I want the House to decide what to do. Do you want to sit today till 10 o' clock or 12 o' clock? At what time should we adjourn the House?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: We can sit up to 10 o' clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am asking till what time we should continue today.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, I am not interrupting him. You please decide about the sitting because today is Saturday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. You are right.

†† [Transliteration in Arabic Script]

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, we can resume the discussion on Monday. We can go up to 8 o' clock and continue again on Monday. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सभापति महोदय, आज रविवार है, कल इतवार है, हमारे बहुत से प्रोग्राम लगे हुए हैं, देने जा रही है, फ्लाइड्स जा रही हैं ...*(व्यवधान)*

श्री सभापति: मैं वही आपसे पूछ रहा हूँ कि आज कितने बजे तक बैठना है ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री गुलाब नबी आजाद: आज 6 बजे तक इस पर विस्मय करें, फिर सोमवार को करेंगे ...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE MINISTER OF POWER MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF NON-CONVENTIONAL ENERGY SOURCES (**SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM**): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I understand that it was decided, if I recollect rightly, in the BAC that we will complete it today. We had been allotted five hours. We started at 3.18 p.m. So, we can go till 8.18 p.m. I request that it should be finished today because we have a Calling Attention on Monday. We have other business also. Five hours are more than sufficient for a subject like this ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): This is not Government's business ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, in the Business Advisory Committee also we decided to complete it today. But at that point of time the understanding was that only those who are opposing it will speak on it. And all of us had an understanding that before lunch it will be completed. But it went on till 3.18 p.m. So, my respectful submission, through you, to the Government and to the Members of the House is that as many Members have to catch flights and trains, today being the holiday, we should sit up to 6 o' clock only. We will have to restrict the time. I can assure the

Government we will complete the business which has been slated for Monday, that is, the Railway Budget and all the other business. Only this much assurance I can give to the House. So, it would be desirable if we adjourn at 6.00 p.m. We can spend two-and-a-half hours on this issue on Monday. Thereafter, we can take up the business, slated for Monday and complete that by sitting till late evening. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Sir, we could not finish the business for Friday also. We have done only the Company Companies (Amendment) Bill. We still have the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Repeal Bill. We still have the Railway Budget. We still have the Goa Budget. We still have the ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: The Goa Budget could not be taken up because of the Government, and not because of us. We were prepared to ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let him speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Sir, I will speak when I am allowed I only wish to submit that there is enough work which was slated for yesterday and day-before-yesterday, and which is going to be taken up on Monday. There is the Railway Budget. There is the General Budget, which we have to consider. There are some others also which, due to time limit, we have to finish. I dare not cross Pranabda, who is a very senior leader, but if I recollect very clearly four hours were sought for.

It was said that at the latest it will finish by 3 o' clock. What was sought is, "Give us our share of four hours, our portion of 1/3rd of that." This is what was pressed by some Members where both sides, the Congress and the BJP, would not press their cases. We have yet not crossed very much. We have crossed by only 18 minutes. If at all, we are going

by the same limit, all I am saying is keep to the limit of 8 o' clock, as planned earlier. It was not decided to finish at 6 o' clock. I repeat it was not decided to finish at 6 o' clock. 7 o' clock is the best; at the worst, one hour more, that is, if one has to discuss what happened in the BAC, which is normally not done. By 8 o' clock we can finish. This subject is not so large that we go on talking. In fact, many of us are achieving many standards of communication where we can spend time and not communicate much. So, I plead that we can be quick with it and we can go on.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I would like to remind the hon'ble Minister that yesterday we were prepared to sit. What happened? Why Goa was not taken up? For the first time, on a Private Members' Day we agreed to sit beyond 5.00. I do not know. I was taken about aback because we were prepared to sit beyond 7.00 P.M. It is unfortunate to pass on the buck to the Opposition. Please remember, for the first time, on a Friday, we transacted Government business. In the Rajya Sabha we never transacted Government business after 5.15 P.M. The House requires cooperation from both sides. I am assuming that, from our side, we will try to complete all the business, including the pending business, by Monday - whatever time is required - so that nothing spills over from Monday to Tuesday. Beyond that, if you want to force us, it will not go on like this. Then it will not be possible for us to cooperate with the Government. *... (Interruptions) ...* If the Government business does not come, it is not our fault. If we have to wait for the Railway Budget till Monday, it is not our fault. If we have to wait for the General Budget till Thursday, it is not our fault because the Government could not plan their business in such a way so that the business of two House synchronize. So what can be done? I am not prepared to sit beyond six.

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: I do not want to cross swords over this issue. I am sorry, Sir, but it is unfair *... (Interruptions) ...*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kumaramangalam, you please listen Mr. Nilotpal Basu also and then you can reply.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, what Pranabdas said: we support. We had the predicament during the entire Winter Session. No Government business was there. We were begging of them to please produce some Government business. There was no Government business Yesterday, we sat for the Goa Appropriation Bill. Why was the Goa Appropriation Bill not ready? We asked the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs as to why he has not getting the Goa Appropriation Bill passed. He said that it was not ready. Now, he is saying that we are not cooperating *... (Interruptions) ...*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him reply.

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Sir, I do not want to cross swords or dispute what Pranabdas is saying. But the fact is, we lost a number of days in this House. Why we lost time in this House, we know. I do not want to say why and what happened. The important thing for us to understand is that, yesterday, we could have done the Goa Appropriation Bill because the General Budget can be discussed *de hors* the appropriation bill. I was under the impression, very frankly, that was going to happen. But I was told at 6.45 P.M. that the House had said 'enough is enough' we can take up Goa on Monday; it is a small matter; it is for one hour. I said 'all right' I am sorry. If I am wrong, I correct myself. But we were ready on the Goa budget. The only issue was the Urban Land Ceiling Bill. There was request that 'let us have it on Monday'. But, may I just point out that, today, what we are seeking is not more than what was decided in the Business Advisory Committee. I never sought four

hours. Government did not propose four hours for the Patents Bill. Four hours and eighteen minutes have been taken. What I am seeking is 'let us complete what has been decided'. Of course, my primary duty, my Government's primary duty the Treasury Benches' primary duty is to see that the Government business comes and it goes on in this House. It is also equally my duty, as the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, to cooperate, to help, find time for discussions which we have decided upon, and I am saying with enough responsibility. I request and plead through you, Sir, to the House that was have very limited time. All of us have got to do certain things which are statutorily, constitutionally required. Please keep that in mind. This discussion could be completed today. I know everybody knows this....*(Interruptions)*...I am requesting all the hon'ble Members not to disturb the House....*(Interruptions)*....

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, while requesting for our co-operation, he has again charged that the time lost in this House was due to us. We did not ask the Government to impose the President's Rule in Bihar. We did not ask it not to let us know what would happen about Bihar. We did not ask it to revoke it. Three or four days have been lost merely because the Government could not....*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, there is no point. That is right.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Actually, we have obliged the Government by sitting beyond the Private Members' time yesterday. Today is a holiday. We have our programmes. This is an additional time that we have given. Tomorrow is the only holiday for us. There are commitments in the constituencies, which we have suddenly cancelled. On an extra day, we are asking this. Somebody has to catch a flight. Somebody else has got to catch a train today. If the Government does not oblige and if it is so rigid....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, today we transacted the Government business. Four were devoted for transacting the Government business. Had we taken it up at eleven o'clock, this business which is ours, we could have completed it by this time. In the morning we transacted the Government business. Yesterday, we were prepared to sit to transact another Government business. I do not understand this. It is really intriguing to me.

The Urban Land Ceiling Bill has been passed by the other House. It was to be passed in this House. Why should the Government take more time? What is the rationality in it? Why was it not brought yesterday? These things are really intriguing. After all, it has been decided that we would sit up to seven o'clock. I do not mind sitting up to seven O'clock. But the Government will have to keep in view that everyday we will sit and get up just at seven o'clock. Whatever be the fate of the business. Otherwise, please cooperate with us. Let us adjourn at 6.00 p.m. today.

We are giving our words that we will complete the Government business including today's business by Monday and that there will be no spill-over from Monday to Tuesday. I want to have an assurance from the Government that the Government will not reschedule the business which it has already indicated to us and the dates that it has indicated to us. I am prepared to sit. On the Railway Budget, we will have general discussions only. We are prepared to pass the Railway Appropriations. But, if you come and say that the Railway Appropriation Bill has not been passed in the Lok Sabha, What can we do?

This is my respectful submission to the Government.

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: I cannot say no to Shri Pranab Mukherjee. He is too senior for me to go and cut short. He has given such a clear

assurance on behalf of the Opposition to us. I would have to accept it. We will sit for whatever time they are willing to sit.

But, I request him and implore them once again: please understand that I have a responsibility, that they have a responsibility and that we have a collective responsibility. Let us move ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have heard him. We will sit till six o'clock today, and the whole business will be taken up and finished on Monday.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Monday at twelve o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with Mr. Ghulam Nabi Azad that day we will have no special Mentions and nothing else because we have to finish this. The Calling Attention on industry will be postponed. It can be postponed.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, while replying, the hon. Minister said, "The time was lost, and the reason is known." we wanted to cast aspersions on the Opposition side....(Interruptions)

This is my opinion.

We demanded from the Treasury Benches to tell us if the Proclamation on Bihar would be revoked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That issue is over now.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: The reason lies with the Government and not with the Opposition. This is my opinion.

SHRI P. R. KUMARAMANGALAM: He is going against the ruling of the Chair. I don't want to point out anything more than that....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Now that is over.

MR. Salim, you continue till six o'clock. Then we will adjourn till Monday.

SHRI MD. SALIM: For the last fifteen minutes when all these things were being said, I did not say a single word at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already taken more than one-and-a-half times the time allotted to you.

SHRI MD. SALIM: This issue cannot be dealt with in a short time....(Interruptions)

अरुण शौरी जी इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में अपने इंटरव्यू में बार बार कह रहे थे। गुरुआत के बारे में कह रहे थे लेकिन आखिरी के बारे में नहीं कहा।

[The Vice chairman (Shri T.N. Chaturvedi in the Chair).

23 फरवरी को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में जो इंटरव्यू उनका छपा है, गुरुखामी जी का उसमें वे कहते हैं कि:

This is in relation to the appointment of Directors and Managing Directors of the State Bank of India, IDBI, LIC, UTI, GIC. It says:

"On the last day, the PMO woke up and offered a six months' extension to Mr. Verma. Mr. Verma turned it down. But, when the PMO wants to act, they act fast. When they wanted to get rid of Bezbaruah. ..."
(Interruptions)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी.एन. चतुर्वेदी): समय का ध्यान रखिए। अब आप खतम करिए।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: चेयरमैन साहब कह कर गए हैं कि...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी.एन. चतुर्वेदी): चेयरमैन गए इस इंटरव्यू के साथ कि आपका टाइम इयोउटा हो चुका है।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: बैज बरुआ साहब और आपको मालूम है कि जय ललिता जी, साउथ में जो हमारी दीदी हैं...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी.एन. चतुर्वेदी): मेहरबानी करके खतम कीजिए और कोई दूसरा बोलेगा।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: उसके बारे में उन्होंने कहा, उस वक्त भी एंटीगेशन लगाया गया था। किस तरह से किसी के कारण रोक किया गया और किसी दूसरे का बहाना किया गया। तो यह तो पुष्टी आदत है। इसी तरह से रिलायन्स के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। दूसरे

لوگوں نے ریلیاؤنس کے بارے میں نہیں کہا۔ اس میں یہ دکھایا جاتا ہے کہ سی-बी-سی، اس بارے میں بیل آ رہا ہے۔ سی-बी-سی نے پائل دیا لیکن سی-बी-آئی کے ڈائریکٹر کو جانا پڑا اور پائل میں جو بڑے آدمی تھے ان کو ان کا ایجنڈا دیا گیا تھا۔ لیکن پھر بھی آپ ڈائریکٹر کی بات کرتے ہیں۔ جب آپ ڈائریکٹر کی بات کرتے ہیں تو آپ ان کو جلیٹ فرم کر دیتے ہیں۔ حکومت کو جلیٹ فرم دینا چاہیے۔ یہ فیصلہ کیا گیا ہے، پرائمر مینسٹر کے پاس سے ان کو ریلیاؤنس آنا چاہیے کہ کس طرح سے گورنمنٹی ساہب یہ چارج لے رہے ہیں۔ اس میں یہ بہت ریلیاؤنس ہو جاتا ہے۔

اسی طرح سے ہندوؤں کا معاملہ ہے۔ انہی ان کے لوگ پلانٹ رہتے ہیں۔ جو بڑے بڑے انڈسٹریسٹ ہوتے ہیں...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी-एन- जयवंदी): अब आप खत्म करिए।

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: मैं इसको कहता हूँ, आफिसर ऑन स्पेशल इयूटी सिंडरम इसको कहता हूँ।

الاشرفی محمد سلیم: ارون شوری جی انڈین ایکسپریس میں اپنے انٹرویو میں بار بار کہہ رہے تھے۔ شروعات کے بارے میں کہہ رہے تھے۔ لیکن آخری کے بارے میں نہیں کہا۔ اس فروری کو انڈین ایکسپریس میں جو انٹرویو ان کا چھپا ہے گرو سوامی جی کا اس میں یہ کہتے ہیں کہ...

This is in relation to the appointment of Directors and Managing Directors of the State Bank of India, IDBI, LIC, UTI, GIC. It says:

"On the last day, the PMO woke up and offered a six months' extension to Mr. Verma. Mr. Verma turned it down. But, when the PMO wants to act, they act fast. When they wanted to get rid of Bezbaruah." (Interruptions)

[T] Transliteration in Arabic Script

اب سبھا ادھیکشن شری تروکی نافقہ
چتر ویری: وقت کا دھیان رکھو اور
اب آپ غم کر لیتے۔

شری محمد سلیم: چیئرمین صاحب
کہہ کر گئے ہیں کہ...

اب سبھا ادھیکشن: چیئرمین گئے
اس انٹرکشن کے ساتھ کہ آپ کا ٹائم
ڈیڑ گھنٹہ ہو چکا ہے۔

شری محمد سلیم: بیڑ پروا صاحب
آپ کو معلوم ہے کہ جے لٹا کی ساؤتھ
میں جو ہماری دی ری ہیں...

اب سبھا ادھیکشن: ممبرانی کو غم
کیتے اور کوئی دوسرا بولے گا۔

شری محمد سلیم: اس کے بارے میں
انہوں نے کہا، اس وقت بھی الیکشن
لگایا گیا تھا۔ جس طرح سے کسی کے کارڈ
ٹھیک کیا گیا اور کسی دوسرے کا بہانا لیا
گیا۔ تو یہ تو برائی عادت ہے اس طرح
سے ریلیاؤنس کے بارے میں کہنا چاہتا
ہوں۔ دوسرے لوگوں نے ریلیاؤنس کے
بارے میں نہیں کہا اس میں یہ دیکھا جاتا
ہے کہ سبھی سبھی اس بارے میں بل
کر رہے ہیں۔ سبھی سبھی نے پائل دیا لیکن
سبھی سبھی کے ڈائریکٹر کو کوٹا پڑا۔ اور
پائل میں جو قدر آدمی تھا اس کو پارٹنٹ

کیا گیا، کر سکتے ہیں یہ گورنمنٹ کا بری
و بیج ہے۔ لیکن پھر بھی آپ ٹرانس
پیرنسی کی بات کرتے ہیں۔ جب آپ
ٹرانس پیرنسی کی بات کرتے ہیں تو آپ
اسکو جسٹی فائی کریں، حکومت کو جسٹی
فیکیشن دینا چاہیے۔ میں سوال کیا ہے
پروٹ منسٹر کے پاس سے اس کا جواب لینا
چاہیے کہ کس طرح سے گورنمنٹ صاحب
یہ چارج لاد رہے ہیں، اس میں یہ بہت
ریلیوینس ہو جاتا ہے۔

اسی طرح سے ہندو جا کا معاملہ ہے
ابھی اس کے لوگ پلا ٹوڑ رہے ہیں جو
بڑے انڈسٹریسٹ ہوتے ہیں۔۔۔۔

اب سبھا دیکھیں: اب آپ ختم
کریں۔

شری محمد سلیم: میں اسکو کہتا ہوں
"فیسر آف اسپیشل ٹیوٹی سنڈرم"
اس کو کہتا ہوں۔

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): When will you wind up?

SHRI MD. SALIM: I am winding up.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): But, you are going on much too long.

SHRI MD. SALIM: No. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you are an experienced Member in this House. We wanted to complete the Short Duration Discussion today. After fifteen minutes of wrangling and all that, we agreed that we will discuss it on Monday also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): But, before the wrangling had started, you had already exceeded your time limit.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: हिन्दुजा के बारे में सुन लीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी. एन. चतुर्वेदी): एक बात करें जो भी है उसको दो मिनट में खत्म करिए।

I will give you two minutes more and then will call the next speaker.

SHRI MD. SALIM: The Chairman had told me that I should continue.

† اسی طرح سے پہلے دیکھا کہ ہندو جا
پاور پروجیکٹ۔ وٹا تھا پشتم میں جو
ہندو جا نیشنل ٹرمل پاور کمپنی ہے اس
میں کس طرح سے باہری دباؤ ڈالا گیا۔
آپ وقت نہیں دے رہے ہیں۔ نہیں تو
میں نے نوڈ کرنا تھا۔ یہ انٹرویو ایجنسی
ایچ میں الرمارج کو چھپا ہے۔ اس میں
ہے کہ:

"Another matter in which the PMO is definitely in the know of things pertains to the coal supply transport agreement between the Hinduja National Power company Limited and the Government of India. In early July, the finance Minister had announced with great applause that he was clearing the two long pending fast tract projects. One was the Hinduja-promoted 1,000 megawatt project." (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): My point is that you have exceeded your time-limit. And you have mentioned all these points.

† [Transliteration in Arabic Script]

SHRI MD. SALIM: these points were not mentioned either by me, or by Mr. Arun shourie or by Mr. Manmohan Singh.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): The next speaker is Mr. Jitendra Prasada, who will begin the discussion and resume it on Monday. These are the instructions to me.

SHRI MD. SALIM: But, Sir, you cannot overrule the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): No. this is the instruction to me. (Interruptions) this is not fair.

SHRI MD. SALIM: The Chairman gave a direction, which you cannot subsequently overrule. this is my submission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Please wind up. When the next speaker is called, he will continue subsequently.

الاشرفی محمد سلیم: شاراٹ ڈیوریشن
ڈسکشن ہو گیا الٹ ڈیوریشن ڈسکشن
ہو، ایک دن کی بات ہو یا دو دن کی
بات ہو، آپ کو معلوم ہے، بھرت سے
ایسے مردے یہاں پر آئے ہیں۔ اسپیس
فکلی ایسے معاملہ ہیں جو ان کے ذریعہ اپنا
کے گئے ایڈوائزر، جنہوں نے ان کا مینو
فیسو بنایا عقابو میں انہوں نے کہا کہ
دن مینی فیسو سے ہٹ گئے، نیفٹل
ایڈوائز سے ہٹ گئے، منتری کے ایڈوائزر
تھے ایک دن ایک منتری نے کہا دو سو
دن دو سو منتری نے کہا، بی ایم او

نے کہا کہ یہ کلرکزدو۔ یہ جو کچھ ان
اور میں نے یہ ایک دن یہاں پر بحث
کرنے ختم نہیں کر سکتے ہیں۔ اسی نے
ہم نے یہاں پر موشن دیا تھا ۱۹۸ کے
ذریعہ۔ جسے پی سی کا کانسی ٹیوش
ہوا اگر دوسرا ہاؤس اس سے کنٹرکرتا ہے
تو میٹ ورڈ اس ہاؤس کی کنکشن میں
جائے کیوں کہ صرف ایک وٹ منتری کے
اختیار میں نہیں ہے کہ وہ تمام سوالوں
کو سیٹھائی کر دیں ڈی براؤن منسٹر
دی لیڈر آف دی کینٹ۔ ہی فائوس
دی کینٹ۔

فادیشن سے لیکر اب تک ان تمام
سوالوں کے ساتھ جڑے ہوئے ہیں اور
یہاں سے لیکر کے بڑے بڑے ملٹی نیفٹل
تک ہمارے دیش کا سوارقہ جڑا ہوا ہے
ہمارا مستقبل جڑا ہوا ہے، ہمارا پارلیمانی
لظام جڑا ہوا ہے ہمارا قانون برستور جڑا
ہوا ہے۔ یہ معاملہ مر ایڈوائزر کا یا غار
ایڈوائزر کا ہی نہیں ہے۔ اس نے ہم چاہے
ہیں اور سرکار بھی ٹرانس پیئرینسی کا ڈولی
کرتی ہے اور ایڈوائزیشن ختم کرنے کا بھی
معاملہ ہے، اس نے جو انٹ پاور لیمینٹی
کمیٹی اپائنٹ کی جانی چاہی ہے جسے یہ معاملہ
صحیح طریقہ سے اجاگر ہو سکتا ہے اور یہ

پتہ چل سکتا ہے کہ کس نے سچی کون کھڑی
ہیں۔
"ختم شد"

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): When will you wind up?

SHRI MD. SALIM: I am winding up.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): But, you are going on much too long.

SHRI MD. SALIM: No. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you are an experienced Member in this House. We wanted to completed the Short Duration Discussion today. After fifteen minutes of wrangling and all that, we agree that we will discuss it on Monday also.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): But, before the wrangling had started, you had already exceeded your time-limit.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: हिन्दुजा के बारे में सुन लीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी. एन. चतुर्वेदी): एक बात करें जो भी है उसके दो मिनट में खत्म करिए।

I will give you two minutes more and then will call the next speaker.

SHRI MD. SALIM: The Chairman had told me that I should continue.

इसी तरह से हमने देखा कि हिन्दुजा पावर प्रोजेक्ट, विशाखापट्टनम में जो हिन्दुजा नेशनल थर्मल पावर कंपनी है उसमें किस तरह से बाहरी दबाव डाला गया। आप बकत नहीं दे रहे हैं। नहीं तो मुझे कोट करना था। यह इंटरव्यू एशियन एज में 11 मार्च को छपा है है, इसमें है कि:

"Another matter in which the PMO is definitely in the know of things pertains to the coal supply transport agreement between the Hinduja National Power Company Limited and the Government of India. In early July, the Finance Minister had announced with great

applause that he was clearing the two long pending fast track projects. One was the Hinduja-promoted 1,000 megawatt project." (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): My point is that you have exceeded your time-limit. And you have mentioned all these points.

SHRI MD. SALIM: These points were not mentioned either by me, or by Mr. Arun Shourie or by Mr. Manmohan Singh.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): The next speaker is Mr. Jitendra Prasada, who will begin the discussion and resume it on Monday. These are the instructions to me.

SHRI MD. SALIM: But, Sir, you cannot overrule the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): No. This is the instruction to me. (Interruptions) This is not fair.

SHRI MD. SALIM: The Chairman gave a direction, which you cannot subsequently overrule. This is my submission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Please wind up. When the next speaker is called, he will continue subsequently.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम: शार्ट ड्युरेशन डिसकशन हो या लॉग ड्युरेशन डिसकशन हो, एक दिन की बात हो या दो दिन की बात हो, आपको मालूम है, बहुत से ऐसे मुद्दे यहां पर आए हैं, स्पेसिफिकली ऐसे मामले हैं जो उनके द्वारा अप्वाइंट किये गये एडवाइजर, जिन्होंने उनका मेनिफेस्टो बनाया था, बाद में उन्होंने कहा कि वे मेनिफेस्टो से हट गये, नेशनल एजेंडा से हट गये, मंत्री के एडवाइजर थे, एक दिन एक मंत्री ने कहा, दूसरे दिन दूसरे मंत्री ने कहा, पीएम-ओ ने कहा कि यह क्लीयर कर दो, यह जो कैबिनेट आफ वॉर्स है, यह एक दिन यहां पर बहस कर के खत्म नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसीलिए हमने यहां पर मोशन दिया था 168 के जरिये, 170 के जरिये जे०पी०सी० का कंस्टीट्यूशन हो, अगर दूसरा हाऊस इससे कन् कर करता है तो ठीक करना इस नॉऊंस का कमेटी बन जाए क्योंकि सिर्फ एक

वित्त मंत्री के अख्तियार के अन्दर नहीं है कि वह तमाम सवाल को सेटिसफाई कर दें। The Prime Minister is the leader of the Cabinet. He forms the Cabinet. फॉर्मेशन से ले कर अब तक इन तमाम सवालों के साथ जुड़े हुए हैं और यहां से ले कर के बड़े बड़े मल्टीनेशनल् तक हमारे देश का स्वार्थ जुड़ा हुआ है, हमारा भविष्य जुड़ा हुआ है, हमारी संसदीय व्यवस्था जुड़ी हुई है, हमारा कानून और दस्तूर जुड़ा हुआ है। यह मामला सिर्फ एडवाइजर का या फार्मर एडवाइजर का ही नहीं है, इसलिए हम चाहते हैं और सरकार भी ट्रांसपैरेंसी का दावा करती है और इंटेग्रिटी खत्म होने का भी मामला है, इसलिए ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी अप्वाइंट की जानी चाहिये तभी यह मामला सही तरीके से उजागर हो सकता है और यह पता चल सकता है कि किस के पीछे कौन खड़े हैं।

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं काफी देर से इस चर्चा को सुन रहा हूँ। नेता विरोधी दल और उस तरह से भी सदस्य बोले। बड़ा गम्भीर विषय है। गम्भीर इस मायने में कह रहा हूँ कि यह तो तथ्य सामने आए हैं इन पर आज हम बहस करने जा रहे हैं। यह तथ्य किसी और ने नहीं बल्कि जो एक एडवाइजर था फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर का सिर्फ एडवाइजर ही नहीं था बल्कि सत्ताधारी दल का सदस्य था, जैसे कि समाचार पत्रों में निकला है, उसके इंटरव्यू में निकला है, उसका इस दल के मेनिफेस्टो बनाने में भी योगदान था, उसने कुछ तथ्य देश के सामने रखे हैं, समाचार-पत्रों के सामने रखे हैं। यह ऐसा मसला नहीं था कि विरोध पक्ष और सत्ता पक्ष एक दूसरे पर कीचड़ उछालते। कुछ बातें ऐसी थीं जिससे देश में वातावरण दूषित हुआ है, एक कनफ्यूजन देश के अन्दर बहुत से तथ्यों को ले कर के पैदा हुआ है। इस चर्चा का लक्ष्य यही था। यहां जो हम लोग जे०पी०सी० की डिमांड कर रहे हैं, उसके पीछे लक्ष्य यह नहीं था कि कोई डिबेटिंग प्वाइंट स्कोर करें और यहां इन के ऊपर इल्ज़ाम लगाएँ, आरोप लगाएँ, यह मकसद नहीं था। हम यह चाहते थे कि एक वरिष्ठ अधिकारी ने जिसको इस सरकार के वित्त मंत्री का विश्वास प्राप्त था और मैं तो यह कहूँगा कि प्रधानमंत्री और पूरी सरकार का विश्वास प्राप्त था, एकदम से ऐसी क्या बातें हुईं जिनकी वजह से उसने बहुत ही गम्भीर तथ्य सरकार की कार्य-प्रणाली और निर्णयों के बारे में देश के सामने रखे। बजाय इसके कि हम इस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करते, ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि हम आरोपों-प्रत्यारोपों की बहस

में चले गये। मैं इसमें नहीं जाना चाहता। मैं सिर्फ यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो सच्चाई है वह देश के सामने आनी चाहिये ताकि जनता में जो भ्रम पैदा हुआ है वह दूर हो सके। मान्यवर, जब मैं आरोपों की बात करता हूँ कि यह जरूर कहना चाहूँगा कि सत्ताधारी दल जब चुनाव में आया था तो उन्होंने अपना एक मेनिफेस्टो बनाया था। उस मेनिफेस्टो में पारदर्शिता की बात कही गई थी मैं उसको उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ... (व्यवधान)

श्री एम० वेंकैया नायडु: किस का मेनिफेस्टो है?

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: आपका है, भारतीय जनता पार्टी का।

श्री एम० वेंकैया नायडु: उन्हें नहीं लिखा।

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: आपने लिखा है। (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी० एन० चतुर्वेदी): ट्रांसपैरेंसी वर्ड आया है, इसलिए कह रहे हैं। (व्यवधान)

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: यह आपका मेनिफेस्टो है, यह आपने लिखा है। इसके पेज नम्बर 8 पर आप देखेंगे तो 6.00 P.M.

इस में हैंडिंग है: सूचना प्राप्त करने का अधिकार

“भा०जा०पा० लोगों में विश्वास पैदा करने के लिए सरकारी कामकाज में पारदर्शिता लाने के ठोस उपाय करने में विश्वास रखती है। न केवल सरकार की कार्यप्रणाली पारदर्शी होनी चाहिए बल्कि ऐसा प्रतीत भी होना चाहिए कि वह पारदर्शी है। अतः हम सरकार के कामकाज में लोगों को सूचना देने के पक्ष में हैं। भा०जा०पा० लोगों को यथा-व्यवहारिक अधिक-से-अधिक सूचना प्रदान करने के काम में वृद्धि करेगी। गोपनीयता संबंधी नियमों और विनियमों की समीक्षा करेगी। विकास कार्यों में सामाजिक परीक्षण की प्रक्रिया शुरू करेगी।”

तो जब आप पारदर्शिता की बात करते हैं, सूचना देने के अधिकार की बात करते हैं तो उस के संबंध में आप के भूतपूर्व एडवाइजर ने बहुत सी बातें कही हैं और उस पर इस तरह की बहस से कुछ नहीं निकलेगा कि अभी शरीरी जी ने कुछ तथ्य रख दिए, हम ने कुछ तथ्य रख दिए या उन के इंटरव्यू को पढ़कर इन्होंने कुछ इंटीप्रिटेशन निकाल लिया, हम ने कुछ इंटीप्रिटेशन निकाल लिया। हमारा आप से सिर्फ यही कहना था कि कम-से-कम बैठकर डिबेट्स में एक-एक मुद्दे पर डिस्कसन होता है और हमें जानकारी मिलती। बहुत सी फाइलें रेफर की गयी हैं, बहुत से दस्तावेज रेफर किए गए हैं और बहुत सी मीटिंगों के बारे में कहा गया है,

उन के संबंध में किस तरीके से देश की जनता को हम अवगत करा सकें कि जो निर्णय लिए गए हैं.... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, he can continue on Monday.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Let him finish that sentence. It is 6 o'clock. Let him finish that sentence. Then the House will stand adjourned.

श्री जितेन्द्र प्रसाद: सर, मैं यही कह रहा था कि जिन निर्णयों के बारे में जिक्र किया गया है, उन के बारे में हमें जानकारी चाहिए और इसी को लेकर हम ने बहस की मांग की थी, उन्हीं तथ्यों को हम जानना चाहते हैं। इस में बहुत सी बातें उद्धृत की गयी थीं, मैं आगाह

सिर्फ यह करना चाहता था कि मामला सत्ताधारी दल जितने हल्के तौर से ले रहा है, उतना हल्का नहीं है। महोदय, उन्होंने जो बात कही है या अगर हम उन के इंटरव्यू को पढ़ते हैं, तो वह सारे आरोप प्रधान मंत्री जी के ओर जा रहे हैं। आज वाक्येयी जी का 40 साल का राजनीतिक इतिहास एक विपक्षी दल के नेता के रूप में उभरा है। हम यह कह सकते हैं कि उन के व्यक्तित्व पर कोई आंच आज तक नहीं आई।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Now, it is already 6 o'clock. Shri Jitendra Prasad will continue on Monday. Now the House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at three minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 15th March.