

[Prof Madhu Dandavate]

Chair's approval

but that is so

As far as one case is concerned, we were told that the Syrian Bank's share issue was raised. It is altogether a different issue. You have raised it for the first time. We are not just now posted with all the details about that, because that issue was not part and parcel of the Call Attention Notice. But separately we will try to collect the information and write to you. Similarly, as far as the building and other things are concerned, if you look at these 15 or 25 cases which have been mentioned, all the FERA violations, tax violations and customs violations are maintained.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: If you are not fully informed about other matters, you can collect the information and give it later on, we do not mind. But please say whether what you have given is conclusive or illustrative. I pointed out by saying that the Syrian Bank business and shares transfer etc. having not come to your notice does not take away from the fact that it is within the framework of the Call Attention Notice because it concerns tax violations. For all these buildings tax has not been paid. So it is within the Call Attention Notice. If this is not conclusive, please say that.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE: Please listen to me. The issue which you have raised is different from the issue which others have raised. Now I am coming to the issue which you have raised. As far as that issue is concerned, it was not the question of transfer of shares. It does not fall within the purview of the Call Attention Notice. It is a different part. But on that we will collect the information. (*Interruptions*)

Let me complete. I did not interfere when you spoke. You can speak after I finish my speech. Otherwise, my trend is completely cut off. I do not take shelter behind the rules. After I sit down, you can speak for hours together and ask me any number of questions. I will answer them subject to the

Sir, one of the allegations is regarding the non-compliance of conditions. Under this, the RBI has permitted Indian Express to maintain the sterling Account in Loyds Bank, London. The non-compliance alleged is regarding the non-furnishing of the statements, remittance of certificate etc. to the RBI. Normally, if the non-compliance is of any serious nature, then it would be intimated to the Enforcement Directorate by the RBI. We have not received any such communication, but we will ourselves unilaterally write to the RBI and try to find out whether any action on our part is called for. We will definitely intervene in the matter, but only because on the spur of the moment you have raised the issue, I am afraid I may not be able to deal with that.

Sir, as far as all the details are concerned, without hiding anything, these are all in the judicial process and the final word is yet to come. So let not this House go away with the information that all these 15 or 16 cases that have been already placed before the House in the form of this document is the final verdict, the final judicial verdict is yet to come. It might be one way or the other, but if anybody points out to us any further violations which are suspected, we will scrutinise it. Not only about Indian Express, about other institutions also if you have any material you can pass it on to me. As a Finance Minister, I will act, I will not consider the political view or the ideological orientation of any particular journal or any institution. We will strictly go by the letter of the law, the spirit of the law and act accordingly.

THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Eighth Report

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI JAGDEEP DHANKAR): Sir, I beg to

move:

"That this House do agree with the Eighth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 24th April, 1990."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That this House do agree with the Eighth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 24th April, 1990."

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mormugao): Sir, I have given a notice for amendment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not allowed to move.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Sir, it is allowed both in practice and procedure.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are just making a submission.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Do you want me to move it?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am saying that you are not allowed by the office to move it.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Why am I not allowed?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay, you may make the submission.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: There is one important situation regarding what is happening in Kashmir and concerning the Indo-Pak relations, at this point of time with which Parliament is not being informed about. What I want is that the House should have a discussion for which I have given notices. Number one is, on the talks that the Minister of External Affairs is holding today in New York with his Pakistani counterpart, he should make a statement as soon as possible, on

his return. Also we read reports in the Press about the mediatory role of the United States and of the interest that the Soviet Union is showing in finding a peaceful dialogue—solution to this question. What is actually the position on this matter?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Faleiro, do not enter into the detailed debate on the subject.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am very much right under rule 290. My time is up to 5 minutes. First proviso to rule 290 says:

"Provided that an amendment may be moved that the report be referred back to the Committee either without limitation or with reference to any particular matter."

The important point is this. It is in second proviso regarding the Members' right which the office has not adverted to:

"Provided further that not more than held an hour shall be allotted for the discussion of the motion and no member shall speak for more than five minutes on such motion."

I am not going to take 5 minutes. I am going to take much less. I am making a substantial point now.

On the day before the Foreign Minister left for New York, the Foreign Secretary had resigned. He was asked to resign as per the Press report.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are allowed to say whether the topic which you have suggested should be included in the agenda or not. You are not allowed to say what happened with respect to that topic and you cannot go into all the details.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: What I want is that the Government should clarify this position as to why the Foreign Secretary had resigned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again you are going into the details.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: You are curtailing my right. I am very sorry, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. With utmost respect to you, I may say, I have been in this House for the fourth term and I know what the procedure is.

The Foreign Secretary has resigned. The reports are in the Press. All that I am asking is that the statement may be made to clarify why he has resigned, why he was asked to resign. He was in charge of Pakistan desk. He was our Ambassador to Pakistan before becoming the Foreign Secretary. Is there any change in policy in regard to Pakistan? He was offered the Governorship of Assam which shows that he is a very competent man. Why was he asked to go? Is there any change in the policy of the Government? Why was he asked to resign? We want the Government to clarify on this point.

I know what the procedure is. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, with utmost respect, I may say that I have raised several such matters in the past since 1977. Let the Government clarify why the Foreign Secretary resigned, why was he asked to resign.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will just read the ruling which was given in the House and the matter ends there.

"Amendment to motion for adoption of Business Advisory Committee report could be made to change allocation of time recommended by the Committee but new items of business could not be added through amendments."

This is new item.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am perfectly all right. The Government should reply to this point. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Eighth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 24th April, 1990."

The motion was adopted

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: There should be no curtailment on the right of the Member. I am very grateful to you but the office was not aware apparently of this rule.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not really the office. It is a decision of the Chair. They do assist the Chair on finding out the rules and regulations. This is really the decision of the gentleman who is sitting in the Chair. I should take that responsibility but, at the same time, there are methods of raising this issue which you can adopt. You have adopted this method!

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am grateful to you for having given the correct decision. (*Interruptions*) We are also entitled to demand a discussion on the statement made by the Parliamentary Affairs Minister regarding the business of the Government.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now we will take up Matters Under Rule 377.

14.15 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

[*Translation*]

- (I) **Need to provide adequate facility to the farmers for cultivating their land, particularly in Districts Kanpur, Fatehpur, Banda, Jalaun, Etawah, Hamirpur etc. of Uttar Pradesh**

SHRI KESHARI LAL (Ghatampur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, even today, agriculture is the mainstay for the majority of the people in our country and also as important sector of