

Thirteenth Lok Sabha**Session : 11****Date : 18-12-2002**

Participants : [Mahale Shri Haribhau](#), [Singh Shri Akhilesh](#), [Arun Shourie Shri](#), [Patil Shri Shivraj V.](#), [Chatterjee Shri Somnath](#), [Tripathi Shri Prakash Mani](#), [Aiyar Shri Mani Shankar](#), [Kuppusami Shri C.](#), [Ramaiah Dr. Bolla Bulli](#), [Verma Shri Ravi Prakash](#), [Khaire Shri Chandrakant Bhaurao](#), [Singh Shri Prabhunath](#), [Singh Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad](#), [Sengupta Dr. Nitish](#), [Paswan Shri Ram Vilas](#), [Badnore Shri Vijayendra Pal Singh](#), [Dasmunsi Shri Priya Ranjan](#), [Panda Shri Prabodh](#), [Acharia Shri Basudeb](#), [Singh Deo Shri AVSM](#), [Brig.\(Retd.\) Kamakhya Prasad](#)

7

16.36 hrs.

Title: Regarding Disinvestment of Public Sector Undertakings.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): Mr. Speaker Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity. We are not keen to discuss the question of disinvestment *per se*, but we are concerned about the manner and the objective with which this process of disinvestment is being carried on because what has happened so far in the name of disinvestment has caused havoc in this country and its history is nothing but a saga of loot and plunder committed in the name of getting rid of so-called loss-making public sector undertakings. That was the plea with which they started. I feel that this plea of disinvestment, that is being carried on and done by this Government, is the dirtiest trick that has been played on the innocent and the poor vulnerable sections of the community of this country by the most unprincipled and tainted concoction which is going by the name of NDA. It is the most sordid chapter, according to many of us, in India's post-Independence era where the people are reduced to penury and financial decimation of the people is there. The country is losing its valuable assets.

Sir, we used to call him "Hero Arun of 1970s" and what a fall! From that, he has become 'also Arun' and probably only Arun to rhyme with the famous advertisement that he is, that inspires him.

Sir, we have been raising certain basic questions, but there is no proper answer. Therefore, we have to raise them again. What is the policy, what is the principle and what is the objective and who have become or are going to be the beneficiaries, of this process of disinvestment? What we have been saying is why this is a hush-hush affair. There is a total vagueness and no attempt to justify what has been done or what is being done. The basic question is who are the owners of these assets and properties. It is not the Minister of Disinvestment. The people of this country, out of whose contribution all these assets had been acquired earlier, are the owners. Are they taken into confidence? Do they know anything as to what is happening in the corridors or office rooms of the Ministry of Disinvestment? Are the people told or consulted in any manner? We have the great privilege of representing the people of this country inside the House.

We have great obligation to the people, and great duties to discharge, but we are not told anything. We are kept totally in dark. We have to put questions to find out what is happening. We have to demand discussions in every Session of this House. It is a calculated affront to the House and to the people of this country. We are never consulted, and nothing is being discussed. Therefore, my question is, who has given this authority to this Government to indulge in this loot. A simple question is being asked, why profit-making units are being sold and for whose benefit.

We know that a lot of criticisms are made, so far as we are concerned, who oppose this, about the way it has been happening so far. Of course, we are not alone; we have got the distinguished company of yourself, Sir, when you were here. Now, the very favourite answer of Shri Arun Shourie is, "Well, your State Governments are also doing it." That is why, he could not resist the temptation of following the controversial Defence Minister in wasting public money in publishing a book called "Disinvestment in States". How are you concerned? He is spending money on some 50-page booklet, like the Defence Ministry has spent money on some booklet, which was prepared and circulated by a friend of the Defence Minister. It is a comical thing and a childish attempt to try to divert the attention of the

people from the real issues. I do not know what to say. I do not know where does our very good friend, Shri Ram Naik, stand now.

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS (SHRI RAM NAIK): I am sitting here.

MR. SPEAKER: He is very much there.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : It seems you have surrendered and you sat down. What about our revolutionary and controversial Defence Minister? What happened to him? Where is our *saffron didi*? Where is our HRD Minister? He only reads NCERT books. All his blabber inside here is about NCERT books. What about his attempts to criticise or oppose this loot that is going on? He is conspicuous by his absence. The Ministers are fighting; NDA partners are opposing. I hope, Shri Geethe, you will be continuing this opposition. I hope, you will oppose it. आप लोग तो अपोज करते हैं, हाथ उठाते हैं, क्या बात है ?

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे (औरंगाबाद, महाराष्ट्र) : मैं अपना मत, जब मुझे भाण करने का समय दिया जाएगा, तब बताऊंगा।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Does it not disturb everybody's conscience that you are selling very valuable assets? Should not there be transparency? Should not this House, at least, be taken into confidence? How are the consultants selected, and how are the reserve prices fixed? We shall come to that recent instance. How are the bidders selected? Everything is being done in secrecy. How much is above the table and how much is below the table? Nobody knows about it. At no stage, the Parliament has been consulted. If the Government has nothing to hide and nothing to suppress from the people, why do they not come to the House or consult, at least, the Standing Committee? They could have requested the hon. Speaker to form a small Committee. The Parliament and the representatives of different parties should have been taken into confidence.

Sir, let the Government say that this was the way they had done it and whether the Opposition had something to say on this or not. But that was not done. It was as if the entire House had to be treated as their enemy and

as if this Government was alone the embodiment of patriots in this country. We cannot accept this position. That is why we shall go on opposing this. We have said that. As I said, why is the Government shying away from these questions?

Sir, I shall take a little time with regard to others on this. The glaring example of the Centaur case is before us. If the process of fixing the reserve price had any relation to the reality, then nobody could have made a profit of Rs. 34 crore within a few months.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this was in your city. Probably you had the occasion to inaugurate this hotel as the Chief Minister of that State. What has been the explanation of the hon. Minister to this? The explanation offered by the hon. Minister before the camera in front of the Parliament House was: 'What could the Government have done. They have become the owners of the property'. We are questioning not the right of the owner, but we are questioning the right, the obligation of the Government in fixing up a proper reserve price. How have the Government done that? Do they not feel ashamed about the fact that they sold a very valuable asset, that was so close to one of their leading partners in the NDA combine, to a private party and that private party, within a period of four to six months, has made a profit of Rs. 34 crore? You know much better all these things than I do.

Sir, the Indian Oil Corporation has been complaining that their land and petrol pumps have been sold out. They are objecting as to how the Government could have sold their land and petrol pumps. The significant question here is, has any head rolled? Has anybody suffered?

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): He has been given another Ministry!

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I hope my good friend, Shri Maran comes back and dislodges him. But I would like him to approve my SEZ.

Sir, this book titled, 'Disinvestment Policy and Procedure' was the Bible of Shri Arun Shourie. I do not know now if he had any occasion to touch this

book or not. Very significantly there is no mention of any date of its publication. This is very significant. What are the objectives of the policy? It has been mentioned at page 10 of the book and I quote:

"Primary objective: Realising large amounts of public resources locked up in non-strategic PSUs for re-deployment in areas that are much higher on the social priority such as basic health, family welfare, primary education and socially essential infrastructure."

I challenge the hon. Minister to prove as to what has been done in either of these spheres out of the sale proceeds.

I am not reading all of it but it further says:

"Realising other tangible sources such as large manpower currently locked up in managing PSUs and their time and energy for re-deployment in high priority social sectors that are short of it."

I would like the hon. Minister to give us one such instance. We would like to know from the hon. Minister about one such instance of re-deployment. Let him give us one instance of utilisation of the sale proceeds in the areas that he has mentioned. These are his statements.

It has been further said at Page 35:

"Resources currently blocked in non-strategic PSEs should, therefore, be released as soon as possible through sale of Government stake in such PSEs for redeployment in the above sectors." - Namely, the social sector, Sir. - "We should also ensure there is no further flow of resources to these PSEs." - And no PSEs are firm, I can understand. - "The logic, rationale for privatising or not privatising a PSE is not based on whether it is making profit or loss, but whether it is in a strategic sector or in a

non-strategic sector, and whether the taxpayers' money can be saved from the commercial risk by transferring the risk to the private sector."

On what basis do you decide whether something is in strategic sector or non-strategic sector? We have been raising this question. What are the parameters? It cannot be like Chancellor's foot! What are the parameters for you to decide on strategic and non-strategic sector? Is defence strategic sector or non-strategic sector? You have excluded some. We have been asking this but no explanation has been given. Why is oil non-strategic sector? Why is petrochemicals non-strategic sector? What is the criteria? Who decides? What are the parameters? What is the principle behind it? You just cannot, at your *ipse dixit*, say, 'Well, I take it as non-strategic. Therefore, I need not bother. I will sell away this.'

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are everyday advised by these 'pink' papers. They are going to decide our fate. They are strong supporters and exponents of this theory. Mr. Shourie's friends, they are. What has been realised by this process? They say:

"During 2000-01, the Government was able to raise Rs.1,873 crore from disinvestment process. This figure shot up to Rs.3,436 crore in the next year. The important part is that in less than half the financial year, though the collection figure has already reached Rs.3,190 crore, out of it Rs.2,576 crore were raised through the big ticket disinvestment like the sale of IPCL (a concern like IPCL is sold to Reliance for Rs.1,491 crore) and the picking up of Maruti Udyog stake by Suzuki. Hindustan Zinc was sold for Rs.445 crore. VSNL was sold for Rs.1,439 crore. Hotel Indraprastha etc., etc. "

Now, the important thing, they are saying, is that some of them have been sold at higher than the reserved price. This is the point. We come back to this. What is the basis of the fixation of the reserved price? One or two

Consultants are appointed whose credentials we do not know, the country does not know. What are the parameters of selecting them? They fix up a price. If it goes higher up they say, 'Oh! Great victory for Arun Shourie! Great Success that he has earned some more!'

Of course, some of them have called this crony-capitalism, people like Mr. Paranjoy Guha Thakurta. The question that has been raised - I have been raising it - is that between 1991-92 and 2000-01, profits of 130 profit-making PSUs went up 4.6 times while the losses of 106 loss-making PSUs increased 3.4 times. Profit-making units are making more profit.

There are Standing Committee reports which you also are aware, Sir. I will place some portions of them. The C&AG also has made complaints about the fixation of the reserve prices. The Standing Committee has made the strongest comments on this. It has been said by one of the well-known financial writers, "Mr. Shourie is perhaps the only salesman in the world who criticises the product he is going to sell before he actually sells it."

We have seen the articles he had produced, trying to say how hotels are badly managed and should immediately be sold. Of course, I do not know what was the response of the Minister of Tourism. This is the case of one Minister abusing the other Minister's performance.... (*Interruptions*) Shri Naik is the punching bag. Everybody is punching him. So, he wrote articles on hotels and India tourism. I do not know whether these Ministers have self-respect or prestige. Somehow, they want to be the Ministers and nothing else.

Sir, has the Standing Committee's Report any significance to this Government? We have been raising this question time and again before the hon. Speaker. We had raised this question before the earlier Speaker, Late lamented Shri Balayogi also. What is the purpose of formation of these Standing Committees? Of course, a lot of expectation is there. We can understand that every issue cannot be discussed on the floor of the House. There is no time. Therefore, the issues are selected by the hon. Speaker and he assigns certain task to us. All of us try, to the best of our ability, to do the work in the Standing Committee. Sir, I am sure, the experience of all the hon. Members, by and large, is that in the committees we try to work in

a non-partisan manner. That is the glory of the functioning of these committees and that is the humble experience I had over the years. Hardly, politics intervenes, except in some rarest of rare cases. These are all unanimous reports of the Standing Committees where representatives of all political parties are present.

With regard to the utilisation of disinvestment receipts, it has been said that nobody knows how they are being spent. I would like to quote:

"The disinvestment proceeds are deposited in the Consolidated Fund of India like any other receipt of the Government of India. The expenditures out of this Consolidated Fund..... incurred for these purposes were much higher than the receipts from disinvestment."

They have said that the Government cannot show how the money realised by disinvestment has been utilised. I further quote:

"The Committee find that there is no system to ensure that the funds thus received are utilised for these sectors. The Committee desire that the Government should put in place a system to ensure that a good portion of the sale proceeds from PSUs disinvestment is actually spent on the social and infrastructural sector as was envisaged in the objectives. "

Now, I come to the question of asset valuation. Strong comments have been made by the Standing Committee. They have said:

"Although the guidelines are there, the Committee note that asset valuation guidelines are inadequate and vague, especially on the issue of land valuation of the disinvested PSUs. Actual land value is not considered in most of the cases. The Committee do not subscribe to the view of the Government that the value of the assets which are not giving income to the company is questionable."

They have said that they must improve and modify the guidelines for evaluation of the assets. This is the considered view of the Standing Committee.

With regard to the qualification of the bidders also, findings have been given.

"The Committee find that though the disinvestment process is continuing for more than a decade now, guidelines regarding qualifications or disqualifications of bidders seeking to acquire their stake in PSUs through the process of disinvestment, were formulated. "

So, very strong comments have been made on each aspect of valuation, selection of consultants, following the guidelines or drawing up the guidelines and also on qualification of the bidders, but nothing has been done.

17.00 hrs.

Now comes the main case. We are all aware of what is happening. I would concentrate on some of the basic live issues like HPCL and BPCL. There was a halt for three months because of internal dissension in the Government. Now, one day, the Prime Minister calls all the Ministers; I do not know whether for dinner or for admonition or for threatening or for cajoling or to give good words or in anticipation of Gujarat's Moditva/Hindutva. I do not know what for the meeting was called. There was a change of stand. Now Shri Arun Shourie has been asked to take the Parliament into confidence by this statement and therefore he has taken us into confidence by committing another atrocity. Of course, they did not ask for a discussion.

The meeting takes place in the Prime Minister's house, as if it is a matter not even of the Cabinet – Cabinet hardly matters – in which two-three Ministers have been called who had the courage for a while to raise and say some words of protest. They were trying to save the Indian silver, or what he says, the country's silver, for which of course he has been thoroughly admonished, it seems. Through you, I would like to inform the House by reading the following:

"The Government has, after detailed deliberations on the various issues expressed, (deliberations at 7, Race Course Road), and suggestions made, decided in a meeting held on 6th December to fine-tune the disinvestment policy and programme by adopting the following approach."

Fine-tuning was therefore necessary. The main objectives of disinvestment are:

"To put the national resources and assets to optimal use and in particular to unleash the productive potential inherent in our public sector enterprises."

English language sometimes is very handy. Nothing is said about how they would put to optimal use the country's resources and assets and how they would unleash the productive potential inherent in our public sector enterprises. How will they do it? What is the process? Again kindly see the objectives:

"The policy of disinvestment specifically aims at modernisation and upgradation of public sector enterprises."

This is a joke. Kindly tell the House as to which public sector enterprise has been modernised. Then you say 'creation of new assets'. I take it in

public sector. Where are those assets? Then you say 'generation of employment'. I do not think the country can be taken for a ride like this. Where is the generation of employment? It is shameless. Today we are trying to espouse these causes about which we feel so agonised. The people come to us and say they are Central Government employees and they are not getting their salaries; their children have been taken away from schools; they cannot treat their members of the family who are ill; they have been given notice by the landlord to quit; they have nothing to eat, etc. But these people are glibly indulging in this kind of gimmickry.

You say 'generation of employment and retiring of public debt.' Here lies the point. Not only they are trying to utilise this money for meeting the fiscal deficit, but also the revenue deficit which shows total inefficiency in their functioning. These are the fine-tuned objectives. Were you asked to sign it? Please do not sign this. I read further:

"The Government would continue to ensure that disinvestment does not result in alienation of national assets which, through the process of disinvestment, remain where they are. It will also ensure that disinvestment does not result in private monopolies."

This is another joke.

What has happened? Can you stop it? I ask with all seriousness and I want an answer from the Government. Can you stop the private monopoly in the oil sector? The public petrochemical sector has almost gone. It is a private monopoly. And about the petroleum sector, what has happened and what has been decided? One is through strategic sale and Sir, just lo and behold and somehow or the other, it will be "Only Vimal". Sir, they say that BPCL will be disinvested through sale of shares to the public. How can you stop them cornering? How can you stop one company and one business house cornering? How can you stop it? Let us know. Some few percentage of shares are given to the workers as if throwing some crumbs before hungry workers. It is said "to disinvest Hindustan Petroleum through strategic sale". This is the greatest method of hoodwinking the people. Again, there

will be the question of evaluation, again the question of selecting a consultant, again the question of guidelines and asset valuation, again the question of bidder and everything will be in secrecy.

I wish if the Government has any honesty – I charge them – they should agree immediately to constitute a parliamentary committee before whom they must come, if not before the House, before they sell any of the assets. This is the minimum thing they have to do. If they have nothing to hide, if there is honesty of purpose and an honesty of method, a specific percentage of shares should be sold to the employees. We are again being told of disinvestment proceeds funds. Will it be outside the Consolidated Fund? Or will it not be so? We do not know. It is said that this fund will be used for financing employment opportunities to investment and for retirement of public debt. What has been done so far financing fresh employment opportunities and on investment and retirement of public debt? That is the real crux of the matter. This is a totally bankrupt Government which cannot pay their debts. They even cannot pay their interest and they are selling away these properties for this purpose . I am very sorry that your leader must somehow show some initiative but again, he has gone to hibernation. Further, it is said that for disinvestment of natural asset company, the Ministry of Disinvestment and the Ministry of Finance will work out the guidelines. One is the beneficiary of the other. One is the methodology and the other is the beneficiary. They will sit together and decide. It is said that the Ministry of Finance will prepare a paper for the consideration of the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment. I do not know who are the members of that Committee. Do you know? You do not know and I also do not know. It is a paper on the feasibility and the modality of setting up asset management companies to hold and manage and dispose of the residual holding of the Government in the companies in which Government equity has been invested to a strategic partner. In future, they will decide after selling most of them as to how the remaining asset management can be done in those companies where the Government may retain some posts. This is nothing but trying to take the country for a ride. I am requesting the Government to please take this House into confidence and the people of this country into confidence. These are the assets and properties of the people, I may be excused for repeating it.

I have got the figures with me. Everybody knows about the assets that have been created by HPCL and BPCL so far . Both of them are highly profit-making units. The net profit earned by BPCL in 2000-02 was Rs. 835 crores against a turnover of Rs.40,000 crore. The dividend paid to the Central Government is Rs.330 crore. The profit of HPCL is Rs.788 crore against the turnover of Rs.45,287 crore. The Central Government has received a dividend of Rs.340 crores.

Sir, the current assets of these PSUs are Rs. 20,000 crore, against the cost of acquisition of Rs. 49 crore. The Government had paid Rs. 49 crore and the present assets are Rs. 20,000 crore. Nearly nine thousand petrol pumps are being run by these two Companies. Twenty-three thousand workers are there. We took a delegation of 20 representative trade unions in which representatives of AITUC, Shiv Sena, HMS, Khamgar Agadi, INTUC, CITU and AITUC were there, apart from the other independent trade unions. We went there with their representatives. Some Members of Parliament from different parties were also there. We requested the Prime Minister. I have the privilege of knowing Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee for a long time, for over thirty years. Not one word was uttered by him. We felt that we went to a sleeping Buddha, sphinx like! It was so unlike of Vajpayee. You have finished him. ... (*Interruptions*) Well, I am told that the workers will not lose their jobs. Then, he said that the law was there. He said only two words. The workers said: "You are the Prime Minister. We have come to you. We have faithfully served these companies. These are people's assets. Tell us if anything wrong was done by us". There was not a single response.

These are Acts of Parliament. We are told that they are going to Attorney-General. Let them go to Attorney-General or let them go to International Court of Justice and take the opinion. But these are people's assets.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Somnath Chatterjee, how long will you take?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Within another five or ten minutes I will conclude.

This is not the question of legality. But it is clear that these were taken over from foreign companies in the public interest. How has that public interest vanished? Money was paid for it. It is said:

"Where it is expedient in the public interest that the undertakings in India such and such should be acquired to ensure that ownership and control of the petroleum products distributed etc., and distributed as best to sub-serve the common good. "

I reminded Shri Vajpayee, the Prime Minister that, if I am not very much mistaken, you also had voted for it. Then, he nodded. We had all voted for it. I believe the entire House must have voted unanimously for it. That was the unanimous decision of this country expressed through Parliament. It was done in the public interest. It was said that management will be done either by the Government or by a Government company for sustenance of the public interest, in the interest of the nation. Now, how has that interest vanished? This Government owes an answer. These are still laws of this country. These are Acts of Parliament. It is the clearest insult to Parliament. With keeping these laws in the statute books, you are trying to dispose them of. There is one very significant thing. The workers and the trade unions, including that of Shiv Sena, Left and the INTUC, had asked him whether they were not entitled to be consulted even once. We asked that to the Prime Minister with great humility. In no case were the workers consulted. They are treated as if they are enemies, and as if they are disposable commodities. 'Go to hell', that is the attitude. Their attitude is that they are the owners. Shri Shourie, you are not the owner.

You are a trustee of this Fund, assets and properties.... (*Interruptions*)
 Why should I not say that this Government is an enemy of the workers? If you are friendly to the workers, at least you should have responded and said that you would talk to them and discuss with them. If you want to improve the performance, tell them and take them into confidence. They are your workers. The Prime Minister is there. You are the Ministers. You can ask them. You can tell them that if they improve further and give better production, probably you shall think otherwise. If there is any slippage – I

do not admit that – why do you not talk to them? If there is any area of better performance which is needed, you can talk to them. They are your people. They have not been imported from outside. This is the way you treat your own people who are the workers.

There is a threat to NALCO. People everywhere in the country, not only from Orissa, say that they cannot accept it. The people have declared this. They have resolved it. The people of Orissa have resolved it....

(Interruptions) I salute them.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Which people are you talking of? I represent Orissa.... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You are an aberration. ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Can you tell me which people of Orissa you are talking of? I also represent Orissa. I also say that Orissa does not belong to you, does not belong to the trade union leaders. You are saying this because your *dana-pani* is going to be served by this. ...

(Interruptions) That is why, you are telling it. That is the reason. I also represent Orissa. You do not represent Orissa.... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not disturb him. Please sit down.

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I say that I have the great honour to be a neighbour of Orissa. My State is a neighbour of Orissa. We are in friendliest of terms with Orissa. There are always some exceptions and aberrations.... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : You are a fringe party in Orissa.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : There is a very well-known author. I believe that many of us would have read this book. This is not a publication of the CPM. He is Mr. Joseph Stiglitz, the former Chief Economist in the World Bank. My friends from that side, it is your

headquarters! He is the former Chairman of President Clinton's Council of Economic Advisors. You would have been happier if he were the Advisor to Mr. Bush. He is the winner of the Nobel Prize for Economics for the year 2001. What has he said? I quote. I shall end my speech with this.

"In industrialized countries, the pain of layoffs is acknowledged and somewhat ameliorated by the safety net of unemployment insurance."

Sir, I know what I am saying. You will wholly agree with me when I say this. I have seen you performing as the Minister of Industry. I am not trying to make you happy. We have always felt that here is a friend of the country, friend of the industry and friend of the workers. I am sure, sitting in that august seat, you will maintain that. I quote further:

"In less developed countries, the unemployed workers typically do not become a public charge, since there are seldom unemployment insurance schemes.

It is important to restructure state enterprises, and privatization is often an effective way to do so. But moving people from low-productivity jobs in state enterprises to unemployment does not increase a country's income, and it certainly does not increase the welfare of the workers....Privatization needs to be part of a more comprehensive program, which entails creating jobs *in tandem* with the inevitable job destruction that privatization often entails. "

I hope he has read it. I wish to conclude by saying this. The most ominous observation based on the experience of this great author is this:

"Perhaps, the most serious concern with privatisation, as it has so often been practiced, is corruption. "

We are seeing the highest embodiment of that in this country. I can only appeal to all sections of this House to consider it. I would request the House not to treat it as a partisan issue. The workers are not only our workers, but workers in different States have different affiliations. Please look at them, at their family members, children and their wives. What crime have they committed that you throw them to the wolves?

Sir, as I said, I am not discussing disinvestment *per se*, but there are ways of doing it. It may be that some units can never be revived and they are a serious drain on the resources. They can apply a human touch to them, redeploy the workers and get rid of those companies. But they are only trying to say: "Oh! You have done it, therefore I am doing it." In which matters are they following us? They are not following us because they are keen on privatising one of the greatest concerns as if they are justified in looting.

Sir, they are in power; maybe in whatever manner they are in power, it is a peculiar combination in the world and probably the Guinness Book authorities are looking into this to put into the Guinness Book. Therefore, I would like to sincerely appeal to all the sections of this House. Let us, for once, on an issue like this, concerning lakhs and lakhs of workers, the future assets of this country, public interests which are manifested through our holding of the public sector undertakings in oil sector, in shipping, in defence and in so many other sectors, not

consider this on the basis of any partisan approach. I can also warn and I hope that my warning would be heeded and my warning could be justified that if they do not listen to us and if they try to defeat us by this contrived and opportunistic alliance, then the people of this country would rise in revolt and, I assure you, that it would be the last fight so far as this Government is concerned.

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI (DEORIA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard Somnath Babu with rapt attention that he always deserves and gets in this House in initiating the debate on disinvestment. Indeed, the

first salvo was fired in the Question Hour today by Chandra Shekhar Ji. When Chandra Shekhar Ji is angry, he speaks very fine Hindi and when he is really angry, he speaks in English. Today he spoke in English and Somnath Babu was vigorously nodding his head. When these two gentlemen put a point across to this House, everybody listens very carefully and takes note of it. Therefore, what Chandra Shekhar Ji said – and some of it was reflected in the end by Somnath Babu by saying – was that it is unfortunate that the NDA is in majority. This is the sentence he used. I do not know any Government surviving for a very long time without having majority. Chandra Shekhar Ji's experience may be very good, but he said, the unfortunate portion is that the NDA is in majority and the second point that he mentioned was that they think that they have got an *El Dorado*. I do not know whether anger made him say all that he said in the afternoon or disinvestment made him angry.

17.24 hrs. (Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh *in the Chair*)

Sir, he is against disinvestment; his stand has been absolutely the same all the time and the same thing I saw in Somnath Babu who spoke very passionately about the whole thing. But I noticed a definite shift in his speech today. He mentioned the 'manner of disinvestment', not the disinvestment and I think the time has come to take a view whether you are for disinvestment or you are not for disinvestment because the 'manner' is an executive function. It is an executive function and no Government gives up its right to take day-to-day actions.

Therefore, are you only talking about the manner because this debate has gone on for a very very long time? This is not a change in the attitude of the Government today. This was a proper change in policy decision taken in 1991. In this Government's time or rather this Lok Sabha's time, this matter has been discussed in the House 14 times. I am not questioning the competence or the authority of the House to discuss any matter at any point of time when it feels like it, and this House is meant to, but this has been discussed 14 times. Yet Shri Somnath Chatterjee says that the House has never been taken into confidence. ... (*Interruptions*)

How do you take the House into confidence when in three years' time, you discuss a subject 14 times? You did not give us a chance to take you into confidence. You have always been acquiring, asking and getting all the information at all points of time. So, the question of keeping the House in darkness for these three years does not arise. I do not think anybody or any Government can talk about its performance or discuss the same subject again and again - 14 times - in less than three years.

It is much more difficult to take an old idea out of anybody's head. It is much easier to put a new idea in that. This process of disinvestment like many other processes that we have seen is from a total picture of controlled economy going on to deregulation. Therefore, there are problems. We have seen these problems. I have been battling with it for the last 18 months in some other forum. The change is a painful experience. A change of this nature and of this economic magnitude is positively a very difficult experience. Therefore, when the nitty-gritty are being talked of, it is my humble request that it should be taken as a learning experience. It is not as if everybody has got perfect answers or answers taken by the Opposition will lead us to a faultless arrangement or a faultless of this thing. That point must be borne in mind.

Now, here is a case where a very major change has positively been undertaken for the last 10 years. An investment of Rs. 2,74,000 and some odd crore, having more than 320 major units, changing into a private sector deregulated economy is a problematic thing. It poses a problem. There are people who will be affected. There are people. For a while, it is possible that the jobs will become less. Thereafter when the thing picks up, it becomes more. This is a transition phase. It must be understood that in this transition phase, there are things that will create problems. But every time saying that we have not been taken into confidence and that there is no transparency, I do not think it bears a factual position as it obtains today. Transparency is of two kinds. One is, how a thing looks. The second is, how a person looks at it. Both lead to transparency or opaqueness. It is not as if anything has been hidden. How can anything be hidden when the discussion in the Parliament in three years had been for 14 times? How can anybody hide anything?

But yes, if same points come up the whole time and the same answers are given, I do not think anybody is going to be much wiser.

I do not think this subject is about Shri Arun Shourie. He has been referred to every time now and then and also loot, etc. has been talked about. I think, in this country, at least, calling Arun Shourie, a person who has such tendencies, will not stick. If it is the officials, that they are blaming, who are looting the country, then they are the same officials that these people had been having them in their time. It is how quickly we can understand from our experience and every disinvestment is a separate process, has separate problems because human beings are involved.

श्री शिवराज सिंह चौहान (विदिशा) : सभापति महोदय, साढ़े पांच बजे आधे घंटे की चर्चा ली जानी थी।

सभापति महोदय : अब वह कल होगी, यह तय हो गया है।

श्री शिवराज सिंह चौहान : ठीक है, मुझे पता नहीं था।

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI : Sir, out of the 250 and odd companies that we are talking about in this disinvestment, the point that is made again and again is why are profit making companies being disinvested. I am quite sure, a lot of problems that have been raised will be answered by the Minister. He is in the know of the things. But one thing definitely I want to ask that if all the loss making companies were offered for disinvestment, who is going to buy them? I am very keen to know that. Nobody is going to buy anything for a loss, it will be for a profit...
(Interruptions) Therefore, there has to be a mix and the mix is there not only at the time of making disinvestment, there are companies...
(Interruptions)

I notice that the people were very quiet when Shri Somnath Chatterjee was speaking, but they have started all sorts of questions when I am speaking...
(Interruptions) May I have my say?

There are times and we should realise that there was a time in the 50s when there was a requirement for a controlled economy, there was a time

in the 50s when the Government had to come in and put up big companies, not only put up big companies but had to provide them with budgetary support. There is a time when that budgetary support was withdrawn. This is a fact. In 1990, the budgetary support was withdrawn because they had come on their own feet. There is a time, it is not yourself, but your party, which is talking about it.

Of course, they always like to quote America, England and what they said and so on, but only yesterday we had the speech of the President of United Republic of Tanzania in the FICCI. He had this to say and I quote:

"Tanzania of today is very different from that of 1970s and 1980s, when we were almost totally centrally planned economy. We came to realise at considerable cost that Governments are not very good at doing business. So, we decided to leave business to business people and concentrate instead on the traditional functions of the State, including social services, law and order, administration and promulgation and enforcement of regulatory mechanism."

Of course, you would say, 'why do you quote His Excellency William Mkapa?' ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (CANARA): Does the hon. Member mean that India, which was leading the Non-aligned Movement, has come to a level to follow Tanzania and Africa. Is that what your Government has come to? It is a tragedy. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI : You would not like me to quote an African President. You do not want me to quote an African President. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): At least Tanzania came to the rescue of your Government. Thank you very much. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI : Your objection is not to this and it is to taking it from an African country. ... (*Interruptions*) If you have all finished, then I can start. Why I am quoting this is this. ... (*Interruptions*)

श्री विजयेन्द्र पाल सिंह बदनोर (भीलवाड़ा) : जब सोमनाथ जी बोले तो हम लोगों ने बहुत पेशेन्ट हियरिंग दी। अब आप क्यों डिस्टर्ब कर रहे हैं?

श्री प्रकाश मणि त्रिपाठी : आप बैठिये। हमें कोई डिस्टर्ब नहीं करता है।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : These are respectful queries. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI : There is no disturbance.

The point I am making is that we have said about them in 1970s and 1980s, those were our conditions in 1950s and 1960s. This is a major difference. I am not saying so.

Of course, a lot of my friends start thinking which one is better – the Government or the private sector and so on. There is a lot of debate. The debate is always welcomed. But this fact of de-regulation is not a thing about whether one decision is good or another decision is good. All I am saying is that it is the quality of taking decision, and that having taken that decision, everybody must go along with it. This is what China has done. Having taken a decision, they are going on with it with similar voice. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : They are not a parliamentary democracy. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI : Therefore, whether you are right or I am right, I am not discussing. What I am discussing is that if we had talked about it for 14 times in this House in Lok Sabha, then in the last 10 years how many times this must have been debated. It is time to take decision and a decision has been taken by NDA. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : The Minister never replies to our questions. He gives *pravachan*. He never replies. That is why, there is no

transparency. ... (*Interruptions*)

श्री प्रकाश मणि त्रिपाठी : उनको आप लोग बोलने कहां देते हैं? हम लोगों को कहां बोलने देते हैं? बोलने देंगे तो जवाब मिलेगा। ... (व्यवधान)

Therefore, my humble request is this. I will definitely make a request to the Minister. If our people disagree with each other, they are thought to be fighting. We are not a monolithic party that everybody will raise his hand at the drop of a coin. Yes, there will be differences of opinion. Just as you have got, everybody has got and everybody expresses his view. That is fine.

Holding a meeting in 7, Race Course Road has come as a very new piece of news as if it has never been held before, and it is a very private kitchen cabinet working, and all that. Even Shri Somnath babu does not know about the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment, who they are, and so on, although it came out in the newspapers. So, holding meetings there and having differences are fine. It should be understood that after considering it for three months, a very deliberate decision has been taken. Therefore, with regard to the quality of the decision, there can be differences of opinion but there are no doubts and differences. It is only the manner - how fast, how slow.

I might say this point also that when every time it comes up in the House for discussion, the price of BPCL and HPCL goes down in the market.... (*Interruptions*) Yes, there is a talk about it. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): In the morning you make one statement and that brings the price down. In the evening, you make the opposite statement and it goes up, and your own friends make money. This is the Government.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI : I am only pointing to the stop-start manner in which this is going on and the damage it is causing. I think this point ought to be taken seriously.

In 1991-92, the target was Rs.2,500 crore. The amount realised was Rs.3,038 crore. In 1992-93, the target was Rs.2,500 crore. The amount realised was Rs.1,913 crore. In 1993-94, the target was Rs.3,500 crore. The realisation was nil. In 1994-95, again it picked up. The target was Rs.4,000 crore. The realisation was Rs.4,800 crore. The realisation was low. In these 10 years, the target had been Rs.78,300 crore and the realisation was Rs.29,490 crore, for which also the Government would be asked why the realisation is so bad. But it is the quality of decision which is important because we are stopping and starting. It is my firm view that there is a give or take 10 per cent right and wrong decisions, but timely decision, then going on with it and making it effective is what will bring us results. But if every time there is a Centaur Hotel or everything is like this, that will be questioned and that will come back.... (*Interruptions*) Unfortunately, I have a bad throat.

I must say one or two points. One of the points that is for the consideration of the hon. Minister is that the companies of national importance that have strong linkages with the industry, transport, power and defence sector should also be examined in the light of trade-related investment measures taken under the World Trade Organisation. It would be otherwise impossible to restrict the foreign buyer after the PSU has been acquired, and we will not be able to do anything about it. So, we must very clearly, very diligently, notify all the measures that are not in conformity with the things before disinvestment. I see a major danger in this point. It is because it is a learning process and having not seen all the angles, if somebody acquires it, he can misuse it in a very, very major manner. One of the examples would be a foreign company deciding to export alumina from the National Aluminium Corporation rather than convert it into aluminium for domestic purpose. So, these checks and balances are a must. That point has to be kept in mind very, very vigorously and a very specific point that has to be made.... (*Interruptions*) Whatever is fair is fair. Definitely, I am not saying that this is something different.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Does the Government share your perception?

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI : The owners of these companies are the people of India. That is the second point that I agree. Whoever sits on this side is the custodian of that faith. I would say that a positive attitude towards disinvestment should be adopted. In my view, disinvestment is an irreversible process like Nehruvian socialism or to use my friend's words, Cronie capitalism or whatever it is.

It is a fact of life and if it is a fact of life, two things are positively required. The first is that we must make up our mind which road we are taking and having made up our mind, start going on that road.

My friend Shri B.B. Ramaiah would bear it out. When we first started out on WTO, adequate knowledge and expertise were not available. So, the second requirement is that now we must build adequate expertise. Let us not make the same mistake that we do not have adequate regulations while we deregulate our economy or make it privatised. Both things have to go hand in hand.

Just as Shri Somnath Chatterjee appealed for every section of the House to come out in one voice, my appeal is also that we must have one voice and we must say that we would change our gear on the road to disinvestment.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was a bit surprised to see that my friend Arun Shourie arrived in this House looking so natty because I expected him to come here in sack cloth and ashes.

We have been telling him for three years, 'For God's sake, review your policy, review your policy, review your policy.' He would not listen to us then but when his own colleagues got on to him and said, 'You should review it', we began to see the beginnings of the disinvestment of Arun Shourie! He is a clever man and he has succeeded in befogging his own colleagues into claiming that he has reviewed his policy through the statement that has been presented on the Table of the House but it is not as easy to make a fool of us as it is perhaps to befog his colleagues. So, our concerns remain.

My good friend and Chairman of the JPC, General Tripathi, has pointed out that we have discussed this matter 14 times in the House. Without going into the details of whether his mathematics is accurate, let me accept that we have many times discussed this, but equally as many times the Minister of Disinvestment – whether it was our King Arun I or it is now our King Arun II – refused to answer the questions that we raised. What is the point of a Parliamentary discussion when Shri Arun Shourie dons his saffron robes and indulges in a *pravachan* instead of answering the questions that are raised from here. He converts every single debate into a moral lecture from the podium on which he stands. He does not seem to understand the distinction between responding to a debate in the House and writing an editorial. That is why we have to keep coming back to exactly the same issues. He is not answering the questions that we have raised.

Now, we had rather hoped that when his own colleagues asked him to undertake a review the review would come in the shape that we have been demanding, which is a White Paper. After all, in Parliamentary practice, if not in the editorial office to which Shri Shourie is accustomed, it is the practice to discuss matters by putting all the facts and all the points at issue in a document called a ‘White Paper’, to enable the nation as a whole to debate the matter and eventually for it to be discussed in Parliament. It is the absence of this that is at the root of the confusion that prevails with regard to disinvestment.

General Tripathi is an Army man. If we do not know who the enemy is, where is he going to send the troops? The whole point of this exercise is, when Shri Shourie is emptying the ocean, General Tripathi is sending his troops to the Himalayas.

We need to understand that disinvestment was, in the time of the Congress Government, a marginal part of overall economic policy. This Government has made disinvestment the centrepiece of its economic policy. When it made it the centrepiece, a large number of issues were raised, which we have been raising on this side of the House and they, on that side of the House, have been consistently refusing to answer.

General Tripathi also said, and I agree with him completely that if anybody attempts to say that Shri Arun Shourie is a crook, it is a charge that is not going to stick, because Shri Arun Shourie reminds me of an Ambassador I once had when I was in the Indian Foreign Service, who disliked me intensely and, therefore, put an adverse comment against every single requirement of the Confidential Report. But then he got a bit stuck when it came to integrity. He did not know what to write, thought about it for a while, and then he said, "If by integrity is meant honesty in money matters, then Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar is completely honest". This is exactly the charge I bring against Shri Arun Shourie. I do not believe for a minute that a World Bank pensioner is in need of any kind of assistance from the market, but the lack of integrity comes in his inability to honestly answer honest questions that are being raised.

Thirdly, on the 10th of August, 2002, that is, close to two and a half years ago, I posed 13 questions to the hon. Minister of Disinvestment. But when in the reply no answers were forthcoming to those 13 questions, once again, on the 20th December, 2000, I requested the hon. Minister to respond to those 13 questions. Still no answers were forthcoming. Since I have known Shri Arun Shourie for 40 years and apparently he is having some hearing defect because he is unable to listen to the spoken word, I thought let us put it down as the written word and so in several articles I have attempted to provoke him to respond, but still there is no response. But, now that we are, once again, at the stage where his own colleagues are repeatedly asking him to look into the policy, I say please give us a White Paper which, at least, touches on the 13 questions I raised then, which I wish to raise, once again, over here. And to those 13 questions, I am just going to add two more questions. I am not going to read all the 13 questions in as much detail as when I first spoke here, but I would like to put them in essence before the hon. Minister.

1. Which are the sectors in which the Government regards a continuing public presence as essential and which are inessential? ... (*Interruptions*) First, I want to have answer on that.
2. Which are the public sector units that should be run purely on commercial lines and which, in the larger interest, should be given

specific social objectives and judged on criteria other than the purely mercenary?

3. How should strategic industries be defined? You have defined them in terms of a narrow construction of defence.

General Tripathi has raised an extremely important point that once they have gone into private hands, resources which are essential for our defence, might find themselves being taken out of the country. The example is of NALCO and I completely agree with him.

Now let us take the oil sector. Why were CALTEX and ESSO nationalised? Why was Burma Shell nationalised?

Today is the 18th December, 2002. General Tripathi on this day, 18th December, 1971, was not in our country. He had entered Bangladesh and was liberating that nation. The 31st anniversary of the liberation of Bangladesh was day before yesterday. It is a moment of immense national pride. But did Burma Shell provide us with the aviation turbine fuel that we needed? Did not Burma Shell play a trick on us by offering us ATF which we could not use so as to prevent us from prosecuting the most just war in the history of humanity.? We did not nationalise the oil industry because we had a penchant for nationalisation. We nationalised it because the 1971 war taught us that oil was a strategic industry and Shri Arun Shourie's government does not think oil is a strategic product.

Take the case of IDPL, the Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Limited, a relatively minor public sector undertaking. It was started near the town where I was brought up, Dehradun. It was started after the 1965 War at Veerabhadra, outside Rishikesh. Why was it set up? It was set up because it was discovered during the 1965 War that our Jawans could not access elementary drugs and pharmaceuticals like antibiotic in adequate quantity in a time of war. Are we to regard drugs and pharmaceuticals as not a strategic product?

Therefore, my third question was – how does this Government, how does this nation, define a strategic industry and then say that these are strategic

industries which we are not going to privatise because they are needed for the nation in the public sector.

We have the example in the oil area of the Kuwait Investment Office acquiring shares of British Petroleum when British Petroleum was about to be disinvested. As soon as the Government of Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, the greatest privatiser of them all, discovered that the Kuwait Investment Office, K.I.O., was acquiring large quantities of British Petroleum shares, they put a stop on it. They said – ‘No, there is a limit beyond which K.I.O. cannot purchase BP Shares because if they do so we may be finding our national interest conflicting with those of Kuwait’s. This was said by the Minister knowing that British Petroleum is going to be disinvested. If the British can be alert enough to think of the possibility of the great United Kingdom having clashing interests with this tiny oil sheikhdom, Kuwait, how much more necessary is it not for us to regard oil supplies to our country, which in the foreseeable future will be heavily import-dependent, to be regarded as a strategic industry?

Why can you not see that getting rid of BPL is not a matter of making some money in order to meet your fiscal deficits? We made BPL out of Burmah Shell. Do we want it to go back, put it under Burmah Shell? If so, why did we ever get angry with them in the 1971 War? Instead of liberating Bangladesh through Gen. Tripathi, we should have asked the Chairman of Burmah Shell to take over Bangladesh. I understand that these are serious questions and we need serious answers.

My fourth point was – what constitutes a core industry? Is it an enterprise which is engaged in economic infrastructure or also one which is crucial to our social infrastructure for example, an industry which is critical to our food security programme or our poverty alleviation programme? There is a company which was set up in West Bengal immediately in the aftermath of a huge refugee influx from East Pakistan which served a critical social purpose at that time. Now, whether today, in the year 2002 we should regard the refugee rehabilitation of people who came in from East Pakistan in 1950 to be a continuing concern is something which we can consider. But when you talk of a core industry, please do not think in terms

exclusively of economic infrastructure. There may be aspects of social infrastructure that need to be taken into account.

My fifth question was – are manufacturing PSUs to be treated on par with PSUs in the social sector? It is a good question to ask because Mr. Arun Shourie, the writer – as distinct from the hon. Shri Arun Shourie, the Minister – has divested his heart over a series of articles about how rotten the public sector hotels are without having the integrity to compare the performance of the public sector hotels last year with the private sector hotels last year.

He has not had the integrity to do that. But he has the journalistic skill to hit out at these public sector hotels one of which is the Ashok Hotel which has turned the corner and made an enormous profit and the gentleman incharge of that is being rewarded for his achievement by being moved out of his office.

18.00 hrs.

It is shameful. I want to know whether the Government intends treating the manufacturing sector PSEs on the same par as service sector PSEs. This is a question which needs a White Paper to answer.

Equally in this, there are Section 25 companies. At one time, when Shri Arun Shourie was advocating this whole philosophy of disinvestment and privatisation, he used to go on and on about the poor performance of the public sector. In doing this, he would include in his adverse figures all the flop cases of the private sector which we had had to take over into the public sector, including the National Textiles Corporation. I am absolutely delighted to see the Minister of Textiles on roster duty here because he, the poor man, has to look after the National Textiles Corporation. What is the National Textiles Corporation except a showcase for the failure of the private sector? We had taken it into the public sector because the private sector could not run it. Yet, Shri Shourie, doubtless on the lessons he learnt in American universities and the World Bank, tells us that the private sector by definition is more efficient and the public sector by definition is less efficient. So, where do Section 25 companies fit into his disinvestment

policy? This is another part of the question that I raised two and a half years ago, to which I am awaiting a reply.

My sixth question was : Should a distinction be made between PSUs that pioneered new fields of industrialisation or new horizons of technology or new geographical areas of development, and PSUs which arose out of the failure of the private sector to run their enterprises properly, including the National Textiles Corporation?

My seventh question was : On what criteria should management control be transferred and under what circumstances should the transfer of ownership be considered? I also asked in what extreme conditions should Government relinquish both ownership and management. Is this an unfair question to ask? They are making their own decisions where strategic sale will take place, where they are going to give it out for public offer etc. I am asking him to tell us the criteria so that automatically, from the criteria, it flows as to which PSE is not going to be privatised, which one is going to be privatised in such a way that we lose management control, and which is going to be privatised in such a way that we lose ownership control also. What is their problem in telling us the criteria? If the criteria is going to be that they would give it up if Shri Ram Naik says `yes` and they will not give it up if Shri Pramod Mahajan says `no`, this is not transparency. We can debate it fourteen times, Shri Tripathi, in this House. But unless you are clear about the criteria, there can be no transparency and therefore, the opaqueness does not lie in the inability of Shri Somnath Chatterjee to see the truth nor does transparency lie in the fact that you, Shri Tripathi, are blinded by the truth. The opaqueness lies in the fact that criteria, on the basis of which decisions are taken, are not in the public realm; they are the private property of the gentleman called Shri Arun Shourie. Maybe, he shares this with his friends in 7, Race Course Road in exchange for every ministership that he is given, but certainly, the country does not know. On behalf of the country, I demand that in the White Paper, this seventh question which I have raised, be answered.

My eighth question is this. What are the objective criteria which should be put in place to determine whether a given unit should or should not be disinvested and whether PSUs with multiple units, such as the Steel

Authority of India Limited, should be disinvested as a composite corporation or first de-segregated into the respective units and then considered for disinvestment, which PSUs should be divested to the general public, which to mutual funds, which to financial institutions, which should be put up for strategic sale, which should be rehabilitated, revived, restructured and which should be sold as irretrievable junk? When Shri Tripathi does not know how to sell irretrievable junk, clearly the BJP is out of touch with the *raddiwalas*.

There is a market even for rubbish. Therefore, the answer to this argument as to who will buy a loss-making unit is, "Well, look for him".

So, we need answers to these -- the objective criteria on the basis of which you decide to do what. You say that this is in the executive realm. If we can have a discussion, preferably 14 times, and if Shri Arun Shourie can arrive here with that calculator that he has got not only in his hand but in his brain, and tell us everyday, like a computer, that he has answered 3,422 questions and preen himself as only a peacock and Arun Shourie know how to do, it does not constitute a discussion. There has been no discussion. He answers whatever he wishes; he leaves out what he does not wish to do, and the really difficult questions which we, from the Opposition, put to him -- not once, not twice, but 14 times, General Tripathy; again and again and again, we ask him -- he does not answer them. What can we do? We had a walk out. When we walk out, it does not mean that we do not read what he says. We read what he says and say, 'Thank God, we walked out! We had better things to do.' He does not answer our questions.

I then come to my ninth question. Should not one distinguish between persistently profit-making units and persistently loss-making units and a large number of units which fall in between, which are intermittently profit-making and intermittently loss-making?

You take SAIL. Back in the 1980s, SAIL was losing in terms of the rupees of those days it was losing one crore rupees a day. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi put Shri V. Krishnamurthy in charge. He turned it around and, within a year, SAIL was making a profit of one crore rupees a day. Now, is

SAIL a profit-making or loss-making unit? When we were in office -- I do not think it had to do with us, it had to do with a lot of factors -- SAIL made a profit of Rs. 1,200 crore, on an average, per year during that period. Then, it went into a period where it was making enormous losses. Now, what has happened? The Minister of Steel of this Government sends, without our asking for it, *gratis*, this document "The Year of Resurgence in the Steel Industry", and it shows that the year of resurgence in steel started with SAIL, not with any of these private sector steel-making firms. If Essar has bankrupted so many of our public sector institutions running into tens upon thousands of crores, it is because under this dispensation, this private sector favouring dispensation, IDBI has been looted to enable Essar to survive. Essar's survival has been at the cost of the steel industry because the year of resurgence, says the Minister of Steel, has been led by SAIL. What would have happened if we had handed over SAIL to Essar? Just ask yourself this question.

Therefore, should we not be distinguishing between persistently profit-making and persistently loss-making and intermittently profit-making and intermittently loss-making companies, in order to work out a policy of disinvestment?

Our tenth question was, whether Navratnas, whether they are maxi-*Navratnas* or mini-*Navratnas*, should or should they not be disinvested? After all, the *Navratnas* became *Navratnas* in Akbar's Court -- I am sorry to mention a Muslim King of India -- and we chose them because they are profit-making. Then, we said that their managements are simply outstanding, so let us give them much more autonomy; let them do their job because they have the personnel to do the job and they have the resources to do the job. Then, after we set up the maxi-*Navratnas*, we set up the mini-*Navratnas*. Should they not be given the position of *Navratnas*? Would you say that Emperor Akbar should have got rid of all his *Navratnas* in order to have a better *Durbar*? The *Navratnas* are supposed to be the diadem of the public sector, so I need to know the answer on this.

Sir, then I come to my eleventh question. Why should disinvestment proposals come from the Government? Why should they not come from

the Boards of the PSUs concerned? After all, they know their companies better than anybody else. They have their companies' interest at heart. They can tell you whether they can be better run by being disinvested or not. They are a responsible people. If your Disinvestment Commission has suggested that, in principle, such and such units should be disinvested, why not refer the matter to the Board of that company and let them tell you, (a) whether they should be disinvested or not; (b) if yes, to what extent; and (c) through what methodology? It would help.

Then there was the twelfth question that I asked then. What should be done with the disinvestment proceeds? Should they go to the Consolidated Fund of India or to the Disinvestment Fund? Now thanks to the review that has been done by the Government -- not because of my question, not because of this Parliament to which this Government does not have any respect, but because of internal pressures and quarrels -- and they have now announced that they are going to set up a Disinvestment Fund, when for three years they were telling us as to why they could not do it and how constitutionally impossible it was to do so because the Constitution provides for the Consolidated Fund of India. Now they have brushed it all to one side to keep Shri George Fernandes happy and have announced that now they are going to have a Disinvestment Fund. But they have not told us as to what are the criteria on the basis of which the money that is being put into the Disinvestment Fund will be disbursed and to whom. We used to talk about the social sectors, but that is significantly absent in the statement that was laid before us a few days ago and which was read out by Shri Somnath Chatterjee here. They are now talking about retiring public debt, which is a very good way of funding their fiscal deficit. We need to know, what are the criteria on the basis of which the Government would make these disbursements? If we have other ideas, then we would tell them what those ideas are.

Sir, my thirteenth question was -- which was a very crucial one -- what needs to be done to render the public sector undertakings functionally autonomous? I had asked this question two and a half years ago, what changes would this involve in regard to accountability to Parliament, to C&AG, to CVC, to CBI and to Government and of the public sector

undertakings' relationship with us? Twice over I had asked Shri Arun Shourie this question. But he has not answered. Why should we not be thinking in terms of putting an explanatory note under Article 12 of the Constitution -- which has been interpreted by the Supreme Court to say that public sector undertakings are the arms of the Government -- to say that public sector undertakings are not the arms of the Government? The Government can consider this so that autonomy for the functioning of these institutions could be promoted, or put it in some such way that there is – it is not day to day interference – a general accountability in what they say to us. But this has not been considered.

Sir, these were the thirteen questions that I had asked two and a half years ago. I would like General Tripathi to take note of this that two and a half years ago, some thirty months ago, I had asked these questions but the Government has not answered these questions. But General Tripathi has given me an excellent fourteenth question to ask. The question that he had asked. It never occurred to me. I am deeply grateful to General Tripathi for this. It is a tribute to his abilities as a Chairman.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): Why are you asking just thirteen and fourteen questions... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I know these Christian superstitions loom large in the minds of our Hindu patriots... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, the fourteenth question is the one that was asked by General Tripathi on TRIMS – Trade Related Investment Measures. It did not occur to me. We have committed ourselves to the WTO. This question is absolutely vital for the defence of this country. If the Government disinvested NALCO, like it disinvested Centaur hotel, and they decided not to run NALCO and sold it to somebody else, how would the Government know that the country's limited alumina would not be exported? The same thing is happening in the case of M/s Hindustan Zinc where a very noble company, namely, Messrs Steilite – we know their ethical standards are the pride of the country – have bought over Messrs Hindustan Zinc and they have made it clear to all concerned that they will operate only in some of the mines and that they are going to close down the others and the

Government can do nothing about it because it is no longer their property; it belongs to somebody else. In this sense, I think, the TRIMS question is very important.

The fifteenth question I now ask is the one raised by George Fernandes. What are you going to do about creating monopolies? You have it in IPCL. Petrochemicals used to be a public sector monopoly. Now it is virtually a private sector monopoly. Now, because Arun Shourie went to Syracuse University, he is going to teach me the difference between monopolies and oligopolies. We learned the same words in St. Stephen's College together. I may be inaccurate in referring to a private sector monopoly, but is private sector oligopoly any better? How is competition fostered by allowing one private sector company to become so dominant in so critical a field of national endeavour as petrochemicals?

Fortunately George Fernandes stood in the way of Arun Shourie. Otherwise, today the oil sector would also be with the same set of companies which are monopolistically or oligopolistically running the petrochemicals sector. We have to be very very careful on this.

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI : It is nice to hear that you agree with George Fernandes in something.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I do not agree with George Fernandes, the Defence Minister, but there are matters on which we agree with George Fernandes.

There is another question, which is on valuation. Somnath-da has raised a number of important points in that regard; I endorse them. But I want to raise the most fundamental question about valuation. Shri Arun Shourie has befogged the Opposition also - this time it is not just his own colleagues - by using a very clever term taken out of management economics, saying that he has relied on the discounted cash flow method to determine what is the valuation. Now, Sir, expressions that come out of mergers and acquisitions of well-organised stock markets, between one private company and another private company, can hardly be the basis on which we determine the valuation of a paradigm shift.

There was a paradigm shift from the private sector to the public sector when we nationalised the banks. The matter had to go up to the Supreme Court. As a result of the Supreme Court judgement, we had to amend our laws. It was decided that it is not discounted cash flow methods, but it is the paradigm shift from private ownership of banks to public sector ownership of banks that is going to determine how the valuation will be undertaken. In exactly the same way, through the Act that Somnath Chatterjee was referring to a few minutes ago, when we took over Caltex, when we took over Esso, when we took over Burma Shell, we did not say to them that we will compensate them on the basis of their discounted cash flow. We decided that a paradigm shift requires a separate set of criteria.

When Shri Arun Shourie's Government loses control over a public sector undertaking, either management control or ownership control, when it is left impotent - as in the case of Centaur hotel where the man who has acquired it can make Rs.32 crore in three months by selling it to somebody else - and when, to take the example given by Gen. Tripathi, we privatise NALCO to Sterlite or one of his friends and then they pick up the alumina and start exporting it abroad instead of utilising it within this country, there is such a significant paradigm shift that you cannot talk in terms of acquisitions and mergers; you cannot talk in terms of discounted cash flow.

That is why, again and again this country feels it has been robbed and cheated - not by Arun Shourie filling his pockets; his pockets are already too heavy to be filled any more. We are not talking about his personal integrity. We are saying that the nation's assets are being liquidated in a manner unacceptable to us which is why - I am coming to a conclusion because I can see that you are looking at me rather sternly - we need a Standing Committee on Disinvestment. It is this body to which proposals for disinvestment should be taken. It is this body which should approve eventually - because after all Government will have a built-in majority - the methodology for disinvestment. Most important of all, it will follow up on the consequences of disinvestment. That is why we need this.

I would request you to please go back to what the Congress has said. The Congress has had no policy on disinvestment. The 1999 Manifesto did not have a section on the disinvestment. We had a section on the restructuring

of the public sector in which disinvestment was one paragraph. Therefore, we do not conceive of disinvestment as a way of dismantling socialism and ending the public sector.

We see disinvestment as one possible way in certain circumstances and in specific cases, of being able to strengthen the public sector. There are these two superb documents that have been lying on Shri Arun Shourie's desk unread for two-and-a-half years. They are written by the top managers who belong to his Government's undertakings. They are his managers. They are the best and the brightest minds in the public sector, that is the Standing Conference of Public Enterprises. In September, 2000, they prepared this document called, 'Disinvestment and Privatisation of Indian Public Sector'. They followed it up in January, 2001 with this document 'Scopes - Views on Disinvestment'. They submitted both to this Minister. He has not even cared to acknowledge the existence of the views of his own managers. I plead that this be done. This is the only way in which we will be able to move ahead with confidence on such restructuring of the public sector that might incidentally involve disinvestment.

Sir, my last word, I plead with this Government that the most important thing for this economy is investment for the poor and not disinvestment in favour of the rich.

सभापति महोदय : श्री कुप्पुसामी का भाण ले माना जाए।

***SHRI C. KUPPUSAMI (MADRAS NORTH):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to participate, on behalf of my party DMK, in the Discussion regarding disinvestment of public sector undertakings.

After globalisation, because of World Trade Organisation impact and liberalisation, successive governments have started disinvesting and privatising public sector units. However, no comprehensive policy in respect of disinvestment which would make the economic reforms less painful, with human face, has not been evolved.

Sir, as the House is well aware, public sector has played a pivotal role in the planning economic and industrial development of the country. It was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who said, it would reach the commanding heights of economy and is also called the Temple of Modern India.

Sir, we have seen how some attempts are being made to sell even strategic units, profit making units which are commercially viable and are efficiently being run with dedication and commitment of workers.

Transport Sector :

Sir, you will be shocked to know that the State of Tamil Nadu Government is having a proposal to even privatise transport undertakings which are providing essential service catering to the people who are mostly daily wage earners, under-privileged, students, Physically handicapped people, freedom fighters and others. It is a public utility unit providing service at cheaper cost, affordable to the people and these units are being run in a most efficient manner and on profitable lines. The transport workers in public undertakings in Tamil Nadu come to around 1,25,000 and they are giving their dedicated service round the clock to the State. They have given properties worth thousands of crores of rupees to the transport

* Laid on the Table of the House.

undertakings, for which no equity was provided by the Government. The Supreme Court has also said that such activities should be considered as welfare and progressive measure. So, I would appeal to the policy makers to be more transparent and keep these things in mind while taking any decision about offloading of Government shares in those undertakings.

If those State transport undertakings which are giving very good service to the general public, which are running on profit, are taken to the path of privatisation, then it would be a suicidal attempt on the part of the Government, since the general public would be put to lot of hardships and more than 2 lakh workmen and their families would be on the street. The general public will be fleeced by the private transport people as we have seen in other sectors.

Salem Steel Plant (SAIL):

About Salem Steel Plant, it was conceived during the period of DMK Government, when Dr. Kalaingar was the Chief Minister in the '70s. SSP was doing well and has produced quality steel for surgical and export purposes also. If it is converted as integrated project by starting Alloy Plant there, Salem Steel Plant would become commercially viable and competitive in the market. I would appeal to the Government to consider so that the economy of the State, the ancillary industries which are depending on this Plant and the interests of workers would be protected.

Neyveli Lignite Corporation Ltd.:

Sir, Neyveli Lignite Corporation is the pride of the nation whose new expansion unit is being dedicated to the nation today by our hon. Minister of Coal and Mines, Kumari Uma Bharati. On this occasion, I congratulate the entire work force of NLC and I thank the hon. Minister for inaugurating this unit. By this they would be increasing the generation capacity to 2490 mega watt per annum. They have earned a net profit of Rs.819.20 crores, registering a growth of 12.85%, declaring a dividend of 13.5%.

As environmental protection measure, they have planted 170 lakhs of trees and reclaimed 165 hectares of land. They are providing quality education for 40,000 children through 34 schools and a college; medicare with 369 bedded hospitals and dispensaries. They have also undertaking social costs, by providing drinking water to surrounding villages and irrigation water to 20,000 acres in nearby villages.

Now, even this sort of golden egg laying undertaking is also unfortunately targeted for disinvestment by the Government. I would only appeal to the Government that since there is already a policy that strategic companies and profit making undertakings should not be disturbed, undertakings like NLC should be given all support and encouragement to stand on their own feet and Government should not burn its finger unnecessarily.

NLC is generating power at the most optimum level and offering to various States at a minimum cost of Rs.1.64 per unit and with this, it is possible for the State Governments to provide electricity at cheap tariff to domestic consumers and farmers. The past experience of privatising the power project is also bitter, as you have seen Enron, Dabhol power project. Even the consumers would be put to hardship since they have to bear heavy burden, since the Government would pass on the extra cost on them.

As we have seen in the last one decade, no tangible results were achieved by the Government by privatising most of the public sector units, rather it invited criticisms from all quarters. So, I would appeal to the Government to reconsider the whole disinvestment policy and in PSEs involving strategic considerations, the Government should continue to retain majority holding. Profit making undertakings should not be privatised since the benefits would be taken away by the private people, and with the result the workers and the general public would face the consequences.

The Government has also committed in various pronouncement made right from 1991 Statement of Industrial Policy, the workers shall be protected in all cases. I would therefore urge upon the Government that wherever the workers were dislocated/affected due to the disinvestment policy of the Government, their interests should be fully protected.

However, in ground reality, nothing is happening. Thousands and lakhs of workers are facing the problems and the Government machinery is not serious in protecting their interests, nor have they been rehabilitated. In the New Economic Reforms process, the workers are the worst sufferers and they are left to fend for themselves. It is creating frustration and unrest in the society. If this situation continues, it may explode any time, leading to law and order problems and social conflicts.

I would therefore, appeal to the Government to pay attention to the labour aspect also so that their interests are well protected and some social security net is provided to them.

DR. B.B. RAMAIAH (ELURU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, many hon. Members have made very exhaustive speeches on the issue of disinvestment, which is being repeatedly talked about every year. All of them have agreed in principle that we have to do it but they have given different suggestions on the methodology as to how it should be done.

When we took up this disinvestment issue in 1991, that was the time when the Government felt that this was an absolutely necessary policy for this country. They have invested nearly Rs.2,74,000 crore in public sector and a substantial amount is the borrowed amount, whether internally or externally. We find that the return on this is not adequate either to repay it or to take up the possible expansion and development. That is the stage when disinvestment policy was started in 1991.

Shri Tripathi has mentioned that in 1991 it started with some push of Rs.3000 crore and sometimes it went down while at other times it has gone up. In 1994-95 it went up to Rs.4,800 crore and in 1998-99 it was Rs.5000 crore. Ultimately, on 24 July, 2002 the total amount realised out of disinvestment was only Rs.29,000 crore as against the projected target of about Rs.78,000 crore. Anyhow, the question is how to take it up.

At the moment, we have taken up this issue when there is going to be a lot of restrictions on this sector. They have already liberalised and have given a sort of freedom for the management. They have started an MoU system. The system is adopted to give more freedom for the operation of the experts to see that their capabilities can be shown. Earlier, for everything, they required permission. You had to move from one place to other. A man from Bangalore has to go to Delhi and do a lot of things. If he has to take

some borrowing or some technology, there are restrictions there. That has been substantially liberalised and they are asked to show their performance. Also, asset and manpower is provided in a number of public sector units.

While we are making this sort of a system, we find that some units are doing better while others are not able to do. So, this sort of categorisation also started. What we had seen earlier, we were able to improve some of the performances because of high duty protection. The methodology which we used is called as the administrative price system.

That is slowly coming down in the present system. We have now opened up to competition and we are facing competition. So, naturally protection is coming down in every direction. Here is the time when we have to show our real abilities. Sometimes we have to see whether we can merge some units; whether we can open up some sectors by improving their capabilities and by reducing their overheads and by seeing to their more efficient operations. That is why, only a few days back we have replaced the word monopoly with competition. Here we would like to bring in judiciary, commerce, and different expertise so that they should be able to take our suggestions.

Everyone is more interested about the evaluation. The most important point is transparency. What is equally important is whether there is transparency in how we are disinvesting some units. Transparency, opening up have to come in and confidentiality has to go out. That is very important. Any other suggestion by which we can have more transparency, opening up and better price realisation than what we are getting today is most welcome. The only way we can think of it is to leave it to the experts committee.

The stock market is fluctuating very much. This is the time when we have to study it very carefully. SEBI has to take things under its control and give proper guidance. We need some sort of a system by which we can ensure transparency here also.

Disinvestment Ministry should completely keep away from the strategic industries. I think the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment will be able to take care of it. They must be already doing some exercise and we have to rely on their wisdom.

Another important point is how you are going to utilise the amount that is coming out of disinvestment. We are giving VRS at a number of places. This amount is spent largely for that only. But, this amount has to be used in some of the places where we find that some units have to be closed down for various reasons beyond our control and we need to give VRS to the workers. We will have to take care of those people to see that somehow or the other they are able to survive. Workers' interest must be taken care of. We have to take enough care for their protection and security. Everyone of us think about welfare measures. We can use this money for giving better health and education and for meeting other social obligations. This is where we need to spend and help this country prosper. Here, suggestions given by all the hon. Members, by the Experts Committee on Disinvestment, Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment and others too play a very important role. With the involvement of more and more people we can categorise as to which are the sectors to be strengthened, where we have to come down to 26 per cent and where we have to maintain at 45 per cent. The number of sectors also should be worked out and a clear-cut policy has to be announced.

I feel disinvestment is absolutely essential. We have to go ahead. The only caution to be exercised here is that we have to see that proper methodology is applied, there is transparency and involvement of experts at every stage.

With these few words, I thank you very much.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा (खीरी) : सभापति महोदय, सरकारी क्षेत्र के उपक्रमों के विनिवेश के बारे में हो रही चर्चा में भाग लेने के लिये आपने मुझे अवसर दिया, उसके लिये धन्यवाद।

सभापति जी, हमारे संसद भवन के अंदर बहुत से महापुरुषों की तस्वीरें और मूर्तियां लगी हुई हैं जिन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के लिये प्रयास किया। हम लोगों ने उनकी मूर्तियां यहां स्थापित

की हैं। इस संसद ने हिन्दुस्तान और हिन्दुस्तानियों की तकदीर बदली है। हम इस बात से चकित हैं और हमें यह समझ में नहीं आ रहा कि जिस रास्ते पर बुजुर्गों ने हमारा चलना तय किया था, वह रास्ता सही था या आज की हमारी सरकार जिस रास्ते पर हमें ले जा रही है, वह सही है?

हमें आज तय करना पड़ेगा कि हमने जो शुरूआत की थी, वह गलत थी या जिस रास्ते पर हम आज जा रहे हैं, वह गलत है। बड़ी कुर्बानियों के बाद हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ और हम लोगों ने एक दिशा तय की थी, उस दिशा के तहत हिन्दुस्तान एक नियोजित अर्थव्यवस्था के रास्ते पर चला था और हमने पी.एस.यू. खड़े किये थे। जो हमारी बैकबोन बन गये थे। लेकिन आज जो परिस्थितियां हमारे सामने आई हैं, उनमें एक-एक करके इन महत्वपूर्ण कंपनियों को बेचा जा रहा है। हालांकि सरकार इसे डिसइनवैस्टमेंट कहती है, लेकिन जो तथ्य सामने आये हैं, जिस तरीके से अखबार रंगे पड़े हैं, उससे साफ-साफ यह लग रहा है कि यह कोई डिसइनवैस्टमेंट नहीं है, यह डिस्ट्रेस सेल है। यह हताश और कमजोर सरकार का ऐसा कदम है, जो वही उठा सकती थी, जो अपने रास्ते पर चल रही है।

सभापति महोदय, हमारे संविधान ने एक एजेंडा तय किया था कि हमें गरीबों को गरीबी रेखा से ऊपर उठाना है और उन्हें इंसान बना देना है। लेकिन इस सरकार ने उस एजेंडा को बदल दिया है। अब सरकार का वर्किंग एजेंडा, खाली कम्पार्टमेंट की पोलिटिक्स करने का है। इस सरकार का जो वर्किंग एजेंडा है, वह खाली आतंकवाद को एक पूंजी की तरह इस्तेमाल करना है, जिससे कि वह लौटकर आ सके। जिन लोगों ने इस मुल्क का वर्किंग एजेंडा बदला है, उनसे हम उम्मीद भी क्या कर सकते हैं। आज सरकार की नीतियों की जो विफलताएं हमारे सामने आ रही हैं। सरकार आतंकवाद को एक मुद्दा बना रही है, लेकिन यह सरकार की अपनी ही नीतियों के फलस्वरूप है। आज जो अंतर्राष्ट्रीय माहौल बन रहा है, जैसे अभी रैफरेन्स आया कि एक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय ट्रेड टैरिफिज्म पूरी धरती पर फैल रहा है और हिन्दुस्तान की पूरी अर्थव्यवस्था, सामाजिक व्यवस्था और राजनीतिक व्यवस्था उसका शिकार हो रही है, इसके लिए कोई सार्थक कार्य करने की बजाय, यह तय किया गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान की बैकबोन कंपनियों को, जिन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान को एक पहचान दी है, उन कंपनियों को यह एक डिस्ट्रेस सेल के अंतर्गत खत्म कर रहे हैं।

हिन्दुस्तान बहुत बड़ा बाजार है और बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियां यहां आने के लिए अपनी पूरी जान लगाकर घूम रही हैं। वे हिन्दुस्तान में किसी भी कीमत पर घुसने के लिए आमादा हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के विशाल बाजार को रिसोर्स के तौर पर ये ऑर्गेनाइज नहीं कर पाये। हालत यह है कि जो बाहर से दबाव पड़ रहे हैं, उनसे हमारी कंपनियां टूटी हैं, उनसे हमारी कंपनियों की अर्थव्यवस्था कमजोर हुई है और इन कंपनियों की कमजोरी को बिन्दु बनाकर आज यह आधार बनाया जा रहा है कि इन कंपनियों को हमें बेच देना है, डिसइनवेस्ट कर देना है, जिससे कि कुछ पैसा हमें मिल सके और उस पैसे से बजट की कमजोरी, घाटा तथा दूसरी आवश्यकताएं पूरी हो सकें।

सभापति महोदय, हमें केवल एक बात कहनी है कि हिंदुस्तान में अपार संभावनाएं थीं। यहां तक कि अमरीका जैसा मुल्क भी कहता था कि हिंदुस्तान एक सोया हुआ देव है, उसके अंदर अपार संभावनाएं हैं। जिस दिन यह जागेगा, पूरी धरती के लिए चैलेंज बन जायेगा। कहां चला गया हमारा चैलेंज और कहां चली गई हमारी संभावनाएं ? मेरा सीधा-सीधा कहना है कि जब हम आर्थिक सुधारों की तरफ बढ़ रहे हैं, मैंने संसद में पहले भी कहा है कि आर्थिक सुधारों के पहले हमें अपने यहां प्रशासनिक सुधार, न्यायिक सुधार लाने चाहिए, जिससे कि हमारे अधिकारी और कर्मचारी जो इन पी.एस.यूज. को चलाने के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं, हम उनकी जिम्मेदारी निश्चित कर पाएं। जैसा अभी हमारे पूर्व वक्ता बता रहे थे कि हिंदुस्तान में जिम्मेदार प्रशासनिक अधिकारियों को लगाकर घाटे में चलते हुए पी.एस.यूज. को लाभ देने वाले पी.एस.यूज. में बदला गया है। इसके उदाहरण हमारे सामने आ रहे हैं। लेकिन जो प्रशासनिक अकुशलता है, एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव मिसपरफॉर्मेंस है, एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव नैगलिजेंस हैं, इन सब चीजों पर बिना गौर किये हुए सीधे-सीधे आर्थिक सुधारों की तरफ सरकार आगे बढ़ रही है। सरकार आर्थिक सुधारों के माध्यम से ऐसा पोटेन्शियल कदम नहीं उठा रही है जिससे हिंदुस्तान के हर आदमी की प्रोडक्टिविटी बढ़े, आमदनी बढ़े, कार्यक्षमता बढ़े और हिंदुस्तान आर्थिक रूप से तरक्की करे। सरकार ने यह निर्णय लिया है जिसे कठोर निर्णय कहते हैं कि जो महत्वपूर्ण पी.एस.यूज हैं उनको बेचेंगे और उनको बेचने के बाद जो पैसा मिलेगा, उससे अपना काम चलाएंगे।

महोदय, जैसा अभी कहा गया कि बहुत बार इस मुद्दे पर बहस हो चुकी है लेकिन सरकार का रुख बदला नहीं है। आज स्थिति यह है। शुरूआत इसलिए की गई थी कि जो हमारे घाटे में चलने वाले पी.एस.यूज हैं, स्ट्रैटेजिक पार्टनर लाकर लॉस मेकिंग पी.एस.यूज से प्रॉफिट मेकिंग पी.एस.यूज में बनाया जाएगा, वह चीज़ पूरी नहीं हुई। उसके बाद यह तय किया गया कि सरकार का घाटा पूरा करने के लिए कुछ पी.एस.यूज को बेचा जाएगा और जब वे टारगेट भी पूरे नहीं हुए तो यह तय किया गया कि प्रॉफिट मेकिंग पी.एस.यूज के साथ लॉस मेकिंग पी.एस.यूज को क्लब कर दिया जाए और उनसे घाटा निकाला जाए।

जैसा हमारे पूर्ववक्ता बता रहे थे कि उनके समय में कहा गया था कि यह सरकार की आर्थिक नीति का केवल एक हिस्सा रहेगा, लेकिन जिन परिस्थितियों में वर्तमान सरकार ने विनिवेश की नीति को अपनी कुल अर्थव्यवस्था का एक मूलभूत अंग बना दिया है, उससे हमें स्पष्ट लगता है कि कहीं न कहीं भटकाव है। आज यह दिखाई पड़ने लगा है कि जिस दिशा में सरकार जा रही है, कितनी ज़बर्दस्त पावरफुल लॉबी मिडिलमैन की बन चुकी है। आज हमारे सामने उदाहरण हैं कि किस तरह से अंडरटेकिंग बेचे गए और उन्हें जिन लोगों ने खरीदा था, उसका एक उदाहरण अभी आया था कि बतरा हॉस्पिटैलिटीज़ ने एक होटल खरीदा और होटल खरीदने के बाद जैसी सरकार की मंशा थी, वैसे उसको नहीं चलाया और आगे बेच दिया। इस बात के साफ सुबूत मिल रहे हैं कि दलाल पैदा हो गए हैं, ऐसे लोग पैदा हो गए हैं जो पूरी प्रोसेस को मोबिलाइज़ कर रहे हैं। मेरी जानकारी में आया है और अखबार में भी लिखा है जिसको मैं क्वोट

करना चाहता हूँ।

"Even Mr. Shourie has admitted to the existence of corporate tentacles in the Government and the critical roles they play. "

मुझे नहीं लगता कि इसके बाद कहने के लिए कुछ बचा है। हम कहां से चले थे और कहां पहुंचे हैं। कहां हमने शुरूआत की थी इस हिन्दुस्तान को एक ऐसा अज़ीम-उ-शान मुल्क बनाने की, जहां हर आदमी अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होगा, एक ऐसा मुल्क बनेगा जो धरती का सबसे बड़ा लोकतंत्र होगा, लेकिन आज जो बड़ी मेहनत से कमाए गए हमारे एस्टैबलिशमेंट्स थे, उनको भी खत्म किया जा रहा है। यहां तक कि अब विरोध के स्वर सरकारी पक्ष से भी उठने लगे हैं। सरकार के महत्वपूर्ण मंत्रिगण और आर.एस.एस. के सरसंघचालक सुदर्शन जी और जो बुद्धिजीवी हैं, उन्होंने भी इस व्यवस्था पर सवाल उठाने शुरू कर दिये हैं। इसलिए आज हमें नए सिरे से सोचना पड़ेगा कि हम जिस रास्ते पर जा रहे हैं, वह सही है या गलत है। आज सरकार का लक्ष्य सिर्फ रिफॉर्म है या हिन्दुस्तान की वह करोड़ों गरीब जनता है जो आशा भरी निगाहों से संसद की ओर देख रही है।

मैं एक बात साफ-साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब से इस देश में कंपार्टमेंट की पोलिटिक्स चालू हुई है और खासकर हिन्दू-मुस्लिम कंपार्टमेंट पैदा किया गया है, यह सुबूत है और अखबार भी इस बात को लिखते हैं कि तब से हिन्दुस्तान में आर्थिक विकास की दर गिरी है। एक तरफ हम ऐसे रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं कि जहां हम आर्थिक रूप से नुकसान उठाने के रास्ते पर जा रहे हैं और दूसरी ओर जब कोई नुकसान हो रहा है तो हम उन पी.एस.यूज़ को बेचने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, जिन पी.एस.यूज़ ने हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थव्यवस्था की बैकबोन स्थापित की।

महोदय, आज हमें बहुत गहराई से सोचना पड़ेगा कि हमारा रास्ता क्या था और हम कहां से कहां पहुंच गए हैं। एक बात बड़े गौर से कही गई कि जो पैसा विनिवेश से प्राप्त किया गया है, उसे कहां खर्च किया जाएगा। जैसा कि आपका डाक्यूमेंट था, जिसके बारे में अभी बताया गया, आपने तय किया था कि हिन्दुस्तान की वह गरीब जनता जो अशिक्षित है, जिसकी प्रोडक्टिविटी बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता है, जिसको अपने पैरों पर खड़े किए जाने की आवश्यकता है। आगे आने वाले दो-तीन वॉर् में पूरी धरती ट्रिप्स कंपलाएंट होने जा रही है। हिन्दुस्तान के प्रत्येक आदमी को अपनी प्रोडक्टिविटी मॉनिटर करनी पड़ेगी, उसे इस लायक बनना पड़ेगा कि वह एक प्रोडक्टिव फोर्स बन कर रह सके, नहीं तो वह उत्पादन की प्रणाली से बाहर हो जाएगा।

महोदय, क्या आज हमारे लिए यह चुनौती नहीं है कि हम इस बात पर विचार करें कि गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे रहने वाले लोगों को हम कैसे ऊपर उठाएंगे, कैसे उन्हें अपने पैरों पर खड़ा करेंगे,

कैसे उनको शिक्षित करेंगे, कैसे उनकी हैलथ केयर करेंगे, कैसे हम एम्प्लॉयमेंट पोर्टेन्शियल जनरेट करेंगे। आज हालत यह है कि जब से उदारीकरण की प्रक्रिया चालू हुई है तब से इसी संसद में हमें बताया गया है कि कई हजार लघु उद्योग चौपट हो चुके हैं, 15-20 लाख लोग बेरोजगार हो चुके हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान का वह नौजवान जो पढ़ा-लिखा नौजवान है, वह भटक रहा है, उसके लिए कोई रास्ता नहीं है, वह कहां जाए ? हिन्दुस्तान के विकास का रास्ता अवरुद्ध हुआ है और हमें आज यह बताते हुए बहुत अफसोस हो रहा है कि सरकार उन कमिटीमेंट्स के ऊपर जो कि सरकार के संवैधानिक कमिटीमेंट्स थे, उन्हें पूरा करने के लिए कुछ नहीं कर सकी है और डिसइनवैस्टमेंट का पैसा जिसे सरकार बता रही है गरीबों के कल्याण पर खर्च किया जाएगा और उससे उनका जीवन स्तर ऊपर किया जाएगा, उसे बजट के घाटे के लिए इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा है। हमने देखा है कि यू.टी.आई. के घाटे के लिए, जो सिक्योरिटी स्कैम हुआ, उसे कंपन्सेट करने के लिए सरकार ने 14,500 करोड़ रुपए दिए हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के वे करोड़ों नौजवान, जिनके सामने एक भविय की बैकबोन है, जो हिन्दुस्तान की आखिरी ताकत है, सरकार उसके लिए कुछ नहीं कर सकी है।

सर, इन सब बातों को देखते हुए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यह सरकार स्वयं अपने रास्ते से नहीं भटकी है बल्कि इसने देश को ही अपने रास्ते से भटका दिया है और आज देश जिस रास्ते पर जा रहा है उसके कारण हिन्दुस्तान को, जो बाहर की क्रेडिट रेटिंग एजेंसीज हैं वे हिन्दुस्तान की सॉवरन की रेटिंग "बी" ग्रेड में करने लगी हैं और यह हिन्दुस्तान के लिए बहुत दुखद सत्य है। इस सरकार के संरक्षण में यह मुल्क सुरक्षित नहीं है।

महोदय, मेरा सभी साथियों से, विशेष रूप से सत्ता पक्ष के जो साथी हैं, उनसे अनुरोध है, हालांकि उन्होंने विरोध का एक स्वर उठाया है, उन्हें दिखाई पड़ा है कि सरकार जो कुछ कर रही है वह साफ-सुथरा नहीं है, उसका रास्ता भी साफ नहीं है, मैं उन्हें बताना चाहता हूं कि जिस रास्ते पर हम चल रहे हैं वह हिन्दुस्तान और हिन्दुस्तानियों का रास्ता नहीं है। कृपया आंखें खोलकर देखें, सोचें और गौर करें।

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे (औरंगाबाद, महाराष्ट्र) : सर, आज जो विनिवेश के ऊपर चर्चा हो रही है, उस पर मैं शिव सेना की ओर से बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं। परसों एक प्रश्न आया था उसके उत्तर में और मैंने अपनी स्पीच में इस बारे में काफी विस्तार से बताया था। अभी श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा जी बोल रहे थे, वे बराबर बोल रहे थे कि हमारी केन्द्र सरकार का कुछ कर्तव्य होता है कि वह एम्पलायमेंट जनरेट करे। हमारा भी कुछ कर्तव्य होता है कि हम अपने यहां रोजगार बढ़ाएं। इसी माध्यम से ऐसा 50 वॉर्स से होता चला आ रहा है। श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर जी ने बहुत अच्छा बोला कि बर्मा-शैल और इंडियन ऑयल वगैरह के साथ ऐसा कर रहे हैं।

18.45 hrs. (MR. SPEAKER in the Chair)

बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के बाद, हम जहां जा रहे हैं, इस पर सोचने का समय आ गया है। हमारे महाराष्ट्र के जितने भी एम्पलाइज हैं, कामगार हैं, कर्मठ कर्मचारी हैं, हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम, भारत पेट्रोलियम, सेंटूर होटल और दूसरे सेंटूर होटल और कई उन कंपनियों में हैं जिन कंपनियों का सरकार विनिवेश करने जा रहे हैं। उनमें हमारे मराठी कामगार बहुत बड़ी संख्या में लगे हैं और यह उनकी जिन्दगी का सवाल है, इससे उनका संसार उजड़ रहा है।

जब हमारे पास हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम और भारत पेट्रोलियम के लोग आये तब हम श्री राम नाईक जी से मिले थे। अभी दादा ने बहुत अच्छा बोला। दादा ने प्रधान मंत्री जी से एप्वाइंटमेंट लेकर बताया था। उसमें शिवसेना के लोग भी शामिल थे। इस बात से हजारों कामगार चिन्तित हैं। यह बहुत ही गंभीर बात है और शिव सेना के लोग इस बात पर बहुत गंभीरता से सोच रहे हैं। हम सरकार में शामिल हैं लेकिन सरकार में होने के बावजूद भी यह बहुत सोचने की बात है। माननीय बाला साहब ठाकरे ने विजय दशमी के दिन कहा था। ...(व्यवधान)

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : यह देश का सवाल है। ...(व्यवधान)

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : इसलिए मैं बोल रहा हूं। हम लोग अपनी भूमिका यहां रख रहे हैं। हमको चाहिए, सदन को चाहिए कि इस पर हम सोचें।

...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : खैरे जी, आप चेयर की तरफ देखकर बोलिये।

...(व्यवधान)

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : दादा ने यही कहा कि सारा सदन इस मांग को उठाये क्योंकि यह राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति का प्रश्न है। मैंने उस दिन यही प्रश्न किया था कि कम्पनियां क्यों लॉस में जा रही हैं, इसके बारे में क्या आपने कभी सोचा ? अभी आप स्टील अथारिटी ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड के बारे में बोल रहे हैं। मुझे आज किसी ने बताया कि कोई अधिकारी बड़ी-बड़ी कम्पनियों के साथ मिलकर उसे विनिवेश करने के लिए मार्ग खोल रहे हैं। वह मार्ग कैसे खोल रहे हैं ? स्टील अथारिटी ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड के जो आफिसर्स हैं, डायरेक्टर हैं, मैं यहां किसी का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता, वे किसी के साथ मिलकर जो प्रोडेक्शन 100 परसेंट होना था, उन्होंने उसे 50 परसेंट किया है ताकि स्टील अथारिटी ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड को सेल करने का रास्ता क्लीयर हो जाये। ...(व्यवधान) आपने नहीं किया लेकिन अगली कैबिनेट मीटिंग में फिर प्रस्ताव रखेंगे कि स्टील अथारिटी ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड को सेल कर दिया जाये क्योंकि वे लॉस में जा रही है। जैसा अभी श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा ने बताया कि घाटा पूरा करने के लिए ये ऐसा कर रहे हैं। वर्तमान पत्र में यह आया था कि चालू र्वा के बजट में विनिवेश से 12 हजार करोड़ रुपये प्राप्त होने की

आशा की गई थी लेकिन अभी तक मात्र 3022 करोड़ रुपये ही प्राप्त हो सकें। आगे लिखा है कि 12 हजार करोड़ रुपये के लक्ष्य तक पहुंचना असंभव है। मेरा कहना है कि हम अपने कामगारों की बलि देकर ये पाप क्यों करें ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपको मानूंगा तथा श्री राम नाईक जी को भी मानूंगा। मेरे चुनाव क्षेत्र सम्भाजी नगर, औरंगाबाद में एच.एम.टी. की एक कम्पनी है। जब एच.एम.टी. को सेल करने का प्रस्ताव कैबिनेट ने पास किया, तब मैं आपके पास और श्री राम नाईक जी के पास गया था। आपने कहा कि कैबिनेट में प्रस्ताव पास हुआ, वह नहीं हुआ। आप मुख्यमंत्री थे और मैं कैबिनेट मंत्री था। कैबिनेट में प्रस्ताव पास होने के बाद भी दुबारा कैबिनेट के पास आया कि इस पर आप पुनः विचार करें। उस समय हमारे आफिसर बोले कि एच.एम.टी. को सेल कर दो तब आपकी पार्टी का होते हुए भी मैंने आपके सामने धरना दिया था कि ऐसे नहीं चलेगा। धरने के समय आपके प्रिमाइसेस में मारुति और एच.एम.टी. के लोग आये थे। उस समय आपने कहा था कि मैं इस संबंध में सब आफिसर से चर्चा करूंगा। उसके बाद भी आफिसर का मत हमारे बाजू में नहीं था। उन्होंने कहा कि आप इसे सेल कर दो। मैंने उसे रोका तो आपने एक प्रस्ताव दिया कि पहले वह कम्पनी प्रॉफिट करके दिखाये। उस कम्पनी ने एक साल में प्रॉफिट किया। क्यों नहीं आप को-आपरेटिव सैक्टर में ऐसा करते ? ...(व्यवधान) हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम और भारत पेट्रोलियम के आज ...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप उधर धरना क्यों नहीं देते ?

...(व्यवधान)

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम, भारत पेट्रोलियम आदि कई कम्पनियां हैं। मैं नालको के बारे में बोलूंगा। ...(व्यवधान)

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी : यह भी एक साजिश है। ...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐसी बात नहीं है।

...(व्यवधान)

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : अब नालको को भी विनिवेश करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं।

नालको ने क्षमता का सौ प्रतिशत से अधिक उपयोग किया है। पिछले दस वॉर्षों में 1153 करोड़ रुपये से अधिक मुनाफा अर्जित किया है। उसमें से सरकार को 2,295 करोड़ रुपये कर रूप में भी दिए हैं और 3,994 करोड़ रुपये का पुनर्निवेश किया है। फिर भी कम्पनी क्यों बेचते हैं।...(व्यवधान)

वधान) एन.डी.ए. के कुछ मंत्री भी इसके खिलाफ हैं।... (व्यवधान) रामबाबू नायक को मैंने बैठने के लिए बोला था। वे भी अपने ही विचारों के हैं लेकिन उनके ऊपर दबाव आ रहा है। दबाव आने से यह सब हो रहा है। हमारी सरकार का कुछ कर्तव्य है।... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : खैरे जी, विपक्ष की तरफ मत देखिए बल्कि इधर देखकर भाण कीजिए। आपके भी बहुत अच्छे प्रौस्पैक्ट्स हैं। मेरी तरफ देखकर बोलिए।

श्री श्यामाचरण शुक्ल (महासमुन्द) : पूरे सत्ता पक्ष में गुरु जी अकेले पड़ गए हैं।... (व्यवधान)

श्री खारबेल स्वाइं : मैं यहां हूं। I am sufficient for everybody.

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : मैं अपनी सरकार के बारे में कुछ नहीं बोलूंगा लेकिन आप लोग उसके बारे में समझ गए हैं। बाल्को के बारे में यहां बहुत चर्चा हुई। वोटिंग भी हमने आपके फेवर में की लेकिन बाल्को कम्पनी शायद पांच सौ कुछ करोड़ रुपये में बेची गई। आज वह कितने प्रॉफिट में आई। स्टैरलाइट कम्पनी ने उधर पैसा करके डाला लेकिन सरकार की तिजोरी में स्टैरलाइट कम्पनी के एक्साइज़ और बाकी सब ड्यूटीज़ के कितने पैसे आ रहे हैं। कुछ नहीं आ रहे हैं। मेरे यहां स्टैरलाइट कम्पनी की फ़ैक्ट्री है। उसमें तीन महीने पहले डेढ़ साल के अंदर 67 करोड़ रुपये की एक्साइज़ की चोरी की। चोरी करके ऐसे लोगों को हम सेल करेंगे, इसके बारे में भी हमें सोचना पड़ेगा।... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपका समय समाप्त हुआ। आपको दस मिनट दिए गए थे, वे पूरे हो गए हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : कुछ दिन पहले मैंने मंत्री जी से पूछा था कि कितने ट्रांज़ैक्शन्स हुए हैं। उन्होंने बताया ---

"In the last two years, 34 transactions have taken place for disinvestment. Out of these, 26 companies were loss making."

ठीक है, मैं यह समझूंगा कि लॉस में जा रही है। आपका विनिवेश डिपार्टमेंट या जो भी आपके संबंधित डिपार्टमेंट होंगे, कम्पनी लॉस में क्यों जा रही है, क्या इसका ख्याल किया गया। मैंने उस दिन भी कहा था कि मैंने जीरियल स्टाफ, सी.एम.डी., ई.डी. इसके लिए जिम्मेदार हैं। इन्होंने एक दिन एक प्रश्न का जो उत्तर दिया, उससे मुझे बहुत दुख हुआ। कर्मचारी और अधिकारी बेकार हो रहे हैं। जो कम्पनी ले रहा है, वह स्टाफ को वी.आर.एस. देने के हित में है। विनिवेश की नीति है,

शायद दादा ने पढ़ी है, मैंने नहीं पढ़ी। विनिवेश में इम्प्लाइज़ को प्रोटेक्ट करने के बारे में कुछ है या नहीं। जिसने भी सेल की, उसे रीसेल करने का भी कुछ नहीं है, मैं आगे बताऊंगा। मंत्री जी ने कहा ---

"Workers are responsible for the condition of the governmental enterprises." ... (*Interruptions*)

मतलब लॉस में आ रहा है। ...(व्यवधान) वर्कर्स की कोई गलती नहीं थी।...(व्यवधान)

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा : कई-कई साल तक पार्लियामेंट में ऐकाउंट सबमिट नहीं किया।...(व्यवधान)

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : मुझे यह बताना है कि सी.एम.डी....(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो आपने अभी पढ़ा, यह आप कहां से पढ़ रहे हैं?

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : आपने मेरे प्रश्न के उत्तर में परसों जो स्पीच दी, मेरा प्रश्न जो सैण्टूर होटल के विनिवेश के बारे में था, प्रश्न के आंसर में सब कुछ दिया था।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उनका यह उत्तर ऑथेण्टिक है क्या?

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : इनका उत्तर है, वह प्रिण्ट है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अरुण शौरी जी का?

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : जी हां, अरुण शौरी जी का उत्तर है। मैं आपको बताता हूँ, मुझे यह बताइये न कि हिन्दुस्तान सरकार की कुछ एम्पलायमेंट क्रिएट करने की जिम्मेदारी है, रोजगार बढ़ाने की जिम्मेदारी है, हमारे पूर्व यहां जितने भी राजकर्ता हुए, उनकी यह भूमिका रही, लेकिन आज हम उन्हें सेल करते जा रहे हैं। हमें सेल करने के समय, डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट करते समय कम से कम... (व्यवधान) मेरी आधे घण्टे की चर्चा थी, आपने वह रद्द कर दी और आज की चर्चा में भाग लेने का बोला है तो मुझे आधा घण्टा बोलना है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आधा घण्टा कैसे हो सकता है। आपको 10 मिनट बोलना था, मैंने 12 मिनट दे दिये। अब आप जल्दी समाप्त कीजिए। ऐसा कोई नियम नहीं है कि आधे घण्टे की चर्चा नहीं आई, इसलिए ज्यादा बोलेंगे। अब आप अपने इम्पोर्टेंट प्वाइंट्स पर आ जाइये।

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : इनको जो सारे हिन्दुस्तान के बड़े-बड़े लोग ले रहे हैं, वे क्या घपले कर रहे हैं, उसके बारे में मैं आगे आने वाला हूँ। हमारी जी नीति है, वह रोजगार बढ़ाने की होनी चाहिए।

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister will reply at 7.30 p.m.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, we are ready to sit up to 9 o'clock.

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : विनिवेश करते समय हमारी कुछ तो रैस्पॉसिबिलिटी होगी कि इन कामगारों का क्या होने वाला है, कर्मचारियों का क्या होने वाला है, स्टाफ का क्या होने वाला है, लेकिन आपने उस स्टाफ के बारे में कुछ नहीं बोला। स्टाफ को आपका कोई प्रोटैक्शन नहीं है। अभी मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ... (व्यवधान) प्लीज सुनिये सर। सैण्टूर होटल के बारे में मैंने जो कहा था, जब से सैण्टूर होटल का विनिवेश शुरू हुआ है, तीन एम्पलाइज की मृत्यु हो गई है। माननीय मंत्री जी ने बताया कि हमने यह किया था, लेकिन जिसने होटल लिया है, वह धाक बताकर वहां के एम्पलाइज को वी.आर.एस. लेने के लिए कम्पैल कर रहा है। उस दिन भी मैंने यह कहा था कि उनमें से तीन लोगों की मृत्यु हो गई। आपने मुझे कारण भी बताया, लेकिन वह कारण सही नहीं है। यह ठीक है कि बीमारी तो किसी को भी हो सकती है, लेकिन कर्मचारियों को शक है कि हमारा क्या हो रहा है। माननीय बाला साहेब ठाकरे जी के बंगले पर सारे के सारे 550 कर्मचारियों की फैमिली के साथ सब लोग वहां मोर्चा लेकर आये थे कि आप हमें बचाइये। मुझे यह कहना है कि व्यवहार में हम लोग यही चाहते हैं, मंत्री जी, मैं आपके बारे में व्यक्तिगत रूप से कुछ नहीं बोलूंगा, दादा ने भी कहा कि हम व्यक्तिगत नहीं कहेंगे। आप बहुत अच्छे व्यक्ति हैं, साहित्यिक आदमी हैं, लेकिन डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट में जो कम्पनियां बेची जा रही हैं, हम लोग तो लोगों से चुनकर आते हैं, आप तो नोमिनेट हो गये हैं। आप तो बहुत ऊंचे हैं, आप बहुत बड़ी हस्ती हैं। हम लोग तो ग्रास रूट के कार्यकर्ता हैं, हम लोग तो घूमते रहते हैं। जब हमसे कहा जाता है कि आपकी सरकार कम्पनी बेच रही है, अगर उसमें 10 एम्पलाइज भी होंगे तो हजार एम्पलाइज होते हैं, वे सब जगह जाकर बोलते हैं कि ये सब कम्पनियां बेची जा रही हैं। हम विपक्ष को क्यों बोलने का मौका देंगे, उनके हाथ में हम क्यों मुद्दा देने जा रहे हैं, यह मैं शिवसेना की तरफ से आपको कह रहा हूँ। यह मौका नहीं देना चाहिए, क्यों देना चाहिए? अगर कम्पनियां लॉस में जा रही हैं तो उनकी मदद करके करना चाहिए, क्या यू.टी.आई. की आपने मदद नहीं की? वैसे ही इनकी भी कुछ न कुछ मदद करनी चाहिए, यह मैं कह रहा हूँ।

मैं यही कहूंगा कि मुम्बई में सैण्टूर होटल के बारे में जो डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट हुआ तो माननीय बाला साहेब ठाकरे जी ने विजयादशमी के दिन भी कहा कि व्यवहार उचित नहीं है। मैं यही कहूंगा कि सैण्टूर होटल का डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट होटल कारपोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया के माध्यम से हुआ।

19.00 hrs.

जब वहां सेंटॉर होटल का विनिवेश शुरू किया, मैं उसके बारे में आपको बताऊंगा और मैं आशा करता हूं कि मंत्री जी अपने उत्तर में उसको स्पष्ट करेंगे। इसके लिए दो बिडिंग हुईं। पहली नवम्बर 2001 में हुई। होटल कार्पोरेशन आफ इंडिया के पास 37 पार्टिज आई थीं। तब यह कहा गया था कि जो होटल इंडस्ट्री से सम्बन्धित पार्टी होगी, वही प्रीक्वालिफाई हो सकती है। इससे पार्टी की संख्या कम होकर 28 रह गई। उनमें से चार पार्टियों ने सेंटॉर होटल के लिए इएमडी भर दिया। उसके बाद तीन पार्टियों ने फाइनेंशियल बिड में शामिल नहीं हुईं और यह बत्रा कम्पनी को मिला। हो सकता है बत्रा कम्पनी कम्पनी के साथ ते तीनों लोग मिलें हों और इन्होंने सिंडीकेट किया हो कि आप चुप बैठो, बोलो मत। जब बत्रा कम्पनी ने यह होटल लिया तो 65 करोड़ रुपए में लिया। बाद में सीसीडी में जाकर आपने लीज प्रीमियम जो एयरपोर्ट अथोरिटा का था, उसको कम करके छः प्रतिशत से दो प्रतिशत किया। एक पार्टी ने बिड से नीचे भरा होगा, तो आपको दोबारा टेंडर निकालना चाहिए था, जो नहीं निकाला।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप समाप्त करें।

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे दस मिनट और दें, क्योंकि इस विषय पर मेरा आधे घंटे की चर्चा का सवाल भी था। मैं मंत्री जी की गलती नहीं बता रहा हूं, उनके विभाग की गलती जो है, वह बता रहा हूं। विभाग ने पारदर्शिता क्यों नहीं रखी ? आपके अधिकारी आपको और सरकार को गुमराह कर रहे हैं। आप उन पर क्यों नहीं कार्रवाई करते। आपने लीज प्रीमियम को छः प्रतिशत से दो प्रतिशत कर दिया। इस तरह से कितने ही करोड़ रुपए का नुकसान एयरपोर्ट अथोरिटी को हुआ। मेरे पास उसका अनुमान है कि दस साल में 17 करोड़ रुपए और 30 साल में 51 करोड़ रुपए का बेनिफिट होने वाला था। जब आपने छः प्रतिशत से दो प्रतिशत किया तो बिड को बढ़ाकर 100 करोड़ रुपए करना चाहिए था। उन्होंने 83 करोड़ रुपए में ले लिया। उसके बाद चार महीने के अंदर ही उन्होंने सहारा ग्रुप को बेच दिया। यह सहारा ग्रुप कहां से आया, क्या उनको होटल इंडस्ट्री का अनुभव है और वे कौन लोग हैं। उन्होंने 35 करोड़ रुपए ज्यादा क्यों दिए, इस पर भी गौर करना चाहिए। वह पैसा सरकार की तिजौरी में क्यों नहीं आया ? मैंने उस दिन भी सवाल किया था कि हमारी सरकार घाटे में चलने वाले उद्योगों की मदद करने के लिए और अपना बजट बढ़ाने के लिए यह कर रही है, तो फिर यह पैसा सरकारी खजाने में क्यों नहीं आया। बत्रा कम्पनी ने चार महीने में ही 39 करोड़ रुपए कमा लिए, इसकी सीबीआई से जांच होनी चाहिए। सहारा कम्पनी कौन है, कहां से आई और कहां से उसके पास इतना पैसा आया ? मुझे इसलिए उस पर गुस्सा आ रहा है कि 39 करोड़ रुपए कि एक तरफ तो उसने 39 करोड़ रुपए ज्यादा दे दिए और दूसरी तरफ उसने हमारे 650 कर्मचारियों को पिस्तौल के दबाव से वी.आर.एस. के लिए मजबूर कर दिया, उनसे लिखित में ले लिया। उसके बाद पता नहीं कहां-कहां से कांटेक्ट लेबर ले आए। हमारी यूनियन के नेता वहां थे, उनको सब जानकारी है। यह सहारा कम्पनी क्रिकेट के खिलाड़ियों पर खर्च कर सकती है, मुझे अपने खिलाड़ियों पर अभिमान है, लेकिन वी.आर.एस. पर नहीं कर सकती। इससे पहले बैंकों में भी वी.आर.एस. चली थी और

करीब 15-16,000 लोगों ने इसको अपनाया था। तब भी मैंने कहा था कि ऐसा मत करो, मत जाओ, लेकिन वे नहीं माने। बाद में ऐसा भी हुआ कि वह पैसा बैंक में रखा जाएगा। आज हालत बहुत खराब है। जिन लोगों ने वी.आर.एस. जिन लोगों ने लिया, उनमें से कई को दिल का दौरा पड़ा।

इसकी पूरी इंक्वायरी होनी चाहिए, यह मैं कह रहा हूं। जब इसमें यह लिखा है, जब उनके एग्रीमेंट में लिखा है कि कंपनी के साथ एग्रीमेंट है, एसाइनमेंट है। उसमें यह था :

"Neither this agreement nor any benefit nor any burden under this agreement shall be assignable by either party without the prior written consent of the other party. "

अभी यह व्यवहार उन्होंने कैसे किया? क्या सरकार से पूछा? 'सहारा' के साथ व्यवहार करने के बाद क्या सरकार से पूछा? नहीं पूछा और आज की वहां की सेंटूर होटल की परिस्थिति बहुत खराब है। मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि अभी सेंटूर होटल, जुहू के बारे में भी हमारे माननीय सांसद मोहन रावले जी के पास निवेदन आया है। बहुत एम्पलाईज ने बोला कि उधर भी एक कंपनी है, कंपनी का नाम 'ट्यूलिप' है। वहां भी ऐसा कर रहे हैं। वह तो ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिए, करेंगे भी नहीं लेकिन यहीं नहीं, जहां-जहां भी फिर 'बालको' हो या और भी हो, वीएसएनएल का कितना प्रॉफिट होगा? वीएसएनएल बेचने के बाद हमारे सुरेश जाधव जी ने एक प्रश्न किया था। मैंने उनको कहा कि अपनी ही सरकार है, इतना ज्यादा मत बोलो।... (व्यवधान) आज वीएसएनएल, टाटा के खरीदने के बाद कितना प्रॉफिट आ रहा है? हमारे सीएमडी, ईडी और सुपरवाइजर कैटेगरी के लोग तब क्या कर रहे थे? इसीलिए मैं कहता हूं कि एक नीति होनी चाहिए। डिसइं वेस्टमेंट करने से पहले ऑफिशियल्स की इंक्वायरी होनी चाहिए। सीबीआई इंक्वायरी होनी चाहिए।... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब समाप्त करिए। मैं आपको बीस मिनट से ज्यादा नहीं दे सकता हूं।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री तरित बरण तोपदार (बैरकपुर) : सर, ये मंत्री लोग कहां हैं?... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : एक मंत्री भी पूरी गवर्नमेंट होता है, आप तो जानते हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मोहन रावले (मुम्बई दक्षिण मध्य) : उस होटल में वहां मराठी लोग हैं। आज उनको वेतन कम मिल रहा है। उनके पेट का पैसा भी नहीं दे रहे हैं।...(व्यवधान) यह जो डील है, उसे रद्द कर दीजिए।...(व्यवधान)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : There is one point of pertinence. The Minister who is in-charge of the enterprises, which are going to be disinvested, is not present. Not a single Minister of them is present except their guardian. This method, which is being adopted by the Government, is not correct. It is against the rule.

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : सर, मैं अपनी बात कंकलूड करना चाहता हूं।...(व्यवधान)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : According to the rules of business, there is no guardian in the Ministry except the Prime Minister. Is the Minister of Disinvestment the guardian of all the Ministries? ...
(Interruptions) How? मिनिस्ट्री में क्या गारजियनशिप चलती है?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, ऐसा कुछ नहीं चलता है।

...(व्यवधान)

श्री तरित बरण तोपदार : बहुत सारे मंत्रालयों का विनिवेश हो रहा है।...(व्यवधान)

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : सर, मैं आधे मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त कर रहा हूं। यह जितना भी हो रहा है, हम एनडीए के मैम्बर हैं। हमें बाहर जाकर बहुत तकलीफ होती है। पारदर्शिता का व्यवहार बार-बार बताया जाए। इन्होंने बोला कि हमारा व्यवहार बहुत पारदर्शक है तो ये बताएं कि सेंट्रल होटल में ऐसा क्यों हुआ? इसकी सीबीआई इंक्वायरी होनी चाहिए। वह व्यवहार जो किया गया है, क्योंकि यह इसमें कायदे में है कि वह कर नहीं सकते। उनके एग्रीमेंट में है, उनके एसाइनमेंट में है। वह 'सहारा' कंपनी को जो दिया है, उस डील को तुरंत रद्द किया जाए नहीं तो फिर से वापस होटल कॉरपोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया को लिया जाए। यह जितनी भी प्रोसीडिंग हो गई है, उसे रोका जाए, यही मेरी मांग है।...(व्यवधान)

श्री तरित बरण तोपदार : मैं व्यवस्था का सवाल उठाता हूं।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : देखिए, चर्चा विनिवेश पर है और विनिवेश मंत्री यहां उपस्थित हैं। आप बैठिए।

...(व्यवधान)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : This is the point which he should respond.

MR. SPEAKER: I have given the floor to him.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : How is he going to take charge of the Hotel Corporation of India which is coming under the Ministry of Civil Aviation?

MR. SPEAKER: It is coming under the Ministry of Tourism.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : He is authorised by the hon. Prime Minister.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I know it is a nodal Ministry.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : The Prime Minister has authorised him.

SHRI PRAKASH MANI TRIPATHI : All disinvestment matters come to him. It is a nodal Ministry. Every Minister is not required to present here for the discussion on disinvestment.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He has been fully authorised to reply.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : He has been empowered as a guardian.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Prabhunath Singh, you have to finish it in 10 minutes' time. I am giving everybody 10 minutes' time.

श्री प्रभुनाथ सिंह (महाराजगंज, बिहार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन में विनिवेश विषय पर चर्चा बार-बार चलती रही है और अब गांवों में भी चलनी शुरू हो गई है। गांवों में यह चर्चा का विषय बन चुका है। जहां तक मैं महसूस करता हूं, जब हम लोग चुनाव के मैदान में जाते हैं, तो पार्टी

का कोई-न-कोई मैनिफैस्टो होता है। एनडीए का भी मैनिफैस्टो बना हुआ है और एनडीए के मैनिफैस्टो से हम लोग चुनाव लड़कर आए हैं। विनिवेश के विषय में श्री मणिशंकर अय्यर जी ने 15 सवाल किए थे, मैं 15 सवाल तो नहीं, दो-चार सवाल जरूर मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा। इस विषय में श्री सोमनाथ चटर्जी जी ने बहुत कुछ कहा है। मैं मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा कि विनिवेश के विषय में एनडीए के मैनिफैस्टों में क्या लिखा है, कृपया मंत्री जी बतायें। दुनिया के किसी भी देश में विनिवेश मंत्रालय नहीं है। इस देश में भी 55 वॉर्स से सरकारें चल रही हैं, लेकिन आज तक विनिवेश मंत्रालय नहीं बनाया गया। लोग अब विनिवेश मंत्रालय को बेचो मंत्रालय कहते हैं। जो सामने आता है, उसे बेच दो। यह मंत्रालय किस लिए स्वीकार किया गया है। आपका नाम भी बेचो मंत्री पड़ जाएगा। इस देश में यह मंत्रालय पहली बार बना है।

महोदय, जो उपक्रम बिक रहे हैं, वे घाटे के भी उपक्रम हैं और मुनाफे के भी उपक्रम हैं। ये उपक्रम किसके हैं - प्रभुनाथ सिंह के, अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी के, अरुण शौरी के या इस देश की जनता के? अगर ये उपक्रम इस देश की जनता के हैं, तो इनको बेचने से पहले क्या जनमत संग्रह कराया गया? अगर जनमत संग्रह नहीं कराया गया, तो इसका मतलब है कि ये उपक्रम इस देश की जनता के हैं। अगर ये उपक्रम इस देश की जनता के हैं, तो इनको बेचने का अधिकार किस को है? एक अजीब सी स्थिति पैदा हो रही है। विपक्ष इसके खिलाफ है। एनडीए के पार्टनर इसके खिलाफ हैं। अभी शिव सेना के एक माननीय सदस्य बोल रहे थे और हम भी एनडीए के एक छोटे साझेदार हैं। हम भी अपनी भावना रख रहे हैं, लेकिन टीवी में प्रवक्ता, श्री विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा द्वारा कहा जाता है कि एनडीए में कोई विवाद नहीं है। विवाद तो तब माना जाएगा, जब हम वोट देंगे और स्थिति पलट जाएगी। हमारी भावना ही विवाद है। इसलिए लाठी के हाथ से सरकार नहीं चल सकती है - अरुण शौरी जी। देश की जनता इसके पक्ष में नहीं है। विपक्ष इसके पक्ष में नहीं है। कैबिनेट के आधे से ज्यादा मंत्री इसके पक्ष में नहीं है। पेट्रोलियम मंत्री को विश्वास में नहीं लिया गया और वे भी इसके पक्ष में नहीं है। भारतीय जनता पार्टी के सांसद इसके पक्ष में नहीं है। यह बात इसलिए प्रमाणित हो जाती है कि यहां सदन में बहस चल रही है और भारतीय जनता पार्टी के साथी आपको अकेला छोड़कर चले गए हैं। मतलब यह कि वे भी इसके पक्ष में नहीं है। उपक्रमों के बेचने के पक्ष में अगर कोई है, तो वे हैं, श्री अरुण शौरी। एक अरुण शौरी का मतलब हिन्दुस्तान नहीं हो सकता है। एक अरुण शौरी जी का मतलब देश के उपक्रम नहीं हो सकते हैं। आप तालियां बजाते हैं, इन तालियों को हम बन्द करेंगे। अरुण शौरीजी हम कह देते हैं कि अगर आपने हमारी भावनाओं का आदर नहीं किया, तो हम लोक सभा के माध्यम से चुनौती देते हैं और सरकार को भी आगाह करते हैं कि हमारी पार्टी आपसे समर्थन वापिस ले सकती है। अगर पार्टी ने समर्थन वापिस नहीं लिया, तो समता पार्टी इसका परिणाम भुगतेंगी। हम इसे स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते हैं, चाहे हमें चुनाव के मैदान में ही क्यों न जाना पड़े। हम खुले मन से देश की जनता को यह संदेश देना चाहते हैं।

हम इसे स्वीकार करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। आप क्यों बेच रहे हैं, जो घाटे में उपक्रम चलते थे। हमने देहातों में देखा है कि घर की सम्पत्ति तब बेची जाती है जब कोई बिलकुल आपातकाल स्थिति आ जाती है। देहात की जमीन-जायदाद तब बिकती है जब किसी के घर में बीमारी और शादी की हालत में दूसरा कोई उपाय नहीं बचता, जब घर में परिवार का कोई वृद्ध व्यक्ति मरता है तो कोई उपाय नहीं बचता। क्या आपने देश को उस स्थिति में पहुंचा दिया है और अगर आपने देश को उस स्थिति में नहीं पहुंचाया तो आज ये सब सरकारी उपक्रम बेचने की जरूरत आपने कैसे महसूस कर ली। आप कह रहे हैं कि ये घाटे में चल रहे हैं, अगर घाटे में चल रहे हैं तो इनमें सुधार कौन लाएगा? ये घाटे में आए क्यों, इस बिन्दु को आपने गंभीरता से क्यों नहीं लिया?

महोदय, अभी हमारे एक साथी बता रहे थे कि ये घाटे में थे, लेकिन ये उपक्रम मुनाफे में आए, इसके लिए इच्छाशक्ति की जरूरत है। आप चाहते हैं कि देश की सम्पत्ति को बेच कर देश की अर्थव्यवस्था सुधार लेंगे।... (व्यवधान) आप कौन सी कम्पनियां बेचने जा रहे हैं - एचपीसीएल और बीपीसीएल। एचपीसीएल ने 2001 और 2002 में 173 करोड़ रुपए और बीपीसीएल ने 218 करोड़ रुपए आपको मुनाफे के रूप में दिए। जो सरकारी उपक्रम आपको इतना मुनाफा दे रहे हैं, आप उसे एक र्वा में बेचना क्यों आवश्यक समझते हैं। आप ये रुपए कहां लगाएंगे, इस रुपए को आप कहां खर्च रहे हैं, यह बताइए? जनता की सुरक्षा पर, उनके स्वास्थ्य के सुधार पर, गरीब बच्चों की शिक्षा पर, परिवहन पर, आप कहां ये रूपया खर्च कर रहे हैं, यह आपको साफ तौर पर बताना चाहिए? आपको ये उपक्रम बेचने नहीं चाहिए। जो सरकारी उपक्रम घाटे में चल रहे हैं, उन्हें ठीक करके मुनाफे का उपक्रम बनाना चाहिए। उसमें जो लोग काम कर रहे हैं, उनके विाय में क्या आपने कभी कुछ सोचा है? आपको जरूरत भी नहीं है और इसलिए जरूरत नहीं है क्योंकि जनता आपसे जरूर पूछेगी। देहात में एक कहावत है - "जानता है चिलम, जिस पर चढ़ता अंगौरा।" रामा वलास पासवान जी, हम लोग ऊधर जाएंगे, आप लोग इधर आएंगे, लेकिन हम तो बीच में ही रहेंगे। हम लोगों को मजबूती से देखना पड़ेगा। आप दिल्ली में रहेंगे, मालिक बन कर बैठे रहेंगे और हमें गांवों में जाकर जनता को फेस करना पड़ेगा, यह नसीब की बात है।

महोदय, हम आपके माध्यम से सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहते हैं, एनडीए की भावना, देश की जनता की भावना और विपक्ष की भावना, विपक्ष की भी भूमिका होती है। देश के लोगों ने इन्हें विपक्ष में बैठाया है। कल वह पार्टी सत्ता में थी और कहीं न कहीं हमसे भूल हुई तो इधर भी तख्ता पलट जाएगा, हम तो बीच में हैं इसलिए हमारे ऊपर कोई अंतर नहीं पड़ेगा। हम आपके माध्यम से सावधान करना चाहते हैं।... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम आपको बताना चाहते हैं कि 1971 का युद्ध हम लोगों को नहीं भूलना चाहिए और शायद 1971 में ही स्व. इंदिरा गांधी जी देश की प्रधान मंत्री थी। उन्होंने तेल कम्पनियों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया, कोयले का और बैंकों का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण किया। उस समय देश के लोगों ने इंदिरा गांधी जी को कहा था कि यह दुर्गा की अवतार हैं, क्योंकि वे राष्ट्रीयकरण कर रही थीं।

राष्ट्र की सम्पत्ति और आय का संसाधन बढ़ा रही थीं, इसलिए लोगों ने इन्हें दुर्गा और देवी कहा था। जो सम्पत्ति जुटाई गयी थी, आज उसे हम बेच रहे हैं। देश के लोग हमें क्या कहेंगे? यदि राष्ट्रीयकरण के चलते इंदिरा गांधी दुर्गा कहला सकती है ...(व्यवधान)... *

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ये शब्द रिकार्ड पर नहीं जाएंगे।

श्री प्रभुनाथ सिंह : यह कोई अनपार्लियामेंटरी शब्द नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐसा कहना ठीक नहीं है।

श्री प्रभुनाथ सिंह : यदि दुर्गा अनपार्लियामेंटरी नहीं है तो यह कैसे अनपार्लियामेंटरी हो गया। यदि राम पार्लियामेंटरी है तो रावण भी पार्लियामेंटरी होगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐसे पर्सनल असाल्ट आप नहीं कर सकते।

...(व्यवधान)

श्री मोहन रावले : ये लोग भी तो सरकारी उद्योग बेचने गये थे।

* Not Recorded

श्री प्रभुनाथ सिंह : हम कहां उनकी प्रशंसा करते हैं। हमने मूर्ति वाले मामले में कहा था कि गड़बड़ हुई है।

अध्यक्ष जी, छोटी-बड़ी 230 कंपनियों का विनिवेश हो चुका है। हमारे दल ने 29 से 31 अक्टूबर 2002 को राजकोट में एक सम्मेलन किया था। उसके कुछ अंश मैं यहां उद्धृत करना चाहता हूं।

"विनिवेश और निजीकरण के मुद्दे पर पार्टी की राष्ट्रीय परिषद् अपनी नीतियों को स्पष्ट करना चाहेगी। पार्टी को विनिवेश और निजीकरण की नीति से कोई विरोध नहीं है। विनिवेश के कई आवश्यक आर्थिक कारण हैं। लेकिन विनिवेश की प्रक्रिया और गति को किसी प्रकार के संशय की गुंजाइश नहीं छोड़नी चाहिए। विनिवेश प्रक्रिया पूरी तरह पारदर्शी होनी चाहिए और अपने मूल उद्देश्यों से भटकनी नहीं चाहिए। हाल ही का एक उदाहरण अगर दिया जाए तो चिंता होती है। मुम्बई के सेंटूर होटल को बतरा हास्पिटैलिटी को इस साल फरवरी में 83 करोड़ रुपये में बेचा गया। बतरा हास्पिटैलिटी ने 6 महीने के अंदर सहारा ग्रुप को यह होटल 125 करोड़ रुपये में बेच दिया और 32 करोड़ रुपये का मुनाफा कमाया। अभी बाजार की गिरती हुई हालत में, इतना बड़ा

मुनाफा, इतनी कम अवधि में होने से विनिवेश के समय हुए मूल्य निर्धारण पर शंका पैदा हुई है।"

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप अब समाप्त कीजिए। दो-तीन मिनट और ले लीजिए। अभी माननीय रघुवंश बाबू ने भी बोलना है। हमें 8 बजे तक इसे समाप्त करना है।

श्री प्रभुनाथ सिंह : ठीक है। अध्यक्ष जी, समता पार्टी ने इनके कार्य के तरीके पर विरोध प्रकट किया है। जैसा कि माननीय सोमनाथ बाबू ने बताया कि स्थाई समिति ने एक-एक बिंदु पर समीक्षा करके इसे भेजा है। उस स्थाई समिति की सिफारिशों पर भी गौर नहीं किया गया। हम जानना चाहते हैं कि क्या एक उद्योगपति का हाथ मजबूत करने के लिए ऐसा किया जा रहा है। रिलायंस ग्रुप के इशारे पर सरकार में पदाधिकारियों का स्थानांतरण होता है। सरकार से जब वे मुक्त हो जाते हैं तो एक लाख, दो लाख रुपये महीने पर इस कंपनी की नौकरी करते हैं। क्या सरकार इस बात की जांच करेगी? यह वही रिलायंस ग्रुप है जिसके बारे में कहा गया कि "रिलायंस इस देश की ऐसी कंपनी है जिसके विरुद्ध जब भी किसी ने आवाज उठाई या इसकी प्रतिद्वंद्विता में कोई उद्योग इसके सामने आया है तो उसे सत्यानाश तक पहुंचाने के कारणों और हथकंडे यह कंपनी अपनाती रही है। वह चाहे कपिल मेहरा का मामला हो, नूसली वाडिया का मामला हो, रूईसा का मामला हो या इस्सर ग्रुप का मामला हो या टाटा ग्रुप का मामला हो। सरकार द्वारा निरीक्षण कराकर, कर से संबंधित मामलों को उजागर कराकर, मीडिया के माध्यम से प्रभाव डालकर तथा उन पर आक्रमण कर, जैसे घृणित हथकंडों को अपनाकर अपनी प्रतिद्वंद्वियों को समाप्त करने का उसका इतिहास रहा है।"

रिलायंस के संबंध में तत्कालीन गृह मंत्री ने भी लोक सभा में कहा था कि "जांच पड़ताल से ऐसे संकेत मिलते हैं कि दिल्ली आधारित रिलायंस लिमिटेड के ग्रुप प्रेसीडेंट का संबंध माफिया सरगना रोमेश शर्मा से रहा है जिसे दिल्ली पुलिस ने गिरफ्तार किया है। यह मामला आज भी अनुसंधान के दायरे में चल रहा है।"

आखिर इसका क्या अनुसंधान हुआ? इसी कम्पनी को लाभ पहुंचाने के लिए यह खेल देश में चल रहा है। ऐसा लगता है कि रिलायंस के हाथ में यह सरकार खेल रही है और खिलौना बन कर काम कर रही है। रिलायंस के बारे में मैं कुछ बिन्दुओं की तरफ आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं।

रिलायंस की एक महत्वपूर्ण विशेषता यह रही है कि उसके विरुद्ध कर चोरी और जालसाजी के जितने मामले चल रहे हैं शायद उस मामले में कोई दूसरी कम्पनी इसकी प्रतिस्पर्धा में नहीं आ सकती है। बड़े पैमाने पर इस देश के आर्थिक कानून को अनदेखा करते हुए जिस तरह रिलायंस ऊंचाइयां छूने का प्रयास कर रहा है, उससे देश में यह धारणा बनी है कि इसकी पहुंच बहुत ऊंची है और बड़े स्तर पर इसे राजनीतिक संरक्षण प्राप्त है।

अपने कम्पनी के हिस्सेदारों के प्रति रिलायन्स कभी वफादार नहीं रहा है। एक लाख पैंतालिस हजार करोड़ का शेयर घोटाला इसके नाम से दर्ज है जिस के संबंध में विभिन्न हथकंडों को अपना कर लोगों को ठगने वाले कारनामे उजागर हुए हैं जिस के हिस्सेदारों को अपार क्षति पहुंची है। मीडिया के एक बहुत बड़े हिस्से पर रिलायन्स का नियंत्रण है और गलत कहानियां गढ़ कर अपने को ऊंचा दिखाना तथा अन्य औद्योगिक घरानों को नीचा दिखाने का कुकृत्य करता रहा है। रिलायन्स का असली चेहरा इस देश के सामने उस समय भी उजागर हुआ था, जब डुप्लीकेट शेयर घोटाले की खबर अखबारों में छपी और उसके घृणित हाथ मुम्बई स्टॉक एक्सचेंज को डिलिस्ट करने के हद तक चले गए। चूंकि बहस रिलायन्स पर नहीं हो रही है इसलिए मैं अन्य बिन्दुओं की तरफ बढ़ना नहीं चाहता हूं। मैं स्पष्ट रूप से बताना चाहता हूं कि सरकार जिस ढंग से काम कर रही है, उससे बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो चुका है कि रिलायन्स को मदद करने के लिए सरकार जानबूझ कर गलत तौर तरीके इस्तेमाल करके और सरकारी उपक्रमों को बेच कर रिलायन्स को मदद पहुंचाना चाहती है। मैं बिल्कुल स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूं कि जिस समय देश में संकट काल की स्थिति आएगी, पाकिस्तान जिस तरह हमारे सामने खड़ा है और आतंकवादियों ने जैसा देश में आतंक का वातावरण पैदा किया है, वैसी स्थिति में सरकार तेल कम्पनियों को खास तौर पर सरकारी उपक्रमों को निजी हाथों में सौंपेगी तो संकट की घड़ी में आपको धोखे का सामना करना पड़ेगा। मैं इसलिए चेतावनी देता हूं कि देश की सुरक्षा के प्रति आप सावधान रहिए, सतर्क रहिए और खास तौर पर तेल कम्पनियों का विनिवेश करने के बारे में पुनः विचार करने का कट करिए। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

श्री खारबेल स्वाइं (बालासोर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी पार्टी के 182 मैम्बर्स हैं। क्या हमारी पार्टी की तरफ से कोई नहीं बोलेगा? यहां ऐसा लगता है कि सारा हाउस हमारे खिलाफ है और हम असहाय हैं। हम असहाय नहीं हैं। हमारी पार्टी के मैम्बर्स को भी बोलने का मौका दीजिए। दो-चार लोगों की पार्टी वाले बोलते हैं और वे हमें धमकी देते हैं कि एनडीए सरकार तोड़ देंगे। जिन के पास शक्ति है, वे सरकार तोड़ कर दिखा दें। वे हमें धमकी दे रहे हैं। आप हमें भी बोलने का मौका दें। यह ठीक तरीका नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आपने प्रश्न समय के बारे में पूछा है, इसलिए सदन को इस बारे में मालूम होना चाहिए। मैं सदन के सदस्यों को कुछ बातें कहना चाहता हूं। मैं कोशिश कर रहा हूं कि हर पार्टी के कम से कम एक सदस्य को बोलने का अवसर मिले। आप देखेंगे कि इसमें न्याय हुआ है। आपकी पार्टी की तरफ से जिस का पहले नम्बर पर नाम था, मैंने उनको परमिशन दी और उनका भाण हो गया। मंत्री जी का भी भाण होगा। आपकी पार्टी की तरफ से केवल एक नाम मेरे पास है और वह श्री विजयेन्द्र पाल सिंह का है। मैं उनको बोलने की इजाजत देने वाला हूं। हर पार्टी का कम से कम एक रिप्रैजेंटेशन होना चाहिए। यहां समय की बात आती है। यहां केवल गुस्सा करने की बात नहीं है। मेरे ऊपर आप पूरा भरोसा कर सकते हैं। मैं अन्याय कभी नहीं करूंगा और न ही करना चाहता हूं। कांग्रेस के लोगों का भी नाम है। मैंने उनसे भी यही बात कही।

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Normally, you decide these things. ... (*Interruptions*) When the first round is over, again, you can consider. ... (*Interruptions*)

श्री खारबेल स्वाइं : मैं आपको एक्यूज नहीं कर रहा हूँ। मुझे आपके ऊपर पूरा भरोसा है। जैसी डिबेट चल रही है, उससे लगता है कि हम असहाय हैं और मंत्री जी के सिवाय कोई नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आपकी यह बात सही है। मैं आपकी बात समझ सकता हूँ।

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, I will share with my dear friend only on one point. In all the debates, it is a system that Members from every party speak, but proportionate time should be given to the Parties who have Members in large number. If one Member is allowed to speak from each party, whether small or large, then, it is not justice. That is what is my point.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to reply to your point also. Every party, considering the time given to the debate, has been considered. But suppose, if the first Member, who rises to speak, only takes the entire time of the party, the other Members will not be permitted to speak. That is done. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : What if the debate is extended?

MR. SPEAKER: You also know the rules. If somebody points out to me the rule, I will have to be very perfect on that.

Sometimes, considering the importance of the subject, we allow more time. However, as per the rules, every party has been allotted some time. I have got the complete record and I am prepared to read it out to the House.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (LATUR): Nobody understands the agony of the person sitting in that Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Except you, nobody understands it because you had suffered that agony.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : We have full faith in your judgment and in your discretion. You are trying to do justice to everybody. The only request we would like to make is that while giving time to all the Members, it should be seen that a small party having one Member may not get disproportionate or so time. One or two Members are speaking on every subject for ten minutes. It is not that they should not be given the time. However, the Chief Whips of those parties, who have large number of Members, have received complaints from their respective Members that they are not getting the time to speak. It is only a request, and I know that you alone cannot help in this matter; the Whips and we, all Members sitting here, have to help you.

MR. SPEAKER: I am fully seized of the matter. There are a number of Members who are individual Members and they have not been given time at all. It is not that major parties get less time, but there are individual Members also and, sometimes, they must be given an opportunity. I have to look after them also.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN): Some time back, it was said that it would be interesting to make a study as to who are all the Members who speak in every debate, irrespective of the support of two or three Members that they have.

MR. SPEAKER: Everybody knows the names of such Members.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विनिवेश पर लगभग हर सत्र में बहस हो रही है। श्री त्रिपाठी जी ने हिसाब जोड़कर हम लोगों को बताया कि इस विषय पर सदन में 14 बार चर्चा हो चुकी है। इस देश के प्रधानमंत्री बार-बार सदन के अंदर और बाहर कहते हैं कि हम आम सहमति से राज चलाना चाहेंगे लेकिन हमें लगता है कि उनकी आम सहमति हो या न हो, एन.डी.ए. की सहमति के बिना राज चला रहे हैं। यह देश बचेगा या बिकेगा, इस पर विचार करने की जरूरत है।

अध्यक्ष जी, हम बार-बार कहते हैं कि आप देश बेचना बंद करिये, देश नहीं बिकेगा, यह आपका नहीं है लेकिन ये लोग मान नहीं रहे हैं। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि जब तक लोक सभा का सत्र रहेगा, इस विषय पर बहस जारी रहेगी और हम लोगों की लड़ाई भी चलती रहेगी। हम विपक्ष की

कमजोरी है जो ये आज देश को बेचने में सफल हो रहे हैं। इन लोगों को सदन और उसके बाहर देश बेचने की इजाजत नहीं दी जानी चाहिये। सरकार ने चालाकी की है और अंग्रेजी में बेचने वाले का नाम डिसइनवैस्टमेंट रख दिया लेकिन हिन्दी में विनिवेश नाम रखा। गांव के लोगों को मालूम ही नहीं कि यह क्या है। इकौनोमिस्ट लोगों ने ऐसे ऐसे ङङंत्र किये हैं कि नॉन परफॉर्मिंग एसैट्स के नाम पर देश को लूट लिया। गांव के लोगों को एन.पी.ए. के बारे में ज़रा भी मालूम नहीं। यह सरकार चालाकी कर रही है। विनिवेश शब्द से लगता है कि कुछ अच्छा है लेकिन आज देश बड़े भारी खतरे से गुजर रहा है। इसे लेकर आज विपक्ष एकजुट है, इसके खिलाफ है। इस विषय पर इसलिये 14 बार बहस हो चुकी है। सदन में सत्तापक्ष की बड़ी-बड़ी पार्टियों के नेता, जिनमें शिवसेना के सदस्य भी हैं, बोल चुके हैं। श्री प्रभुनाथ सिंह जी बोल चुके हैं जिन्होंने कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री के यहां मंत्रियों की बैठक हुई और वे लोग असहमति जाहिर कर चुके हैं। क्या सरकार देश बेचने पर आमादा है और हम लोग पूरी तरह इसके खिलाफ हैं। गांव में सूखी हुई गाय जो दूध नहीं देती, किसान चाहता है कि वह उसे बेच दे। उसे चारा खिलाना दंड है, हालांकि उसका गोबर फिर भी काम का होता है। लेकिन दुधारू गाय, जो बढ़िया दूध देती है और सब तरह से दुरुस्त है, उसे बेचना समझ में नहीं आता। अभी श्री प्रभुनाथ सिंह ने कहा कि जब बहुत कठिन परिस्थिति हो जाती है, जब परिवार भुखमरी के कगार पर होता है, तभी गाय, जेवर, उपजाऊ खेत और अंत में घर बेचने का नम्बर आता है। यह देखकर ऐसा लगता है कि जैसे किसी दूसरे देश की हुकूमत यहां हो जाए और वह देश इस तरह से बेचने वाला काम कर रहा हो, उस तरह का काम यह सरकार कर रही है। इसमें लाभ वाली कंपनी एच.पी.सी.एल. है। 1974 में इसे नेशनलाइज किया गया था।...(व्यवधान)

डॉ. नीतीश सेनगुप्ता (कोन्टाई) : इसे नेशनलाइज नहीं किया गया, निगोशिएट करके खरीदा गया था।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : हां, खरीदा गया और पार्लियामैन्ट में कानून बना। पार्लियामैन्ट के कानून से यह पारित हुआ।

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : The Act was passed in the Parliament.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : पार्लियामैन्ट के एक्ट से क्रिएट हुई और उसे हम सुनते हैं कि अब बेच रहे हैं। यह पार्लियामैन्ट का भी गर्दा उड़ा देंगे, सब खत्म कर देंगे।...(व्यवधान)

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा : पार्लियामैन्ट को भी किसी दिन बेच देंगे।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : जिसकी टर्न ओवर 14 करोड़ से बढ़कर 50 करोड़ हो गई, वह लाभ में चल रही है। स्ट्रेटेजी बनाने वाले लोग बोल रहे हैं कि देश की सुरक्षा सर्वोपरि है। सुरक्षा के

समय ऐसो, बर्मा शैल आदि कई प्राइवेट कंपनियों को हेराफेरी करके नेशनलाइज किया था, फिर कहा गया कि ये सरकारी कंपनी होनी चाहिए, लेकिन आज जनता में इसकी बड़ी भारी चर्चा है कि ये लोग ऐसा क्यों कर रहे हैं। वह खुलकर रिलायंस का नाम बता रहे हैं। हम लोग भी पहले सुनते थे कि रिलायंस है। रिलायंस के कहने पर यह सरकार चल रही है। आज इसका भांडा फूट गया, सारा भेद खुल गया। ये सारा कुछ रिलायंस को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए, उसकी प्रगति के लिए किया जा रहा है। उसके हिसाब से ही मंत्री और अफसर बहाल होते हैं, ऐसा प्रभुनाथ सिंह जी बता रहे थे। यह जो देश बेच रहे हैं, हम इसके खिलाफ हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे सामने सेन्टूर होटल का उदाहरण है। इसका आपके पास क्या जवाब है। आप सी.बी.आई. जांच से क्यों भाग रहे हैं। आप बार-बार कह रहे हैं कि हमारे यहां ट्रांसपेरेन्सी हैं, हम ठीक काम कर रहे हैं, फिर आप सी.बी.आई. जांच से क्यों भाग रहे हैं। यह सारा खेल दुनिया जान गई है। जिस होटल को सरकार ने 80 करोड़ रुपये में बेचा, उसे दो-तीन महीने के बाद चालीस करोड़ रुपये ज्यादा में किसी दूसरे ने ले लिया, यह अमाउंट और भी ज्यादा हो सकता है। आप कितना बेच रहे हैं, 230 कंपनियों को आपने बेच दिया। उसमें बड़े-बड़े घोटाले हुए हैं। लोगों में इसकी बड़ी चर्चा है कि अंदर ही अंदर, औने-पौने दामों में ले-देकर सारा काम हो रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपको एक उदाहरण देता हूं। भगवान बुद्ध को बोध गया में ज्ञान हुआ था। वहां राज्य सरकार ने साठ एकड़ जमीन इन्हें दी। राज्य सरकार इसलिए जमीन दे देती है कि केन्द्र सरकार संस्थान बनायेगी। आई.टी.डी.सी. को राज्य सरकार ने होटल चलाने के लिए साठ एकड़ जमीन दे दी। इन्होंने उसे दो करोड़ एक लाख रुपये में बेच दिया। यह हालत बोध गया की जमीन की है, जहां अंतर्राष्ट्रीय हवाई अड्डा बनने वाला है। मैं इस पर दो सवाल उठाता हूं। इनको राज्य सरकार की जमीन बेचने का क्या अधिकार है। इन्होंने राज्य सरकार से परामर्श भी नहीं किया, पूछा भी नहीं। आप वहां की जमीन कैसे बेच देंगे। इस तरह से कांस्टीट्यूशनल क्राइसेज पैदा होगा। वहां की राज्य सरकार और जनता अड़ेगी और फिर सैन्टर-स्टेट रिलेशंस में खतरा पैदा होगा। लेकिन ये उस जमीन को बेचने पर आमादा हैं। उसे सरकार नहीं देगी, हमारी जमीन को कोई कैसे बेच देगा। वहां की जनता भी तैयार है। इन्होंने पूछताछ भी नहीं की और दो करोड़ एक लाख रुपये में जमीन बेच दी। उस जमीन का क्या दाम है, होटल का क्या दाम है। सैन्टूर होटल की तरह ये उसकी भी बिक्री कर रहे हैं। वहां की सरकार की तरफ से प्रोटैस्ट आई है कि आप इसे कैसे बेच रहे हैं। अभी मशहूर अखबारों हिन्दू, हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स आदि में खबर छपी है कि आई.टी.डी.सी. में एक लोहानी नाम का अफसर था। उनके रहने से उसमें तरक्की और फायदा हो रहा था, अच्छी परफॉर्मेंस थी। जगमोहन जी इन्हीं की कैबिनेट में हैं। उन्होंने लिखा कि इसे रहने दिया जाए, पक्का किया जाए, बहाल किया जाए और वह डिसइनवैस्टमेंट के भी खिलाफ थे। जो सम्राट होटल है, वहां विदेशी डिग्निटरीज़ आते हैं और सरकार की तरफ से हैदराबाद हाउस या अशोक होटल में ही ठहरते हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि सम्राट होटल नहीं बेचना चाहिए, इसको बेचना ठीक नहीं है। वे होटल को लाभ में भी चला रहे थे। उसको बेचने वाली लॉबी ने पी.एम.ओ. पर

दबाव डाला और मामला पी.एम.ओ. में गया तो कहा कि अब लोहानी नहीं रहेगा। अखबार में यह छपा है और मंत्री जी इसका जवाब दें कि असलियत क्या है, उसमें क्या भेद है। अखबार में छपने से हमें लगा कि जो बेचने वाली लॉबी है, जो दलाल लोग हैं, वे लगे हुए हैं कि किसी तरह से औने-पौने दामों में सरकार की संपत्ति बिक जाए और जो पूँजीपति हैं, वे मालामाल हो जाएं। पूँजीपतियों से अंदर-अंदर इनका कुछ तालमेल और समझौता होगा, और कोई बात हमें नहीं लगती। लेकिन थोड़े से निजी स्वार्थ के लिए देश को बेचने का काम, देश की संपत्ति को बेचने का काम ये कर रहे हैं। जो घाटे वाले उपक्रम थे, पहले उनको बेच रहे थे। फिर देखा कि घाटे वाले उपक्रमों के ज्यादा दाम नहीं मिल रहे हैं तो अब लाभ वाले उपक्रमों को ही ये लोग बेच रहे हैं। इन्हीं के मंत्री जो दूसरे विभाग चला रहे हैं, वे विरोध कर रहे हैं। राम नाईक जी की बात सुनी है कि सब पक्ष बता रहे हैं कि बेचना ठीक नहीं है। लेकिन लोग इतने अंधे हो गए ... (व्यवधान) जार्ज फर्नान्डीज़ भी रोक रहे हैं, कई मंत्री रोक रहे हैं, सहयोगी दल भी रोक रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान) राम विलास पासवान जी ने देखा कि उनकी उधर ठीक से सुनवाई नहीं है तो इधर आ गए। ... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : के.पी. सिंह देव जी, आप उनको प्रॉम्पटिंग क्यों कर रहे हैं? वह बोल सकते हैं।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : अरुण शौरी जी को यहां रख लिया है क्योंकि दूसरा कोई आदमी तैयार नहीं हुआ, यह बेचने वाला काम स्वीकार करने के लिए। इनकी तो लाचारी है कि ये पैरवी पर राज्य सभा में आ गए हैं और पैरवी पर मंत्री बना दिए गए। हम लोग चुनाव जीतकर आते हैं तो हम भी अपना बल लगाते हैं सर ज़मीन से और सुनते हैं कि वर्ल्ड बैंक के भी लगुआ हैं और वर्ल्ड बैंक और आई.एम.एफ. के दबाव से यहां की राजनीति और अर्थ नीति तय हो रही है। इसलिए देश पर बहुत भारी खतरा आने की संभावना है। इसलिए इस देश बचाने वाली नीति का हमें एकजुट होकर विरोध करना चाहिए और सरकार को भी जनता के साथ घात नहीं करनी चाहिए। सरकार जनता की थाती होती है। जनता ने आपको समर्थन दे दिया और अब एन.डी.ए. का राज आप चला रहे हैं। अमानत में खयानत का काम मत करिये। अमानत में खयानत है देश की संपत्ति को बेचना। जो होशियार लोग हैं, वे ट्रांसपेरेन्सी और विधि और प्रक्रिया की बात करते हैं - इस सारी विधि और प्रक्रिया में हेराफेरी है। कोई जो सामान बिकता है तो टेन्डर होता है। टेन्डर में देखते हैं कि चार-पांच बदमाश 19-20 करके डाल देते हैं और असली आदमी को टेन्डर नहीं डालने देते हैं। उसी तरह से व्यापारी लोग संगठन बना लेते हैं और बोली लगाते हैं, आम आदमी उसमें नहीं जा सकता है। इसलिए सरकार की संपत्ति को औने-पौने दामों में बेचने की साजिश और ाड्यंत्र ये लोग कर रहे हैं।

यह डिसइनवैस्टमेंट कुछ नहीं है और उससे देश को लाभ नहीं होगा। गरीब आदमी को उससे कुछ मिलने वाला नहीं है। जो काम करने वाला है, वह मर रहा है, त्राहि-त्राहि कर रहा है। इसमें लिखा है कि एच.पी.सी.एल. वाले आंदोलन पर उतरेंगे, टोटल स्ट्राइक करेंगे। कितना भारी खतरा

है। जैसे ही ये बेचने के लिए आगे बढ़ेंगे तो वे कह रहे हैं कि हम सभी लोग हड़ताल पर चले जाएंगे जब तक सरकार वापस नहीं लेगी। इस तरह वर्किंग क्लास विद्रोह में हैं, एन.डी.ए. के पार्टनर्स विद्रोह में हैं, हम सभी विपक्ष एक साथ हैं। आम लोग इसके खिलाफ हैं, संसद इसके खिलाफ है लेकिन कुछ दलाल लोग इनके पक्ष में हैं, जिन दलाल लोगों के कुछ वैस्टेड इंटरैस्ट हैं। अब उनका भंडाफोड़ हो गया है, इसलिए हम इसका घोर विरोध करते हैं और कहना चाहते हैं कि देश बेचने को हम कभी बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे। हम जनता में जाएंगे और एकजुट होकर इनको पछाड़ने का काम करेंगे। इनके सहयोगी दल भी इधर आ जाएं, तब तो यह बात ही खत्म हो जाएगी।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA (CONTAI): Sir, this subject of disinvestment like King Charles's head has been appearing, disappearing and again reappearing for the last three years that I have seen. I have seen that even those who are opposing disinvestment today were Members of two successive Governments. Before this Government. Disinvestment has been on the agenda of the Government since 1991-92 and nobody seriously objected to it.... (*Interruptions*)

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : क्या आप भी देश बेचने के पक्ष में हैं ?

डॉ. नीतीश सेनगुप्ता : मैं, देश की जो कैपिटल है, उसका प्रॉपर इस्तेमाल करने के पक्ष में हूँ।

The basic point is that disinvestment as a policy was devised by the Government which was headed by Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao of which Dr. Manmohan Singh was the Finance Minister. Since then that has been on the agenda. There had been two UF Governments and after that the present NDA Government but nobody has seriously questioned this. So, it is

interesting to see that so many people who never opposed it at that time when they were sitting on the Treasury Benches are now vocal against disinvestment.

First of all, if you go through the Budget speeches of all these Finance Ministers or the Economic Surveys from 1991 onwards, every year there has been disinvestment. Disinvestment has been very boldly mentioned as one of the primary objects of the Government. Now, Sir, the Government in its wisdom set up certain undertakings in the core sector or heavy investment sector since 1950. There is nothing wrong in it. It was very appropriate at that point of time. During sixties and seventies the Government nationalised certain undertakings as a part of the public policy sometimes and sometimes in order to order to save some of the undertakings from going into liquidation, because they had been brought to near liquidation under the private sector management. So, the Government felt its duty to protect employment and to take them over. That is why we came up with a very mighty impressive public sector system where a number of units have been floated by the Government, like the Steel Authority, some of the oil sector companies, like the Indian Oil, ONGC and all that. Also, some companies like the Hindustan Cycles, Modern Bakery, National Textile Mill were taken over by the Government when under private sector management many of the companies were going into near ruin or almost total liquidation. Managing public finances is not different from managing our own family budgets. Wherever there is money, which is lying deployed in a certain way which is not productive, which is not giving anything in return, the owner has a right to redeploy.

Let us look at the assets invested in the total public sector system. I wanted to make a calculation, a rough projection about three to four years ago. It ran into something like Rs.5 lakh crores. The State sector firms are also included in it. So, that is the amount which is lying invested in the public sector system. We talk of the NPAs in the banking sector. Nobody talks about the NPA in the public sector or Government. If only this critical mass could give a yield of 10 or five per cent, even then the Government's financial position will be much better today. But that has not been the case. Year after year except for a few companies like the Oil sector companies

which take advantage of the monopoly and some other companies which because of professional efficiency, efficiency of the professional management like BHEL or NTPC have been steadily giving returns, all others have been by and large non-performing units, not giving any return to the Government but year after year drawing money by way of Budgetary support. This state of things cannot go on for all times to come.

Therefore, if we have to prevent near collapse of the entire economic system, as happened in the Soviet Union in the 1990s, disinvestment is a must. We have to take out money from certain areas and redeploy it elsewhere. In any case, a Government that cannot provide drinking water supply to each village in this country, a Government that cannot supply free primary education to the people, which is a Constitutional injunction has no right to get so much money locked up in the public sector system, the unproductive NPA without getting any return but on the other hand giving a lot of budgetary support every year just meeting the cash losses.

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not disturb the hon. Member. If you start disturbing each and every Member, it would not be fair. Shri Nitish Sengupta, please address the Chair; do not pay attention to each and every Member.

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : In that process there may be sometimes some omissions and commissions. There is no doubt about it.

In this debate certainly one was very sorry to see how Members of the Treasury Benches could go whole hog against the disinvestment system, even to the extent of threatening withdrawal of support. Perhaps NDA leadership would do well to sort out these things within the NDA, before allowing some people to wash dirty linen in public. I would say this is a good lesson. The NDA leadership should take these things seriously and make sure that the people of the Treasury Benches do not go into the Parliament and openly announce the withdrawal of support unless their policies are not accepted.

On the issue of the Centaur Hotel, I simply say while there might have been some mistakes, for instances discounted cash flow as a method of

share and asset valuation of a company is not a very standard practice even in the private sector accounting. I would advise the Minister not to rely too much on the discounted cash flow as a method. But, anyway, certain valuations were arrived at. As far as I can see, it was all done quite in the open with a lot of transparency. There is a differential of only about Rs.18 or Rs.28 crore between the price at which the party bought it and eventually sold it off.

Recollecting the situation of that time, one can say that the Centaur Hotel sale was decided shortly after the situation caused on the 11th September 2001. After that, tourism really went for a spin. Tourism just went down completely. Therefore, hotel industry was in shambles. In that situation a certain valuation was done. With the resumption of the normal situation later on if the valuation improved, I do not see anything wrong in it. The matter could be however looked into. We do not know whether the particular party, the Batra Hotels, which acquired it initially had effected any improvement in the property. We do not know any of those details. They might have effected some improvement in the property and that might have led to higher valuation. But I do not think it would be fair to unnecessarily criticise the Government. Initially Centaur Hotel was a part of the Hotel Corporation of India Ltd. and its divestment process started long before. Ultimately Government took over the disinvestment process . Unless we know the full facts of the case I think it is not fair to criticise the authority as if they helped Batras in making an unconscionable profit.

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : शिवसेना के साथी यहां बैठे हैं, वे बता देंगे। उन्होंने विस्तार से बताया है।
... (व्यवधान)

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN (MURSHIDABAD): As the Government to provide all the papers regarding Centaur Hotel sale. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Dr. Nitish Sengupta, have you finished?

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : If you want me to finish, I will finish.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not asking you to finish. But you have to address the Chair if you want to continue.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You have my full protection. You can go ahead.

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Once a company has been sold off, whether the new owners had effected any improvement in the property or whether they better packaged the property than the public sector system was able to do it before, is very difficult to say. I do not think it would be right to attribute any motives to it.

The point is, disinvestment is an inevitable and irreversible process. If we have to prevent the collapse of our economy as the Soviet economy did in 1990 or 1991, I think we need to pool our resources, take a lot of money from the places where it is lying in an unproductive and locked up manner and then use it elsewhere.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): Soviet economy and Indian economy are not the same.

MR. SPEAKER: Your time is over; will you please conclude now?

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Well, thank you very much.

श्री राम विलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) : अध्यक्ष जी, मैं पहली बार डिस्कशन में भाग लेने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं चाहता नहीं था और यह मेरा विाय भी नहीं है लेकिन जो एक-दो बातें सदन के सामने नहीं आई हैं, उनकी तरफ मैं ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। बहुत सी बातें माननीय सदस्यों ने कही हैं लेकिन हम लोग जिस वर्ग से आते हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि सदन में उसके काफी सदस्य बैठे हैं। डिसइन्वैस्टमेंट का जो मेन मुद्दा या पॉलिसी है, अंततोगत्वा इसका आप निजीकरण करें, उदारीकरण करें या वैश्वीकरण करें, इसमें तीन शब्द हैं, अंततोगत्वा इसका वैश्वीकरण है जिसका मतलब है खुली स्पर्धा।

शौरी जी, जब मैं मंत्रीमंडल में था, मैंने पर्सली भी आपसे आग्रह किया था कि जब आप खुली स्पर्धा कहते हैं, उसमें बड़ी मछली छोटी मछली को हमेशा निगल जाती है, बड़े पूंजीपति छोटे पूंजीपतियों को खाएंगे, मल्टीनैशनल्स इंडियन पूंजीपतियों को खाएंगे या उनके साथ मिलकर काम करेंगे। खुली स्पर्धा में गरीब आदमी के लिए जगह कहां है, यह सबसे ज्यादा चिन्ता का विषय है। आज सरकारी आंकड़ों के मुताबिक 29 हजार करोड़ रुपये की सम्पत्ति का इन्वैस्टमेंट, बेचना या निवेश कहें, की गई, 29 हजार करोड़ रुपये की जो सम्पत्ति बेची गई, उसमें शैडयूल्ड कास्ट्स, शैडयूल्ड ट्राईब्स, बैकवर्ड क्लास के लोगों का हिस्सा नहीं है लेकिन नौकरियों में कम से कम 50 प्रतिशत हिस्सा उनको मिलता था - साढ़े बाइस प्रतिशत शैडयूल्ड कास्ट्स, शैडयूल्ड ट्राईब्स का और सत्ताइस प्रतिशत ओ.बी.सी. को मिलता था। जब वह प्राइवेट में चला गया तो वहां कहीं आरक्षण नहीं है। जब मैं कैबिनेट में था, हम लड़ते थे, बार-बार कहते थे कि कम से कम ऐसी पॉलिसी बनाइए कि जब पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग प्राइवेट में चला जाता है तो उसमें आरक्षण की व्यवस्था रहे लेकिन ऐसा नहीं है। इसका मतलब है कि जब वह प्राइवेट में चला गया तो उसे कोई रिजर्वेशन नहीं मिलेगा, उसे खुली स्पर्धा, फ्री कम्पीटिशन, मेरिट के आधार पर आना पड़ेगा।

19.57 hrs. (Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh in the Chair)

गांव का लड़का, गरीब का लड़का, शैडयूल्ड कास्ट्स, बैकवर्ड क्लास का लड़का कैसे फ्री कम्पीटिशन में आकर कम्पीट करेगा। गुड़गांव में काल सेंटर बना हुआ है। उसमें यहां का लड़का बैठता है जो अमरीका से डील करता है। यदि अमरीका से कोई व्यक्ति पूछे कि मेरे बैंक एकाउंट का नम्बर क्या है तो सीधे गुड़गांव में टेलीफोन ट्रांसफर हो जाता है और यहां का लड़का उसी ऐक्सेंट में, जैसे वह अमरीकन अंग्रेजी में बोलता है, जवाब देता है, वहां के लड़के को पता भी नहीं चलता कि वह गुड़गांव से ऑपरेट कर रहा है। ऐसी कैपेसिटी गरीब लड़के में कहां से आएगी। कल तक गरीब लड़के रिजर्वेशन के माध्यम से नौकरी में आ जाते थे। अभी भी दूरदर्शन में चले जाइए, उसमें 10-12 प्रतिशत लड़के कहीं न कहीं मिल जाते हैं। लेकिन अब चैनल बन गया है, इलैक्ट्रॉनिक मीडिया आ गया है और उसमें गरीब लड़के के लिए कहीं जगह नहीं है, कहीं मेरिट में आ गया तो आ जाएगा। प्राइवेट कम्पनी जो बन रही है, उसमें गरीब लड़के को कहां जगह मिलेगी। इसलिए मैं आपसे बार-बार आग्रह करता हूं कि सरकार बदलती है, आती-जाती है, हमने कोई ठेकेदारी नहीं ली है, न आपने ली है, न इन्होंने ली है। सरकारें आती रहेंगी, जाती रहेंगी, जन्मभर कोई नहीं रहेगा। ऐसी परिस्थिति में आपने 29 हजार करोड़ रुपये में जो कम्पनियां बेची हैं, आप इस तरह की व्यवस्था क्यों नहीं करते कि घाटे की पूर्ति करें या नहीं करें, आप उस पैसे को फंड बनाकर क्यों नहीं रखते, उसमें ट्रेनिंग, एजुकेशन की व्यवस्था करें, इररिस्पैक्टिव ऑफ कास्ट एंड क्रीड, गरीब घर का लड़का या जो लोग गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे रहने वाले हैं, उनके ऊपर खर्च कीजिए।

20.00 hrs.

उनके लिए कैसे एम्प्लायमेंट जैनरेट करें, कैसे उसे योग्य बनायें, जिससे वह कम्पीट कर सके - यदि इस पर कुछ सोचा जाये तो बात समझ में आती है।

बैंकों के बारे में मैंने उस दिन यहां सवाल उठाया था, बैंकों के प्राइवेटाइजेशन का बिल आ गया है, 33 परसेंट का बिल बनाना है, बैंक में टोटल डिपोजिट 12.40 लाख करोड़ रुपये है। इसमें से 70 परसेंट पैसा साधारण जनता का है और उसमें से 80 हजार करोड़ रुपया बड़े-बड़े लोगों के ऊपर बकाया है। जितने निजी बैंक हैं, सारे के सारे निजी बैंक फेल हो गये। ये 19 नेशनलाइज्ड बैंक्स हैं, जो मुनाफे में हैं। 8.10 हजार करोड़ रुपये इस साल उन्हें मुनाफा हुआ है। अब सारे के सारे बैंक प्राइवेट में जाएंगे, यह जो आपकी पॉलिसी है, जिस पॉलिसी के तहत कहा गया है कि हम कृषि के ऊपर ऋण देंगे या सब्सिडी देंगे। आज अमेरिका जैसा देश है, वहां एक आदमी जो किसान है, वहां औसत किसान के पास 200 एकड़ जमीन है। हमारे यहां एक किसान के पास डेढ़ एकड़ जमीन है। वहां 4500 करोड़ रुपये प्रतिदिन वह सब्सिडी देता है और हम किसान की सब्सिडी हर चीज में कटौती करते जा रहे हैं।

यहां राणा जी बैठे हुए हैं, यहां हथकरघा के बदले आपने हैण्डलूम चला दिया और उसे सब्सिडी देना बन्द कर दिया। अब ये उसके बदले में कहते हैं कि हम स्वचालित मशीन चलाएंगे, स्वचालित मशीन से कपड़ा बनाएंगे तो फिर मजदूर कहां चला जायेगा। फिर आप कहते हैं कि बने बनाए हुए कपड़े विदेश से आयात करेंगे। बने बनाए कपड़े विदेश से आएंगे तो टेलर मास्टर कहां जायेगा, टेलरिंग के लोग कहां जाएंगे। एक का इम्पैक्ट दूसरे के ऊपर है।

प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कहा कि हम साल में एक करोड़ लोगों को रोजगार देंगे, कहां से रोजगार मिलेगा, कहां रोजगार दिया जा रहा है। हम लोगों की शौरी साहब से बार-बार बात होती थी, जब कोल इंडिया का मामला था। हमें कहना नहीं चाहिए, कोल इंडिया के मामले में हमने इनसे कहा था कि हमें एक साल का समय दीजिए। कोल इंडिया का घाटा 1995-96 से चला था, तीन करोड़, नौ करोड़, 13 करोड़ से 2001 तक 1500 करोड़ रुपये पर आ गया। उसके बाद सितम्बर में हम मिनिस्टर बने थे, आपसे हमारी बातचीत हुई थी तो हमने कहा था कि अभी इसकी चर्चा मत कीजिए, मजदूरों को हमें कॉन्फीडेंस में लेने दीजिए। हम लोग वहां गये तो मजदूर ने कहा कि जूता नहीं है, हमने कहा कि तुम्हारे पास जूता नहीं है तो हम बाटा का जूता देंगे। उसने कहा कि हैट नहीं है, हमने कहा कि बढ़िया हैट देते हैं। उसने कहा कि लाइट नहीं है, हमने कहा कि लाइट देते हैं। सारी चीजें करके फिर कहा कि हम लोग यहां काम करते हैं और हमें बीमारी हो जाती है, टी.बी. के पेशेण्ट हो जाते हैं, हमें कोई देखने वाला नहीं है। हमने अपोलो हॉस्पिटल के मालिक प्रताप रेड्डी से बात की। बिलासपुर में मेरे पास जमीन थी, वहां मकान था, हमने कहा कि मकान लीजिए, यहां मकान बना हुआ है। कोल इंडिया के पास रेडी जमीन है, उसमें से मजदूर का 25 परसेंट एक्स्ट्रा लगेगा, उतना बजट था तो हमने कहा कि 25 परसेंट ले लीजिए,

उन्होंने ले लिया। जमीन लेने के बाद... (व्यवधान) में खत्म ही कर रहा हूँ। मैं 10 मिनट बोला हूँ,

..*

उसके बाद हमने कहा कि जमीन ले लीजिए तो जमीन ले ली। जमीन लेने के बाद आपको जानकर आश्चर्य होगा कि वहां के लेबर ट्रेड यूनियन के लोग हैं, वहां दफा 28 थी, जिसमें मजदूर को बिना शो कॉज़ नोटिस दिए हुए रिट्रेंच कर देते थे। हम गये तो ट्रेड यूनियन के लोगों से हमारी बातचीत हुई। मैंने ट्रेड यूनियन के लोगों से पूछा कि यह जो धारा 28 है, जिसके तहत मजदूर को बिना नोटिस के रिट्रेंच कर दिया जाता है, इसकी बात आप क्यों नहीं करते हो तो बोले कि इसे तो कोई करने वाला नहीं है तो हमने कहा कि कोई नहीं करने वाला है तो हम अभी से इसे खत्म कर देते हैं और आठ बजे रात से वह खत्म हो गया। वही कोल इंडिया का मजदूर है, जहां पहले 1500 करोड़ रुपये का घाटा था, वह सात महीनेके अन्दर 1750 करोड़ रुपये का मुनाफा हो गया। वही मैनेजमेंट है, जो वहां बंगलिंग थी, कोल माफिया था, लिकेज के नाम पर इधर-उधर सारी चीज होती थी, करप्शन होता था, हम लोगों ने कुछ नहीं किया, सिर्फ उसे खत्म कर दिया।

3200 करोड़ रुपए कोयला मजदूरों के बकाया थे। हमने उसमें से 2800 करोड़ रुपए का पेमेंट भी कर दिया। हमारा जो मैनेजमेंट है, जो अधिकारी और कर्मचारी हैं, वे संसार के किसी भी देश के अधिकारी या कर्मचारी से कम सक्षम नहीं है। सिर्फ केयर का अभाव है। यह ऊपर से चलती है। अगर गंगोत्री गंदी रहती है तो गंगा का पानी साफ नहीं होगा। गंगा का पानी इसलिए साफ रहता है, क्योंकि उसकी जड़ में जड़ी बूटियां हैं।

**....Expunged as ordered by the Chair*

यहां मोहन रावले जी बैठे हैं। 1999 में ये विरोध पक्ष में थे और हम नेशनल फ्रंट की सरकार में थे। हम लोग मुम्बई गए थे। रेलवे में कुछ प्रब्लम थी। वहां रेलवे के कर्मचारियों द्वारा मुर्दाबाद के नारे लग रहे थे। हमसे अधिकारियों ने कहा कि आप वहां मत जाएं, लोग उत्तेजित हैं। हमने कहा कि हम जाएंगे। वहां जाकर बातचीत हुई, उसके बाद मामला कुछ नहीं रहा। दो मिनट में ही वहां जिंदाबाद के नारे लगाते हुए लोग चले गए। रावले जी जानते हैं, ये भी वहीं थे। गरीब क्या मांगता है, इसको देखिए। लेकिन आप यह न करके उसको डंडा मार कर कह रहे हैं कि हम रिट्रेंच करेंगे वीएसएस ले लो, इसका कोई मतलब नहीं है।

अभी बिहार में बरौनी फर्टिलाइजर कारखाने का मामला उठाया गया। बिहार में सिर्फ यही कारखाना बचा है, वह भी बंद हो गया है। वहां सिर्फ अपहरण का उद्योग चल रहा है, उसके पीछे भी गरीबी है। रोज अखबारों में पढ़ने को मिलता है कि बिहार में इतने अपहरण हो रहे हैं, किडनैपिंग हो रही है। अब गरीब और क्या करेगा। सब लोग काम के अभाव में मर रहे हैं, क्योंकि

कोई उद्योग नहीं है। रघुवंश बाबू जानते हैं, वे इस समय चेयर पर बैठे हुए हैं, उनको मालूम है कि बिहार की क्या हालत है। एक यही कारखाना बचा था, वह भी बंद हो गया। बिहार राज्य का बंटवारा हुआ, तो सिर्फ बरौनी फर्टिलाइजर का कारखाना ही बिहार में बचा था। उसको भी बंद करने का निर्णय ले लिया गया है। परसों यानी 20 तारीख को उसके कर्मचारियों को वीएसएस लेने के लिए कहा जा रहा है। अभी हम बसुदेव आचार्य जी से और सोमनाथ दादा से पूछ रहे थे कि वीआरएस और वीएसएस में क्या फर्क है। उन्होंने कहा कि 20 तारीख के बाद वहां रिट्रैचमेंट हो जाएगा। उसके बाद लोग क्या करेंगे, पता नहीं। बीआईएफआर से ऊपर एएआईएफआर है। उसने कहा है, जजमेंट दी है कि फिर से बीआईएफआर में भेजो। और चार महीने लगेंगे। हम उनसे सहमत नहीं हैं, हमारे पास पूरे जजमेंट की कापी है। आप प्रतिठा का प्रश्न बनाए हुए हैं कि उसको बेचेंगे नहीं, बंद करेंगे। इसको लेकर बिहार में रेल रोको अभियान भी चला था। जिस दिन मजदूरों को मालूम हो जाएगा कि कारखाना बंद हो गया है, उसके बाद हंगामा शुरू हो जाएगा। एक्ट अलग होता है, फैक्ट अलग होता है और टैक्ट अलग होता है। थोड़ा टैक्टफुली डील करें। आपने एक्ट बना दिया और कहा कि 1991 का बना हुआ है। हम तब भी उसका विरोध कर रहे थे। मैंने उस समय भी कहा था और इनको बुरा लग रहा था। अनुसूचित जाति, जनजाति और पिछड़े वर्ग के लिए आरक्षण की नीति बनाई गई है, अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो न बांस रहेगा और न बांसुरी बजेगी। न ये सरकारी सेक्टर के उपक्रम रहेंगे और न आरक्षण रहेगा, न मंडल रहेगा, न ही कमंडल रहेगा। इसलिए खतरा सिर्फ गरीब तबके को है। इससे जो खतरा होगा, उससे देश बंट जाएगा। मैं कहना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन मैं कह रहा हूं कि देश में भी कुछ हिस्सा विकास कर रहा है। जितना विदेशी निवेश देश में हुआ है, उसका 70 प्रतिशत हिस्सा साउथ में, तमिलनाडू में, कर्नाटक में, आंध्र प्रदेश में और महाराष्ट्र में लगा है। बाकी का 30 प्रतिशत देश के बाकी हिस्से में लगा है। एक तरफ राज्य विकास करेगा, दूसरी तरफ शहर विकास करेगा और तीसरी तरफ गांव मरेगा। मैं जब संचार मंत्री था, तो हमें निजी क्षेत्र में गांवों में टेलीफोन लगाने का जिम्मा दिया गया। एक लाख गांवों का टार्गेट था, लेकिन एक हजार गांवों में भी टेलीफोन नहीं लगे। इसलिए नहीं लगे, क्योंकि वहां टेलीफोन लगाना घाटे का सौदा है। आप निजी क्षेत्र से कहें कि वह गांवों में रोड बनाए, नहर बनाए, रेलवे लाइन बिछाए, वे ऐसा नहीं करेंगे। वे पकड़ेंगे दिल्ली को, कोलकाता को, मुंबई को, चेन्नई को। जहां उनको फायदा होगा, वे वहां जाने का काम करेंगे।

इसीलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि कुछ समय ऐसा आएगा कि आपका एक स्टेट है जो डैवलप्ड स्टेट है और मान लीजिए कि जो पूरा सरकारी सैक्टर है, तो उसमें घाटा भी होता है और मुनाफा भी होता है। एक टेलीकॉम डिपार्टमेंट था जो दिल्ली में मुनाफा कमाता था और उसका घाटा होता था तो बिहार, पश्चिम बंगाल और उड़ीसा में लगा देता था। लेकिन आप अलग-अलग कर देंगे तो प्रतिस्पर्धा में कर देंगे तो दिल्ली में तो टेलीफोन खूब लगेगा और दिल्ली के लोग इंटरनेट से अमरीका में एक रुपये बीस पैसे में बात करेंगे और गांव के आदमी को पुरानी दर पर बात करनी पड़ेगी। इसलिए लोधी होटल, सेंटूर होटल में क्या हो रहा है? वीएसएनएल को कितना मिला और 1400 करोड़ में से तो पैसा निकाल दिया और फिर 800 करोड़ निकाल रहा है। 2000 करोड़ में

बेचते हैं और 2200 करोड़ रुपये, उसी में से कैसे पूंजी निकल जाती है? इन सब चीजों का है। इनकी नॉलेज में हो या नहीं हो या सरकार की हैसियत से ये बचाना चाहे, वह एक अलग बात है लेकिन गांव में इस मामले को लेकर बहुत गुस्सा है।

गुजरात में चुनाव हुआ, यह ठीक है कि उसमें आपको प्लस प्वाइंट मिल गया लेकिन यह उफान होता है, जैसे कॉफी होती है, कॉफी कम होती है और उसमें फेन ज्यादा रहता है, गैस ज्यादा होती है। इसी तरह से आप धरातल पर आ जाएंगे क्योंकि अभी 11 राज्यों में चुनाव हैं, फिर वही रिजल्ट आ जाएगा। इसीलिए मैं आपसे आग्रह करना चाहता हूं कि यह बुनियादी सवाल है और प्रतिस्पर्धा के नाम पर जो हो रहा है, किसी गरीब की दुकान बेचने वाले है, चाय की दुकान बेचने वाले हैं, जो गरीब लोग हैं, उनका हक मारने वाले हैं, उनकी कुछ रक्षा कर सकें तो इस पर आपको ध्यान देना चाहिए नहीं तो अखिलेश जी भी बैठे हुए हैं, चौधरी जी बैठे हुए हैं, हम लोग ट्रेन में आ रहे थे, एक आदमी हम लोगों के सामने कह रहे थे कि आपके मंत्री जी जो हैं, हमारे गांव में एक कहावत है कि बापदादा ने सम्पत्ति अर्जित की और नालायक बेटा सम्पत्ति बेच रहा है। इस तरह की हालत हो रही है। यह मैं नहीं कह रहा हूं। कठियार से एम.पी. हैं रोज इनके सामने बातचीत होती रहती है, अपने हुसैन जी के साथ भी बातचीत होती रहती है। यहां मैं क्रिटिसाइज करने के लिए नहीं खड़ा हुआ हूं लेकिन इतना ही कहने के लिए आया हूं कि यह जो मामला है, इस मामले पर गंभीरता पूर्वक सोचिए। नीति ऐसी बनाइए जिसमें जो आम गरीब लोग हैं, गांव के लोग हैं, उनको और जो वर्किंग हैं, देखिए, सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि यहां हमेशा कोई जिंदा रहने के लिए नहीं आया है।

न राजा रहेगा, न रानी रहेगी, यह मिट्टी है, मिट्टी सबकी कहानी कहेगी।

गरीब की आह सबसे बड़ी आह होती है। गरीब के मन में सैटिस्फैक्शन होना चाहिए। गरीब दुआ दे तो इस तरह का काम करना चाहिए। बड़े-बड़े लोगों के लिए बहुत रास्ते हैं और वे पूरे संसार में रास्ता खोज लेंगे।

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH BADNORE (BHILWARA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I stand to support the Disinvestment Policy being pursued by the Union Government. Let me start with the remark that the world is changing and is changing constantly. What was good 50 years ago may, today, become or have become obsolete policywise or otherwise. In the changing times, you have to adapt yourself to the changing situations. Otherwise, you will become a relic of the past, a relic only in the history.

Sir, even China and Russia – and they are the mentors of Somnath Babu – have also realised this and the realisation dawned on these countries that

they must disinvest. It is also true that West Bengal is also disinvesting. When we talk of the 1950s, immediately after the Second World War and in the post-colonial era, nationalisation and putting up public sector units were being done throughout the world.

Most of the countries were doing it. Our honoured Prime Minister, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, also followed that. That was a time when the public sector units really came up. There were very many reasons that I do not really want to elaborate just now. But the 80s saw a real sea-change, a pragmatic shift and a paradigm shift in the policies. That was the time that necessitated that the public sector units must be disinvested.

It was also mentioned here that the champion of the disinvestment and denationalisation was Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of England. What we are facing today, she was facing in the House of Commons to the extent that her own Chancellor of Exchequer, Mr. Geoffrey Howe, opposed it. Here we call the Finance Minister whereas in England, they call him the Chancellor of Exchequer.

Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar was talking about selling family silver. That is where it has come out. That is where Geoffrey Howe himself stood up against Mrs. Margaret Thatcher. But she stood her ground. Whatever England is today, it is because of that 'Iron Lady'. She pursued this policy of disinvestment. That is why the Pound Sterling is strong today. ...
(*Interruptions*) I did not disturb anybody.

SHRI SHYAMACHARAN SHUKLA : Margaret Thatcher did not allow the shares to be sold to large shareholders. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH BADNORE : I will come to that. It is a very valid point being made by the hon. Member that she sold these shares in the open market. Now, we could also have done that. But we would not have realised the amount that we are doing it today because we do not have the liquidity to strengthen the market to pick up the shares at the rate that we should. That is why we have followed a policy that is a little different. But tomorrow, we would get the strength in the stock market. We would get liquidity in the stock market. We will also be able to do the same thing.

There is nothing wrong in what you are saying. This is what exactly a lot of people have been talking about.

Let me also remind a few hon. Members who have been raising this point that we have been selling the family silver. To whom does it belong? The people have been talking that the Government is the custodian of this family silver. Let me also put it here that it is not just the Government. It is the taxpayer's money that is involved. When the taxpayer's money is involved, we must get the profit. Are we getting the profit? You see the records. The people talk about the profit. Shri Paswan was talking about the profit. What does the profit mean? If you earn Re. 1, that is a profit. If you earn Rs. 2, it is a profit. If you earn Rs. 20, that also is a profit. What we have been really getting is pittance. If we have a comparison with the same type of industries, which are in the private sector, we would realise that we are getting only two per cent return out of the money that is being borrowed at the rate of 12 per cent. ... (*Interruptions*) आपको डिस्टर्ब करने की क्या जरूरत है। आप हमारी बात सुन लें। हम आपको डिस्टर्ब नहीं कर रहे थे।

आप हमारी बात सुनने की भी क्षमता भी रखिए। हमें भी हिन्दी आती है।

Let me also get to the point that even in my constituency, there was a public sector unit and it has been quoted here that the Hindustan Zinc Limited is not doing well. It was not doing well, and once it was disinvested – it was disinvested only to the extent of only 26 per cent – they have not refurbished and renovated it, but they have put in so much of new technology and new techniques of management that once it was a loss making public sector unit but now it has come into profits.

Let me also talk about Centaur Hotel, which has been much talked about here. What is it? There has been a transparency. Everybody is talking about that no other Minister has been so transparent as Shri Arun Shourie. Everybody agrees to it. He has not had any vested interest. Nobody has accused him of having any vested interest in the deal.

What has happened? Somebody makes Rs.30 crore, somebody can make more. How did it happen? Now, what happened was that there was a bid and the highest bidder got the hotel? An opportunity comes. In Mumbai,

the Sahara Group has got lot of planes. The hon. Minister of Aviation is here. He knows about it and he will agree that they have lot of staff in Mumbai whom they wanted to accommodate, and that was an opportunity. When it came to a hotel, they grabbed it. They were not getting any hotels. सिम्पल सा रास्ता है और वह यह है कि अगर किसी चीज की इतनी जरूरत है, the market value might be high, you have to pay a little more, and not just a little more but even more to grab that, and that is exactly an opportunity. Now, in the private sector, there are opportunities one does not miss. They are going to make money even after having paid Rs.30 crore more. That is exactly what happened. When Sahara was not in a position to bid for this hotel, they were not in the market. That was the time that they did not bid for it. You cannot really judge the whole scenario by one deal. Certainly, an opportunity has come.

What about the VSNL? You have had a loss. It was sold for Rs.200 per share. Now it is Rs.80 per share. Now, what do we do about that? Somewhere you have a profit, somewhere you have a loss.

सभापति महोदय, मैं एक ही बात कह कर अपनी बात समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ कि जब सरकार व्यापारी बन जाती है तो वह चलती नहीं है, प्रजा भिखारी बन जाती है।

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Mr. Chairman Sir, I have been taking part in this debate for the last so many occasions and today I will be too brief because I have said what I could say in the matters of oil sector. In the last debate, unfortunately, it could not be replied due to lack of quorum.

Let us understand the thing in objectivity. Let us understand what is the reflection of the Government, which is determined to disinvest the oil sector. It is an NDA Government. We are discussing very frankly and let us understand the composition of the Government. The constituent which is outside, that is, TDP is opposed to this disinvestment of the oil sector.

One of the important constituents within the Government, Shiv Sena have taken a public position and within the Parliament opposed disinvestment of this type. There is a component called 'Samata Party'. Its President within the Cabinet and its MPs in the Parliament opposed the disinvestment of this type. There are parties like JD(U) and DMK which opposed publicly but unfortunately they did not take part in this debate today. There is a party, TMC - whatever form it could be. I do not know how Dr. Nitish Sengupta has talked about it, and if Kumari Mamata Banerjee comes to know the contents of his speech, I do not know whether he will stay in the party or not because Kumari Mamata Banerjee took a public position against the whole policy.

So, what is NDA? Within the BJP, I admire and salute the courage and conviction shown by our Petroleum Minister, Shri Ram Naik, not for any reason but for the genuine reason of national security, country's assets and the contribution of the officers, workers in the petroleum sector. ...
(*Interruptions*) Shri Ram Naik at least tried to share his opinion.

Shri Arun Shourie is a Minister. Can he first explain one point as to why he thought to review the whole matter and change his pattern of disinvestment in oil sector from the strategic sale to public sale of shares? It was because of our consistent opposition from the Opposition parties and consistent opposition from within NDA and also from within the Cabinet. Do you not agree to that? If you agree to this, then do you not understand and interpret what does it mean? He will not share.

We are not here to question your *bona fide*. You are here in the Government. You have every right to bring your programmes and policies, and get them endorsed by the Parliament. Therefore, NDA, as a constituent of the Government, with overwhelming majority, is opposed to disinvestment of this type, and specially the oil sector. If you say, 'No, you are bullying us.', I am not bullying. Let the Prime Minister come with a proposal on this in the House. You bring a motion to get rid of all the controversies. Let the NDA Government headed by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee move a motion in the Parliament, whether the Parliament is endorsing the disinvestment of the profit-making public sector and that too of the oil sector in the manner as the Minister is proposing. You can issue a

three-line whip. All right, you do not issue the whip and you can ask the Members to vote on their free will. If the Parliament, on the vital matter of the national interest, gives the endorsement to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee's motion, we will not say anything. If it does not give the endorsement, we will not construe it as 'no confidence' and we will not say, "Shri Vajpayee, you resign." Rather we will admire him. The *Navaratna* companies are not only the pride of the Government but also the pride of India. The point - India can do a miracle - has been proved by ONGC, Indian Oil, BPCL and HPCL. On this particular matter only, if the Prime Minister comes with a motion and if the House says, 'No, Shri Arun Shourie is right', then we will not say anything.

You are not discussing the issue with an open heart. You think that everything should be done in terms of majority. This is not correct. This is not correct for your side or for our side. If the Congress had done some mistake, will you say, "We will repeat that mistake"? For everything you say, "It is you who showed us the path." You abuse us 10 times. Who will be preventing you from doing it? You can accuse us. When we were attempting to liberalise our economy and trying to make an experiment whether two per cent or three per cent could be disinvested, even then there was a public furore. Did you all - Shri Ram Naik, Shri Vajpayee, and Shri Advani - not address from this side and also outside in the *Swedish Manch* that it was wrong?

The people gave you the mandate. Now, sitting here you are making a volte-face. How do you justify? A Member of the ruling Party is threatening to withdraw the support. He is from the Samta Party. Shiv Sena MPs are asking honestly and sincerely how do they go to face their electorates. You still consider that this can be manageable. The word 'manageable' can be used in all matters. If that is an issue of no confidence on the Government, we are not bringing any No- Confidence Motion. We are not questioning the *bona fide* of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee as the Prime Minister. We are trying to argue a point that at this critical situation when US ship is on way to Iraq, when the Gulf is entirely surcharged with the likely attack by the United States of America, when Pakistan is insisting on its efforts to destabilise India, when everything is not quiet on the front and

after having learnt the lesson from Shrimati Indira Gandhi in 1971, do you still consider that it is the fit and proper occasion to disinvest the public sector oil companies in the oil sector? If you rationally think and if the Cabinet Committee on Security also thinks, yes, that it is the fit occasion, then why does the Prime Minister not come with a proposal and share with us? If the majority of the House says, Mr. Prime Minister, no, it is not correct, then, let the Prime Minister honour the sentiment of the House. This is only my first appeal.

Mr. Chairman, this is my second appeal. I was thinking that the Speaker would be in the Chair, but this is my appeal, through you, to the hon. Speaker. The Speaker can still save the situation. How? The Speaker can give a direction to the Government saying let the proposal of disinvestment of the oil sector and other profit making Public Sector Undertakings be brought before the Standing Committee on Finance by the respective Department Secretaries. Let the Standing Committee examine this and send back its report to the Government. That report be tabled in the next Session of Parliament. Then, let the Government act sensing the mood of the House. If that direction goes at least we will feel that the mood and sentiment of all the Parties in the House and the people as reflected through the Standing Committee would, at least, be responded. Is it against democracy? If the Parliament gives you the mandate to take away Burma Shell, Caltex, and ESSO, and if it tells you to do it in this way, then who is Shri Arun Shourie or the Cabinet which is ignoring the Parliament? You can dispose such a vital issue without the knowledge and sanction of the Parliament. This is such a vital issue. These are the matters I thought of bringing it to you. Therefore, I demand that the proposal should be brought to the Standing Committee immediately. From now onwards, if the Government is so transparent, it can do this. You cannot give a green signal to every disinvestment proposal unless it is screened by the Standing Committee and placed before the Parliament. You make a policy. It could be the policy of the NDA. What is wrong with this?

There was a situation when Air India was to be sold. The people of Air India met and requested us to give them a chance. They said that within a year they would show profit. Today Air India is making profit. The

Minister was happy to inform this in the House the other day. Therefore, this is not a battle between Shri Arun Shourie, as an individual and the Opposition. We have no personal thing against Shri Arun Shourie. The other day I was telling this that if Shri Arun Shourie had left the Cabinet and joined the newspaper, he would have exposed this scam and sent it to a news digest column. This is only my appeal because I cherished his writings.

I will now come to only one point regarding Centaur Hotel. It is a scam. I cannot explain to you what is the magnitude of this scandal. The details have been stated by many of our friends, especially, from the Shiv Sena. The bid was rejected because he quoted Rs.65 crore. While we have the second bid, did you call for the tender again? Can the Minister tell us this in the House?

Did you make a public pronouncement through newspapers that the second bid was open? You did not do that. If my information is wrong, the hon. Minister may correct me and I would correct myself. Before the second bid was opened, two things happened. There was a six per cent turnover levy as it was arbitrated in favour of the Hotel Corporation of India through the Airports Authority of India. All the hotels in the Airport Authority's land, whose custodian is Shri Syed Shahnawaz Hussain, have got this six per cent annual turnover levy. The Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment brought it down to two per cent after the first bid was lost. When it was brought down to two per cent Shri Hussain's Department suffered and the Airports Authority suffered. The appreciation of price of the property would have been more than Rs.100 crore. The reserve price was Rs.78 crore. Without any tender and again without any publicity through newspapers, the letters were sent out clandestinely to three of those who lost their earnest money deposit earlier knowing full well that only Shri Batra would come to bid.

Shri Batra first gave the bid in the name of AB Hotels along with the Radisson Hotel. ... (*Interruptions*) I am giving out only the facts. The hon. Minister may later clarify whether I am right or wrong. AB Hotels was not listed and so Batra quoted later as an individual. The guideline is that there should be a turnover worth Rs.25 crore. The stake of Shri Batra, while

quoting in the name of AB Hotels along with the Radisson Hotel was six per cent. When he quoted as an individual, his share of the turnover was less than Rs.25 crore. Yet, he was favoured as an individual and he sold it over to Sahara, making a huge profit. This violated the Central Vigilance Commission's guidelines; it violated the basic norms of the tender-bid process; it violated the basic principles of pricing.

In the case of the ITC Hotels, you may have seen in many places that they were evaluated by four banks. They determined a particular price but when the CPWD was asked to do the pricing, it was more than price fixed by the four banks. If you take the State Government's evaluation, you would find it different from the evaluation of the four banks. Did you consult the Government of Maharashtra about the land price, the market price and so on of the Centaur Hotel Complex? Did you get it evaluated by the CPWD? Who evaluated the price? I do not like to take the name of officials because they cannot defend themselves here in Parliament. The kind of correspondence that went on between the Tourism Secretary and the Disinvestment Secretary is unfortunate but they decided just to punish one officer, Shri Lohani, because he was of the conviction that this should not be disinvested.

It is not Shri Arun Shourie who is our target. I do not like to malign him. He is unfortunately placed to carry out all the sins of the NDA Government.

20.38 hours (Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Hon. Speaker, Sir, I was taking your holy name. You inspired me. ...
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: But I will not give you more time because of that!

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : I would just conclude again by making my request to you. I appeal to the hon. Speaker to save the situation. Many times, in the House of Commons, when the Government was confused and the Parliament was confused, it was the Speaker who came to save the situation. Therefore, I appeal to you to give a direction

that between the Winter Session and the Budget Session the proposals of disinvestment of profit-making public sector units and those in the oil sector should be placed before the Standing Committee

on Finance. Let that Committee consider the proposals and present a Report. After that, the Government may come out with a Motion, whether such a disinvestment should be done or not and let Parliament decide on that. If this is done, the nation would be protected.

With these words, I conclude my speech. Thank you for giving me the time.

SHRI PRABODH PANDA (MIDNAPORE): Mr. Speaker, Sir, due to the paucity of time, I rise to make only points as I am aware of the time constraint. My first question is about the logic of the disinvestment. So far I understand from the deliberations made by the hon. Members in this august House that nobody has questioned the disinvestment of the loss-making enterprises. But the question is whether the profit-making public sector undertakings would be under the process of disinvestment or not. So, my point is that what would be the attitude towards the public sector? This should be thought out first as to what should be our attitude.

Some hon. Members of the Treasury Benches rightly pointed out that this policy has been initiated since 1991. Yes, I do admit it. But that was not the disinvestment indiscriminately. Now, the Government of the day is pursuing the disinvestment policy vigorously with a greater zeal and without any discrimination.

A new idea has come up of strategic and non-strategic. So, my point is what is strategic and what is non-strategic? Who is to decide it, how to decide it and what is the parameter to assess what is strategic or non-strategic? Even Defence is strategic or non-strategic? This should be sorted out first.

In 1997, the Government had identified 11 Central public sector undertakings as *Navratnas*. I think, 46 enterprises categorize as mini-

ratnas. Now, all sorts of *ratnas* – whether maxi-*ratnas* or mini-*ratnas* or *Navratnas* are under the process of disinvestment.

It is very rightly pointed out that the asset of our country is not the asset of a person or of a definite Ministry, but it is an asset of our country, as a whole.

Our hon. Prime Minister often talks about the consensus. What is to talk about the consensus in regard to the disinvestment of the public sector enterprises? So, it is a very pertinent question now a days. Yes, I do agree that there are some lapses and some shortcomings... .. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Prabodh Panda, we have to finish the debate now.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : Sir, please give me one more minute. I will conclude soon. The public sector undertakings are facing various problems like low productivity, poor-project management, lack of technological upgradation and so on and so forth. So, what should be our attitude – whether we should try to strengthen them to overcome all these shortcomings or shall we throw them out? Shall we throw out the baby with the bath water? It would be the attitude now a days of our country. So, all these things should be considered and all these things should be taken for an in-depth study.

Sir, I am not being given more time. ... (*Interruptions*) I think the Government will think over it. I would like to mention only one point. It has been said by Gen. Tripathi that we have discussed this point 14 times.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Basu Deb Acharia to speak now. Shri Acharia, I will be able to give you only two minutes. You can only make one or two suggestions.

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : Sir, My point is that we could have discussed it for 14 times or 100 times; but what was the Government doing; have they taken cognizance of the discussions? ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Basu Deb Acharia, you may speak now.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRABODH PANDA : Sir, I am not being given more time. I conclude my speech at this point.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): Thank you Mr. Speaker, Sir. During every debate on disinvestment that I participated I wanted to know one thing from the hon. Minister of Disinvestment. He has stated a number of times that one of the objectives of disinvestment is to revive the sick public sector undertakings and to spend on health, education and social welfare. The Government has, so far, received Rs. 29,000 crore out of the proceeds of the disinvestment, sale of public sector undertakings. We wanted to know the break up of figures as to how much has been spent so far on health, education and social welfare. What we have seen is that in the current year's Budget, the allocation has been reduced in these three sectors than what was allocated in the earlier year.

We know that a number of public sector undertakings have been closed down. We demanded that the MAMC, a very important public sector undertaking in West Bengal is to be revived. To revive this undertaking an amount of Rs. 425 crore is required. But that fund was not provided. Sir, you are aware of the National Instrumentation Limited. A number of times I took delegations to you. Even the BIFR recommended for its revival and asked the Government to provide funds for the revival of the National Instrumentation Limited. Uptil now no funds have been provided for the revival of National Instrumentation Limited. Similar is the case with BOGL – Bharat Ophthalmic Glass Limited. How much money is required for its revival? An amount of only Rs. 25 crore is required. That fund was not made available to it either.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri K.P. Singh Deo to speak now.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Singh Deo, you have to speak; otherwise I will go to the next Member.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, just a minute. Every time the hon. Minister says and today also he will say the same thing. What happened after the disinvestment of BALCO and Modern Foods?

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Basu Deb Acharia, I will not take on record what you are speaking. Shri Singh Deo to speak now.

*(Interruptions) ... **

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, it is very important. Nobody has pointed it out. Please allow one sentence.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Singh Deo, after his one sentence, you may speak.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : What happened to the workers after the disinvestment of BALCO? What was to be done by the private management, Sterlite Company? There was an agreement that there would be no retrenchment. There was enmass displacement of employees which is forcing them to accept indirect retrenchment. Hundreds of workers were forced to take VRS. Those who have not taken VRS are retrenched. What about the service conditions? ... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Singh Deo, please speak now.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, there are four very important points.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, I may not be able to allow you.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, nobody has pointed out these things.

MR. SPEAKER: You write to the hon. Minister.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : I will take only one minute.

MR. SPEAKER: You will make injustice to others.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, there was to be no change in service conditions. The service conditions have already been changed. There was

to be no closure of any establishment or unit. The company, at their sweet will have closed down their Vidhan Bagh unit in West Bengal.

MR. SPEAKER: You can speak on some other occasion. Shri Singh Deo, do you not want to speak?

SHRI K.P. SINGH DEO (DHENKANAL): Sir, I want to speak.

* Not Recorded

MR. SPEAKER: Please go ahead.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, just a second. They have closed down their Chennai office and they have closed down their regional offices. They have violated all the agreements after disinvestment of BALCO.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister to speak now.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, just a second. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, when he will replies, about all these things. He may clarify these points because after disinvestment of BALCO the Sterlite Company has violated all the agreements. ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister will speak now.

SHRI K.P. SINGH DEO : Sir, I also want to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Members do not want to observe discipline, what else can I do?

SHRI K.P. SINGH DEO : Sir, I am maintaining discipline. I should not be penalised.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, you speak.

SHRI K.P. SINGH DEO (DHENKANAL): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am extremely grateful for having been given this opportunity. After three years, this is the first time that I am getting an opportunity of speaking on it. What are we discussing today? We are discussing something which has

taken us 50 years to build up by investing Rs. 2,40,000 crore in 240 public sector units. Public sector has been pivotal, has been substantial to our economic development as well as to our standing in the world as an industrialised nation. It has provided jobs and employment to more than 20 lakh people. What are we trying to do? We are trying to sell it off in the name of disinvestment. Where we are keeping 26 per cent share, we are not standing by the labour and the work force which has brought it up to this level. Where it is strategic, where the Government has more than 51 per cent share, it is only there that the worker is to be safeguarded.

Sir, as a student of Geology, I had opposed it in 1972 when I was in the other House. Our iron ores and other ores are going out. Instead of empowering our own States, we export them to, say, Australia, Japan or elsewhere where we provide jobs to the youth of those countries and then, we buy back the finished products. I had my first field work in Jarandi Coalfields and Kargalli Washeries, where today the Bokaro Steel Plant stands. It was in 1958. The same thing is going to happen to NALCO which is there in my constituency, in my State. An amount of Rs. 2,408 crore was invested in it which came out of Euro-dollars and French loan and not a single penny was spent by the Government of India.

In the year 1981, Shrimati Indira Gandhi wanted to empower socially as well as economically the mineral-enriched Orissa because Rs. 74,000 crore worth of Bauxite ores are there. We will be able to exploit the ores of Panchpatmali in Koraput district for 100 years. It has got uranium content. Yet, Govt. say that it is not strategic. Shri Shivraj Patil was a Minister when I was still in service as a military man. Policy is decided by the Government, strategy is decided by the Armed Forces headquarters and tactic is decided by the field commanders. Now, the Government wants to decide policy as well as strategy. They are not equipped for deciding strategy.

Out of 6,600 people who are employed, 30 per cent are Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes who are the poor people whose land had been taken ostensibly for the establishment of public sector units. We have befooled the Government of Orissa and we have befooled the people of Orissa. They have given up their lands. Some of them, about 1,700 families, have

not been resettled as yet. Yet, it has brought prosperity to our country, to our State and to our district in the form of exports or in the form of saleable aluminium and peripheral development. It has given down-stream products and fabrication material and provided wages and income. We are selling it off without enforcing the safety net for the workers.

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले (मालेगांव) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सर्वप्रथम सम्माननीय राम नाईक साहब को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने मराठी भावनाओं को समझने की कोशिश की है। यह सरकार वैसा ही कर रही है जैसे किसी को अंडा चाहिए, तो वह अंडे के लिए मुर्गी को काटने का काम करे। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अंडा प्राप्त करने के लिए मुर्गी को काटने की जरूरत नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे मेरी मां की याद आ रही है। मैं छः महीने का था, तब मेरे पिताजी गुजर गए। कई लोगों ने मेरे पिता की जमीन छीनने का प्रयास किया। मेरी मां राहीबाई शंकर महाले को, जैसा कि आप जानते हैं हमारे आदिम जाति क्षेत्र में जिसे भुताली कहते हैं, मेरी मां को जमीन छीनने का प्रयास करने वालों ने डाकिनी तक कहा। उन्हें डाकिनी कहकर यात्रा निकाली लेकिन उन्होंने बिल्कुल ढील नहीं दी और न ही जमीन बेची। मेरा कहना है कि घर और राट्र एक जैसा ही है, यानी जैसे घर का काम होता है वैसे ही राट्र का काम होता है। अब अरुण शौरी जी अरुण है और अरुण तो अंधकार दूर करता है लेकिन आप तो अंधकार करते हैं, यह कैसा अरुण है ? आप डायरेक्ट आये हैं। जो मां बालक को जन्म देती है, वही प्रसूति की पीड़ा को जानती है। ये डायरेक्ट आये हैं, यानी जनता से चुनकर नहीं आये हैं। मैं उस जगह पर कभी नहीं जाऊंगा। अगर प्रयास भी करूंगा तो भी इस जगह पर मैं कभी नहीं आता। अगर आता तो यह मंत्री पद फेंक देता। मैं यह सच बोल रहा हूँ। यह ठीक नहीं है। इस बारे में महाराट्र में श्री वसंत दादा पवार थे। ...(व्यवधान) मैं विपक्ष में बैठा था। पुनर्वास के रस्म कायदे के बारे में कमेटी बनी। उसमें पांच डि वीजन के लोगों को बुलाया और उनमें विश्वास पैदा किया। ...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : महाले जी, अब आप बैठिये।

...(व्यवधान)

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले : आपको भी ऐसा ही विश्वास पैदा करना चाहिए। आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया, इसके लिए आपको बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

MR. SPEAKER: Kunwar Akhilesh Singh, you are the last speaker. Please take only one minute to make your points.

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : अध्यक्ष जी, जब से यह सरकार आयी है तब से आधुनिक भारत के पवित्र मंदिरों को लगातार धराशायी करती जा रही है। यह सरकार निर्माण की बजाय ...(व्यवधान)

इसको समझने की कोशिश कीजिए। ये कल-कारखाने आधुनिक भारत के पवित्र मंदिर ही हैं। ये लगातार इन पवित्र मंदिरों को ध्वस्त करते जा रहे हैं और निर्माण की बजाय विध्वंस का कार्य श्री अरुण शौरी जी के हाथों हो रहा है। श्री अरुण शौरी के विचारोत्तेजक लेखों को हम पढ़ा करते थे, उनका अध्ययन करते थे और उसकी गंभीरता पर जाते थे तो लगता था कि वह कैसे आय और खर्च में संतुलन स्थापित करते हुए, खर्च में कटौती करते हुए देश के राजस्व घाटे को समाप्त करने की बात करते थे। आज आपने विनिवेश नीति के द्वारा मात्र 29 हजार करोड़ रुपये ही इकट्ठे किये हैं। आपके पिछले लेखों को जब हम पढ़ते हैं और आज के कृत्य को देखते हैं तो हमें लगता है कि आप या तो अपनी लेखनी के साथ इंसोफ नहीं कर रहे या आज जिस पद पर बैठे हैं, उस पद के साथ न्याय नहीं कर रहे हैं।

अभी सेन्टूर होटल का मामला हमने नहीं बल्कि आपके सहयोगी साथियों ने, शिवसेना के साथियों ने इस सदन में और राज्य सभा के अंदर उठाया। जो सम्पत्तियां आप बेचने का काम कर रहे हैं, वे हमारी और आपकी नहीं बल्कि जनता की सम्पत्तियां हैं। हम आपके ऊपर रिश्वत लेने का आरोप नहीं लगाते लेकिन हमारा और आपका यह कर्तव्य बनता है कि यदि 100 रुपये का सामान 75 रुपये या 50 रुपये में बिकता है तो कहीं न कहीं हम अपने कर्तव्य का निर्वहन नहीं करते। हम निश्चित तौर पर कहते हैं कि आपने अपने कर्तव्य का सेन्टूर होटल के मामले में पालन नहीं किया और कर्तव्य-हीनता का आरोप आपके ऊपर प्रमाणित होता है। जिन लोगों ने सेन्टूर होटल की खरीद और बिक्री की है, उसमें यह साबित हो चुका है कि सरकार में बैठे हुए लोगों ने अपने उत्तरदायित्व का सही तरीके से निर्वहन किया होता तो एक खरीद और दूसरी बिक्री के बीच जो इतना भारी अंतर हो रहा है, वह अंतर निश्चित तौर पर सरकार के खजाने में आता। ...(व्यवधान) मैं दो मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त कर रहा हूं। ...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने आपको एक मिनट दिया है।

...(व्यवधान)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : मैं आपका संरक्षण चाहता हूं। आपका बराबर मुझे संरक्षण मिलता है। मैं मंत्री जी आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि आप जिन कल-कारखानों को बेचकर जिन क्षेत्रों को धन मुहैया कराने का काम कर रहे हैं, उससे क्षेत्रीय विमता पैदा हो रही है। हमारे गोरखपुर में खाद का कारखाना बंद पड़ा हुआ है। वहां आप वी.आर.एस. स्कीम को लागू करके मजदूरों को मजबूर कर रहे हैं कि वे सड़कों पर उतरकर अराजकता की स्थिति पैदा करें। आज पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में लगभग दो दर्जन समृद्ध दो दर्जन चीनी मिलें बंद पड़ी हैं। हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि यदि

आपको धन की आवश्यकता है तो आपको कृषि क्षेत्र में, कृषि उद्योग क्षेत्र में नियोजन करना चाहिए। ... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : अगर आप उन दो दर्जन चीनी मिलों को धन मुहैया करा दें तो मैं साफ शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम 24 लाख लोगों को आप सीधे रोजगार देने का काम करेंगे जिसमें किसान, मजदूर और ट्रैक्टर मालिक आदि सारे लोग जुड़े होंगे। मैं एक बार फिर निवृत्तापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि ... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: What Kunwar Akhilesh Singh is saying now should not be taken on the record.

*(Interruptions) ... **

* Not recorded

21.00 hrs.

THE MINISTER OF DISINVESTMENT, MINISTER OF DEVELOPMENT OF NORTH EASTERN REGION AND MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): Sir, I am deeply grateful to all the hon. Members, specially those hon. Members and particularly the senior Members who have stayed on till the end of this debate. As has been mentioned by several speakers, in the last two and a half years, in the two Houses, this is the 14th time that a discussion is taking place on this subject. The discussion on the eleventh and twelfth debate, that had taken place in the other House, had to be discontinued for want of quorum. I think, it is a matter of some progress that actually you can see the level of interest now and that everybody feels that he or she has spent his or her fervour and anger so that the attendance has become so thin in these matters.

Sir, the object of disinvestment has been exactly what everyone says it should be, that is, optimal use of national resources. That has been our purpose in this. In spite of the things that have been said here, I make bold to say that there is consensus in practice.

Sir, it is probably a surprise to most of us to learn that eleven States are today in the process of disinvesting their enterprises. In this case no distinction is being made even in States like Punjab, Karnataka and Madhya Pradesh between profit-making and loss-making enterprises. I can read out to you the names of the profit-making enterprises in these States -- in which other Parties and other combinations are in power – that are being disinvested. Today we can even look them up in the websites of those States. None of them has brought out any White Paper as one of my friends keep saying and refers to what he had said two and a half years ago. No valuation has been done by any of these Assemblies, not one after answering those questions. None of those things, as was being mentioned by Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi, has been brought to the Standing Committee and then a direction given that it should be done only after passage of a resolution. On the contrary... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): You talk about the Central PSUs... (*Interruptions*)

MR.SPEAKER: The Minister has not yielded. You must listen to the Minister.

SHRI K.P. SINGH DEO : Sir, the Petition Committee had said no to the disinvestment of NALCO... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, on the contrary, in each one of those instances, the position has been the opposite. The Government of Tamil Nadu had written to us, the Punjab Government has written to us and only yesterday I have received a letter from the Government of Sikkim. There is only State Government, Shri Somnath Chatterjee knows that, that is not following the template, procedure and the structure that has been evolved in a transparent manner, in a thorough manner after an extensive discussion with the best experts in the Centre.

Sir, one State after another has come to us to get the structure perfected, to get the bidding procedure perfected. They have been so kind as to bring their advertisements. The Government of Punjab is also included in this. The Madhya Pradesh Government, not ruled by the BJP or the NDA, has

asked for a loan of Rs. 100 crore from the Asian Development Bank so as to start the process. The Government of Kerala, which again is not ruled by the NDA, has sent a team, you can read it in the newspapers, to the Asian Development Bank for a loan of Rs. 1800 crore. The first thing that they are going to do in the reforms package is privatisation in this way.

The Chief Minister of Karnataka has stated his disinvestment policy by saying, "We will privatise all public sector units and those which we cannot privatise, we will close down." If you want, Sir, I will now go through the list of public sector undertakings disinvested in West Bengal, which they will not let me read. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : We are not in any State Assembly. This is a discussion in Parliament.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I am saying that there is a compensation practice ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Respond to the points we have raised.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I am coming to that. Please be patient. I have heard patiently for five hours.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : सुनना नहीं है तो बोल दीजिए, अभी बन्द कर देंगे। आपने भी बोला है, हमने सुना नहीं क्या? We heard you for four hours. ऐसा थोड़े ही होता है कि चार घण्टे बहस करो और पांच मिनट में डिस्टर्ब करने लगे।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, it is late in the evening. I do not know why the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs should interrupt like this. You yourself have said that it is so late. I am only saying that we are waiting to hear the Minister's replies to the points raised.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I am coming to that, Sir.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You are talking as if you are inspired by the State Assemblies.

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : फिर हमें भाण लिखकर दे दो, वही पढ़ देते हैं।

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Shri Somnath Chatterjee speaks for one hour and we have to listen to that with great respect. How can we not ...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, I have permitted you. You are exactly going as per the requirement of the speech of a Minister. Please go ahead.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): If you think we have talked without sense, do not reply.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: No, no, you have made important points. The point of law that you made is a very important point.

Sir, many of the criticisms are based on complete misconceptions, I can only use the word 'misconceptions'. For instance, one hon. Member said, "Look here! IDPL was set up for providing drugs to defence personnel. If it is disinvested to a private company, how will the defence personnel get drugs?" The point is, almost all units of IDPL are long closed. Its paid up share capital is Rs.117 crore. Its accumulated losses till two years ago were Rs.1,425 crore. The situation has become further worse now. I have figures of 2001 March. Its net worth has come down to minus 1,095 crore rupees. Almost all the plants are closed. Yet, an argument is fabricated, or put together, on that basis.

In NALCO, Gen. Tripathi's point was directly put up by other friends, saying, "Look here! What would happen if it is privatised?" I am not on the point of privatisation. I am on the point of the argument that was given; precisely, the point that was being made. Gen. Tripathi said, "If somebody buys it, a foreigner buys it, and then does not make aluminium or aluminium products, what will happen? What will happen if he starts exporting alumina?" It will come as surprise to you that that is precisely the condition of NALCO today. Sixty-one per cent of its revenue comes because it does not process alumina. It just sells alumina as it is. It does not even make aluminium metal from it, far from making any product. In case of a sister company in India like Hindalco, one hundred per cent of its revenue comes from aluminium metal and aluminium products. It does not sell any alumina. That is the condition! I do not want to go to other things.

That is why, the profit after tax to income ratio of NALCO is 16 per cent, and of Hindalco it is 32 per cent.

The same is the case with HMT which was given as a great example. You yourself know actually, I do not have to narrate the figures, the difficult circumstances in which it is. A rehabilitation package, because of your great initiative, of Rs.347 crore was given to it. In spite of that, its accumulated losses are Rs.302 crore. Its net worth has come down to minus 90 crore rupees.

In Centaur Hotel, the same kinds of things have been said. I have great affection and honour for some of the Members who have made this important point, and their concern for labour is evident. As you know, the other day also it was said that workers have died. The other day the number given was five, today it was reduced to three. I have got information in writing from these people. They say that indeed, after disinvestment in June, three persons have died.

Just listen what has happened. I am reading it out. If I am wrong and the Members have other information, they will please correct me. I will get back to the person who has supplied this information.

"Shri Gajanand Tukaram Pahwa, who was a senior Utility Worker, died suffering from Cirrhosis of the Liver. "

Do you know how that is caused?... (*Interruptions*) What has it to do with the disinvestment? It is a long-term disease and has nothing to do with the disinvestment.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Lack of protein is also responsible for this disease.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Shri Chandrakant Sawant, then Captain, whose name was mentioned the other day when you were in the Chair, was diabetic and was advised dialysis in May, 2002, before disinvestment.

It is such a big cause. Then, for us to build the entire argument and link it with all this... (*Interruptions*) I am just beginning. Please be patient.

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : मैंने अपने भाषण में भी बोला था कि मंत्री जी ने लिस्ट बताई थी। जब वीआरएस और विनिवेश का प्रोसिजर चल रहा था, उस समय उनको बहुत शॉक लगा। ... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : खैरे जी आप सुनिए। मंत्री जी तीसरा नाम क्या है ?

श्री अरुण शौरी : मैं अभी बताता हूँ।

श्री मोहन रावले : वहां वीआरएस जबर्दस्ती दिया गया है। उनका पी.एफ. जबर्दस्ती वेतन से काटा जाता है।

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : सभी चीजों का ख्याल रखना चाहिए।

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The unions, including the Shiv Sena Union , were writing to the Hotel Corporation. पहले तो इतना भी पता नहीं किया कि यह सारा होटल कार्पोरेशन आफ इंडिया ने, it is the subsidiary of Air India. Therefore, all the advertisements and other things were put up by the Air India. जो आप कहते हैं कि, one person went so far to say that the officers of my department have done this and others, but we did not even find out that the officers of our department did not have anything to do with the processing of the case. When everything had been done and the financial bids had to be called, we were called in. We do not find that out and make an allegation using the great privilege of this House.

Other than that, it is the Air India which did this. Supposing, in the case of VRS, the Hotel Unions were writing, 'introduce VRS before disinvestment'. Then they said, make sure that VRS clauses are there in the Share Purchase Agreement. We made sure of that. They then took VRS. Supposing, somebody says that... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : If Air India has done this, let the Civil Aviation Minister speak ... (*Interruptions*)

श्री अरुण शौरी : मैं हाथ जोड़कर कहता हूँ कि मुझे बोलने दिया जाए।

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : He was in the bidding process only. He is absolving himself of the scam. It is okay.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: No, I am not. It is the Government's responsibility. I will explain every single point.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : If the Minister says that Air India has done it, then let the Civil Aviation Minister respond.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, you go ahead with your argument.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Under our laws, as you know since you have worked with the labour, Members have worked with labour, we have very important people from Left also who have worked with the trade unions, if any such injustice is perpetrated on the workers, there are remedies in Labour Courts. Nobody has gone there. Shiv Sena had a powerful union in that place. Shiv Sena is a very powerful body in Mumbai. How is it that they have not taken it up on the ground and prevented this?

श्री मोहन रावले : प्रिवेंट किया है। 1 लाख 80 हजार रुपए का वीआरएस मिलने वाला है। उसने एचडीएफसी से तीन-चार लाख रुपए का लोन लिया है। इसलिए उसको सात-आठ लाख रुपया मिलना चाहिए। मेडिकल फ़ैसिलिटी छीनी जा रही है।

MR. SPEAKER: This is not Question Hour.

श्री अरूण शौरी : दिल्ली में विनिवेश नहीं हुआ सेंटॉर होटल का, वह भी प्राइम प्रोपर्टी है। मुम्बई में भी प्राइम प्रापर्टी थी, एयरपोर्ट की प्रापर्टी थी। अगर इतनी वेल्यूएबल प्रापर्टी थी, how is it that the average losses in the last eight years were Rs.3.24 crore per year?

Secondly, in Delhi, Centaur property has not been disinvested.

Therefore, there is nobody to force anybody. But out of 1,162 persons in Chef Air and Centaur Hotel, 676 have taken VRS. Tomorrow if somebody says they were forced to do it, you have to prove your charge also. I would now mention the sequence of events in Centaur Hotel, which is like this. In fact, in the first bid the Government is being accused of favouring some Batras. Actually, this Batra's bid was rejected. As has been rightly pointed out, there were 37 parties. Everybody was at par. Then somebody said Jet

Airways was rejected and Sahara was also rejected. Sahara never applied and Jet was allowed to continue. Of the 37 bidders, 28 survived; eventually four survived and only one bid came to us. Far from favouring that fellow, that bid was rejected. And then the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment, CCD, asked us that we go and re-examine the terms and come back to it and say whether the terms can be made more attractive. You remember that in Hindustan Zinc this had to be done. We rejected the bid and then we were asked to re-examine the whole process. Sir, you had been a member of the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment; so I do not have to mention these points. We then gave three options to the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment. They chose this particular option.

I do not want to speak everything because the hon. Speaker was himself a member of the CCD at that time. Therefore, I am not going to go into the details of the CCD proceedings. We gave three options and this business of reducing the list from six persons to two persons was then communicated to all the four qualified bidders even though they had not bid. That is the standard procedure that we have been following in each of these instances.

Very strong words were used that this was done surreptitiously. Actually, the fact that the bid had been rejected was announced; that the CCD was going to re-examine the matter was also announced. When the CCD came to a decision, we went back to all the bidders even though there was absolutely no need.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Can I seek a clarification on this?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Maybe, after I finish.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE): The Chair has permitted me. Usually, when some offer is given, all the tenderers are not given this opportunity. That is the point.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: There is a certain procedure in the CCD; it may not be up to your approval. But that is the procedure that has been adopted. We followed exactly the same procedure.

The second point is, very strong comments were made. I think you are completely justified in saying that there was a pause for three months. That arose because senior members felt that we should re-examine the policy. The result of that re-examination has been read out by me in the House. But now you make fun of it saying that this is no re-examination. I do not want to say anything about individual Ministers or anybody else. But the Ministers who had mentioned these points were present in the Prime Minister's meeting. The Prime Minister asked them a question, not once, but thrice, whether this was the unanimous view. Everybody said yes, unanimous. He then directed me to go and use that word. Then I went outside and that is how I reported it. Now, for a person from a Party supporting the NDA Government, whose leader was present in the meeting, to say this and to almost threaten that unless the policy is changed, Samata Party will break away, is an internal matter for them to sort out. It is not something that I need to go into.

I believe that actually many of the concerns that have been expressed are important matters and they have been in the forefront of our concern also: पासवान साहब ने एक बड़ी इलोक्वेंट बात कही। आपने कहा, ... (व्यवधान)

श्री राम विलास पासवान : लेबर के साथ एससीएसटी, ... (व्यवधान)

श्री मोहन रावले : सर, मैं आपके ऑर्डर करने के लिए रुका हूँ। इतने सारे वर्कर्स हैं। 91 प्रतिशत हैं। उनकी अभी बीस साल की सर्विस बाकी है।

लेकिन जबरदस्ती उनको बाहर निकाला जा रहा है। उनको एक लाख 80 हजार रुपये मिलने वाले हैं और तीन-चार लाख रुपए उनके ऊपर लोन है। वे लोग सड़क पर आ जायेंगे। उनको बाहर निकाला जा रहा है। आपने कहा है कि वर्कर्स के इन्टैरेस्ट को प्रोटेक्ट करेंगे। ... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: How much more time do you require, Mr. Minister?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I will take another 20 minutes, if you want me to continue. Otherwise, I would wind up.

MR. SPEAKER: You can take as much time as you want.

... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister's reply is not complete.

... (*Interruptions*)

श्री मोहन रावले : बत्रा को बेचने के बाद सहारा को बेचा गया और तीन करोड़ रुपए कमाए। क्या यह राशि सरकार नहीं कमा सकती थी? ... (व्यवधान)

श्री अरुण शौरी : आप मुझे बोलने दीजिए। बात को खत्म करने दीजिए। ... (व्यवधान)

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : बत्रा होस्पिटैलिटी कमा सकते हैं, तो सरकार के अधिकारी जो विनिवेश विभाग में हैं, उन्होंने सैल्फ प्रमोशन अच्छा क्यों नहीं किया - यही बाला साहिब ठाकरे जी का प्रश्न है। (व्यवधान)

श्री मोहन रावले : आप बाद में मुझे पूछने की इजाजत दीजिएगा।

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, we were having the fullest co-operation from leading trade unions. We will come with a surprise to you. The reason for this is, actually they have been watching us and I will read out something to you from a letter which is not fabricated, on which a CBI inquiry was ordered and was pursued by other Members. I will read to you a letter from the head of INTUC on these matters. But the reason why the workers have been working with us is that, in these very enterprises which have been privatised and disinvested, you will find that the wages have gone up. In BALCO, Shri Acharia said that this and that has happened to the workers. Actually, the wages of workers have gone up by 20 per cent and eight allowances which had been discontinued have been restored. In Paradip Phosphates, the wage revision which had not been done since 1997 has been done now and the wages have been increased by 30 per cent. The wages per employee, on an average, have now become Rs. 12,400 per month. In Modern Foods, the wages have gone up by Rs. 1800 per month.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : What has been the number of employees at that time and now, and how many have been forced to take VRS? ...

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I will come to that. It is very interesting. You will be surprised to know that in BALCO plant which is in Korba.....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Let the Minister complete his reply.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, they have been forced to take VRS..... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Such is the care of the officers for their workers in the Korba plant that 134 of them were taken not in Korba but in Delhi. That is the point.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: Why was Korba unit closed? ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Both of us can shout like this..... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): How many workers were forced to take VRS? You tell us on that point.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Acharia, you were all allowed to speak. Now the Minister is replying. You may like it or may not like it. But you cannot protest like this. There are other matters of protest for you. This is not the way to protest in the House.

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: In the case of the great care that the public sector is taking of the workers, it will come to you as a surprise that even the Provident Fund contributions of Rs. 1578 crore had not been deposited in the Provident Fund Account till we found out. And in the case of ITDC, all these hotels which you were so concerned about, the Provident Fund dues which have not been put in which is a criminal act was Rs. 367 crore. It is only because of us that these figures were found out and the amounts have been deposited.

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : महोदय, मैं एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ। ... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: If the Minister yields, only then you will be allowed to ask.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : How many thousand crores worth of NPAs are there and who are responsible for this? About Rs. 200 and odd crores are there by the private sector. Are we children sitting here? And you can say anything you like just because you are eulogising the private sector..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: In the case of HPCL and BPCL, the President of the Indian National Trade Union Congress (INTUC) wrote to us to kindly disinvest them by strategic sale. That is what he has exactly written in two letters to the Prime Ministers with copies to me.

It is because they have seen that production has doubled, expansion plans afoot, workers' wages etc. have gone up. The other point which was made, and made repeatedly was about profit-making units.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will not take long because the points which were made were really repetitive and the answers have also been given. I will take up only three points. The first is about profit making companies. The figures are startling. From 1991 to 2000, thirty-nine companies were disinvested. Thirty-seven of them were profit making companies. Only two out of thirty-nine were making losses. Now, in 2000-2002, thirty-four transactions have taken place. Twenty-six of them, that is, two-thirds of them were making losses. I just do not understand how these figures keep going. We still keep saying that we are selling profit making companies. There was another that is being done. In the case of State Governments, if you want I will give you the list of enterprises which are profit making. In Karnataka, it is Karnataka Soaps and Detergents, Karnataka Vidyut Karkhana, Karnataka State Construction Corporation, Karnataka State Electricals Development Corporation. In Madhya Pradesh, there are six companies. In Punjab there are two companies. I can just read them out. So, where is this great debate that is always taking place.

SHRI RUP CHAND PAL : How is the nation going to be benefited as a result of selling the profit making oil majors? Please convince this House.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: I will come to the oil sector also. Some important points were being made. You will yourself be surprised. A point was made about creating monopolies and so on. It is again a misconception. A point about IPCL was specifically mentioned, that it has been given to Reliance and that it is almost a monopoly in this vital sector and so on. Actually, probably, it will surprise everybody to know that all petro chemical items are on Open General Licence. The way to break anybody's misuse of the market dominance is by allowing imports. The Government has put them in OGL. In fact, to put the buyers under pressure, the duty was reduced from 35 per cent to 20 per cent. The Finance Minister had announced that it would be reduced further. You have yourself passed just the other day the Competition Bill in the Lok Sabha. In that you have yourself said, this House has said, that the test shall not be market dominance, but the abuse of market dominance for which you have provided an entire mechanism to check it. What is the problem in checking this monopoly? In IPCL, it is very interesting.

In BALCO, Shri Jogi is the strongest supporter of BALCO privatisation today because the Company is now implementing an expansion programme of Rs. 6,000 crore, which will provide jobs all over. In IPCL, they have announced an expansion programme of Rs. 1,000 crore. When I bring these facts to your attention, you say that I am an advocate of the private sector. In these cases, it is an important fact to realise, irrespective of disinvestment and so on, many of our companies, though they look large in the Indian context, are minuscule. NALCO is a minuscule scale and you will find it impossible to compete with giants abroad. You have to expand them. You have to raise the resources one way or the other for their expansion which is the purpose of this entire exercise.

In the case of oil, the matter has been thoroughly discussed. The fact is that, as you know, the successive Governments have opened up exploration. Foreign companies are there. Private companies are there. But no threat to security! They are mapping your sea bed. But no threat to your security! Refining has been opened up; and ports and terminals have been opened up. They get access and have permanent presence in our ports. But

no threat to security! But if somebody acquires petrol pumps, then that is going to be a threat to our security.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, he is ridiculing the Opposition. We are walking out in protest.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, we demand that CBI inquiry should be held into the Centaur Hotel scam. ... (*Interruptions*)

s

2129 hours

(At this stage, Shri Somnath Chatterjee and some other hon. Members left the House.)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : Sir, the hon. Minister speaks in terms of derogation. Can a Minister do like this?... (*Interruptions*)

श्री विजयेन्द्र पाल सिंह बदनोर : सही बात कड़वी लगती है।

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, questions will not be permitted. I am sorry.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I will not be able to permit questions. No more questions are allowed after the debate.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : We are not asking questions. मैंने दो पाइंट उठाए हैं।

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: The Parliament, in its wisdom, has just passed the Petroleum Regulatory Bill. The Petroleum Regulatory Bill has strict provisions for take over of the companies by the Government in national emergencies.... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष जी, आप कह रहे हैं कि जल्दी करो, दूसरी तरफ ये लोग इंटरप्ट कर रहे हैं।... (व्यवधान)

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मेरा कहना यह है कि जो एससी और एसटी का रिजर्वेशन का मामला है, उस विषय में हम कई बार माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी से भी मिल चुके हैं, उनके रिजर्वेशन का प्राइवेट सेक्टर में क्या होने वाला है। प्राइवेट सेक्टर में जो पैसा आ रहा है वह कहां जा रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रश्न क्या आप बाद में नहीं पूछ सकते हैं।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : पहले भी प्रश्न पूछ नहीं सकते हैं और बाद में प्रश्न आप पूछने नहीं दे रहे हैं। इस तरह से कैसे होगा?...(व्यवधान)

श्री अरुण शौरी : आप किसी और डिपार्टमेंट के बारे में ऐसा होता है, तो बतलाइये।

श्री मोहन रावले : मंत्री जी, कर्मचारियों से जबर्दस्ती वीआरएस लिया जा रहा है या नहीं, यह बताइये। ...(व्यवधान) आपने कहा कि वर्कर्स को सपोर्ट करेंगे...(व्यवधान) आपने कहा कि पेट भरा नहीं है।...(व्यवधान) बाकी के लोगों को मौका नहीं मिल रहा है।...(व्यवधान)

श्री प्रमोद महाजन : अब आप पूछ रहे हैं, क्या आपने पहले प्रश्न नहीं पूछा था।...(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मंत्री जी उत्तर दे रहे हैं, मैं बीच में किसी को बोलने की इजाजत नहीं दूंगा।

श्री चन्द्रकांत खैरे : मंत्री जी हमारे प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं दे रहे हैं।

श्री अरुण शौरी : आपने बिल प्लेस किया। That has provisions as far as this is concerned. Similarly, when crude is being imported by the Government, the security is not threatened. The security lies in not protecting the individual petrol pumps but in doing something about them which the Government is doing. One of the ways in which it is doing is by holding the road shows in the rest of the world to invite foreigners to come and do exploration, refining, to lay pipelines and terminals. When we do these things, these are not a threat to the security of the country. This kind of an item is always being brought up. It has been thoroughly discussed and reported to you. A unanimous decision was taken. I will take only two more points and then I will finish my speech.

One very important point that my dear colleagues raised was about the legality of the sale of the Centaur Hotel. The second point was about the legality of these companies and so on being sold by the Government. Shri

Somnath Chatterjee wanted to know about it कि इसमें आपकी क्या बात हुई है? In the agreement between the Hotel Corporation of India and the Batra Hospitalities, it had provided that neither this agreement nor any benefits or burdens under this agreement shall be assignable by either party without the prior written consent of either party. Similarly, in the lease agreement between the Airports Authority of India and the Batra Hospitalities, it was provided that if the lessee wants to part with the lease, he has to get the written permission of the Airports Authority of India. In these transactions, the Batra Hospitalities did not ask for or obtain the written consent of either the Hotel Corporation or of the Airports Authority. I have checked up that. So, we have referred the matter to the Law Ministry. If there is any illegality committed, naturally the Government will take remedial action.

Now I come to the final point and I will conclude with that. This is a point that can mislead many persons.

When a company has been nationalised under an Act of Parliament, can the Government disinvest or not? This is the point which Shri Somnath Chatterjee made at great length. When you nationalise a piece of land under an Act, what happens after that is not governed by that particular Act unless there was a restriction in the Act itself. For instance, in the case of coal nationalisation, a restriction was put in the Coal Nationalisation Act that no private party shall be allowed and this business shall be conducted only by the Government. In the case of bank nationalisation, the Act provided that the Government shall not lower its equity beyond 51 per cent. We have examined the law and this is the position. Therefore, these were then incorporated as companies and their meetings were held according to the provisions of the Companies Act, including the enlargement of shares and the disposition of shares.

This is the central point. Today, we are talking about HPCL and BPCL. He was quoting the Act pertaining to nationalisation. The fact is that today 49 per cent shares of HPCL had already been disinvested by the Congress Government. How did they part with those shares without amending the Act because what applies to 100 shares applies to one share also? In BPCL, 34 per cent of the shares had already been disinvested. In VSNL,

Shri Pramod Mahajan steered the whole process and 40 per cent shares had already been disinvested and 60 per cent remained with the Government. In IPCL also, 40 per cent had already been disinvested.

So, this was being done. But the best case is that of Maruti. Maruti, as you know, sir, was a private company and you handled it. It was nationalised in 1980, by an Act of Parliament and 100 per cent of its equity was with the Government. In 1982, 26 per cent of the shares of Maruti was given to Suzuki without amending the Act. In 1984, that 26 per cent was increased to 40 per cent, again without amending the Act. In 1992, when the Congress Party was in power, Dr. Manmohan Singh was the Finance Minister and Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao was the Prime Minister, 50 per cent of the shares were given to Suzuki, the Government shares were reduced to 49.7 per cent and it was made a private company, without amending the Act. There is a reason for that. That is why, I requested the Lok Sabha Secretariat to provide me with the Constitution.

Sir, article 298 is the important article here and I will conclude after quoting that. With Shri Somnath Chatterjee's eminence as a lawyer, these things can be taken seriously, more seriously than they should be taken. Article 298 of the Constitution says:

"The executive power of the Union and of each State shall extend to the carrying on of any trade or business and to the acquisition, holding and disposal of property and the making of contracts for any purpose:.... "

It is an executive function. That is why, these pseudo arguments are being given, but, in any case, since Dr. Manmohan Singh had raised this point in the other House, we had referred the matter to the Attorney General for his opinion.

Sir, once again, on the issue of Centaur Hotel, I gave two assurances. One was that I made diligent enquiries on the deaths that had been reported. As you know, it is like this. One was a case of cirrhosis of liver and the other

person was on dialysis. If there is anything wrong with that, I would be grateful for that information and I would correct it. The second assurance was that on the question of legality of the sale, I am awaiting ...

(Interruptions)

श्री मोहन रावले . आपने वीआरएस के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा है। ... (व्यवधान) इस मामले में जबर्दस्ती की

जा रही है और उनके सारे हक भी छीन लिए हैं।

श्री अरुण शौरी: आपकी यूनियन है। आप अभी इन मामलों को लेकर लेबर कोर्ट में जाइए।

श्री मोहन रावले : आप इसमें क्या कर सकते हैं? आपने कहा था कि मजदूरों को संरक्षण प्रदान करेंगे। उनका कहां संरक्षण हो रहा है?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, I will make a full enquiry about that. Thank you very much.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : Mr. Speaker, Sir, we sat here for so much time and a very important issue has been raised by the hon. Minister at the fag end of this debate. When I am sitting here and when that important issue has been raised, if I do not say anything contradicting it, a wrong impression will go. So, I seek your indulgence now. I will not take more than two minutes to make my point and I seek a reply from the hon. Minister.

If it is possible for him to reply now, he can do so. He can also reply afterwards. The point is that there is a difference between the executive powers and the legislative powers. The provisions to which a reference was made related to the executive powers. If anything has been done by using the executive power, the executive authority can undo it. But if anything has been done by using the legislative power, it is the legislature that can undo it. Let us understand this simple principle. The article to which a reference was made related to the executive power and not the legislative power. That is one thing.

If a company has been brought into existence under the Companies Act by the executive orders, they take the decision in the Cabinet. They create a

company and its shares can then be given by that company. The Air India, the Indian Airlines and others were brought under the Government's control by passing a law. That was the law that was passed for their nationalisation. What has been done by the Government of India by passing a law in this House cannot be undone by the executive without coming to this House.

The third point is that if you create a statutory institution by passing a law, even that cannot be given up by the Government. But these are the legal points. I am not saying that my word is final. But let it be clearly examined by you. We do not accept your proposition that the executive order can undo the legislative order. The executive is responsible to the legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: I think, you have made your point.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL : The executive is responsible. What is really happening here is that Members sitting here are opposing it. The Members sitting on your side are opposing it. Even some members of the BJP are also opposing it. Where is the majority? Where is the support?

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, it is a very important point. As he has rightly said, there is a different interpretation that they have. We had studied the law carefully and taken proper legal advice. But, in any case, the matter has been referred to the Attorney-General. I will be faithfully putting forward the views of the Attorney-General to the Cabinet Committee on Disinvestment whenever HPCL and BPCL cases come up before that Committee. The Cabinet Committee would certainly be apprised of the viewpoints that Shri Shivraj Patil has expressed. This is very important.

21.43 hrs

***The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock
on Thursday, December 19, 2002/Agrahayana 28, 1924 (Saka).***

