

Title: Combined discussion on the statutory resolution regarding Disapproval of Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001 and the Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Bill, 2001(Not concluded)

15.00 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, we will take up the Legislative Business. Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN (CHIRAYINKIL): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House disapproves of the Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001 (No. 5 of 2001) promulgated by the President on 5 July, 2001."

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (DR. DEBENDRA PRADHAN): Madam, on behalf of my colleague, Shri Ajit Singh, Minister of Agriculture, I beg to move:

"That the Live-Stock Importation Amendment Bill, 2001 be taken into consideration."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time allotted is one hour. Therefore, maybe we can pass it by four o'clock. Now, I call upon Shri Radhakrishnan to speak.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Madam, our Parliament is primarily a body entrusted with law-making process. All laws would originate in this House. But there are two exceptions. One of them is, whenever there is an emergent situation, article 123(2) provides an extraordinary power to the Executive not to use it always but only sparingly. An Ordinance can be issued to meet a particular emergent situation.

I would like to bring to the Speaker's notice also the casual way in which the present Government is dealing with the power of issuing Ordinances.

Now, I may point out that this Ordinance was issued on 5th July, 2001. We all knew that there would be Monsoon Session of the House. We met on 23rd July, 2001. That is, the Ordinance was issued about 15 days prior to the meeting of this House. If I put it more precisely, the Ordinance was issued at the time of the issuance of notice of summons to the Members for the Monsoon Session. The issuance of such a notice is very pertinent. Therefore, issuance of the Ordinance cannot be justified on any ground because the Government could have waited till the Monsoon Session which was a definite thing. More particularly when the issuance of summons by the President is done, why should there be an Ordinance on 5th July, 2001? Is it an emergent situation? We will have to take that also into consideration.

In the first place, we all know that in 1995, the Government of India removed all restrictions with regard to import of articles into this country as per the agreement entered into with the WTO. So, it is pending there for over six years. This contingency was there. Anybody could import here any food article, like milk and milk products. Then, other articles of food can be imported without any restriction. That restriction was there prior to the removal of restrictions. So, the Government is fully aware that the articles will be imported into India. Moreover, it is very certain that diseased and contaminated articles of food will be imported and new diseases will spread in India. That is a matter known to everybody. In that respect, I may point out that recently in the United Kingdom, there was spreading a disease called 'mad cows'.

The economy of the country was also adversely affected. Not only that, even European countries were affected by this new disease due to the unrestricted import of food materials from abroad.

So, this contingency was there for a long time, at least for four-five years. During this period, the Government would have brought in a Bill to the House without pursuing the extraordinary process of issuing ordinance. The Government was fully aware of it. But they did not utilise the opportunity. They did not care to bring the Bill to the House before issuing an ordinance because in the natural course of events, there was sufficient time for the Government to bring in the Bill to prevent such spread of new diseases in India. That they did not do. They slept over it for a long time. The disease that got spread in the UK is well known. It has been reported in many international newspapers. Even, they had introduced a provision that no cows would be imported in the UK. That is what we read in the newspapers at that time. The authorities in the government of India were also aware of the fact, but they did not bring in this legislation to prevent the spread of this disease.

With reference to this particular case, I may point out another thing. Today, the hon. Minister of External Affairs sought the permission of the House to withdraw a Bill. This is a glaring example of how casually this Government is taking the extraordinary powers of issuance of ordinances. In that case, I refer to the ordinance issued by the Government of India in respect of Indian Council of World Affairs Bill, 2000. That Bill was introduced in this House with a view to replacing ordinance No.3 of 2000.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That can be discussed separately, Shri Radhakrishnan.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (BANKURA): He is giving an example.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Then again, I would like to point out that re-issuance of an ordinance is strictly prohibited by the apex court. In the Wadhwa case, it was finally decided that the Executive has no power to reissue an ordinance on the same plea on which an ordinance has already been issued. What some of the clever Governments do is that they change the title, and change some sections to make it appear as a new ordinance. But here, in this case of Council of World Affairs Bill, the same thing was repeated thrice. First, ordinance No.3 of 2000, then No.1 of 2001 and then No.31 of 2001 were issued. All these have lapsed. Even after getting it passed by the Lok Sabha, the ordinance got lapsed as it could not be passed in Rajya Sabha. Now, they have come before this House for permission or for the assent of the House for the withdrawal of the Bill.

Why I pointed out all these things? This is how the present Government is dealing with the power of issuing ordinance. They are doing it in a casual way. The ordinance is a committed legislation. It is not an original legislation. Why do we prefer an original legislation in the House? Because the Members can express freely the merits and demerits of a particular section and that chance is given.

Now the Members of the Ruling Party are committed to replace the Ordinance because the Government has taken some steps under the provisions of the Ordinance. Now the Ruling Party Members will not get an opportunity to express their viewpoints freely in the matter of legislation. That is why, I used the word committed legislation, because the Members have committed themselves to follow the footsteps of the Executive.

That is the position. That is the danger inherent in an Ordinance. Why we prefer an original Bill in the House is because when an original Bill is introduced in the House, Members irrespective of party affiliation can take part in the discussion and they can express freely their views. That power is denied at least to the section of the Ruling Party. Thus, the law will be a committed legislation. That is why, I am against issuance of Ordinance. The Supreme Court also came to the conclusion that no Ordinance can be reissued. The Ordinance on the Indian Council of World Affairs was issued thrice against the decision of the Supreme Court in Wadhwa case. The Apex Court clearly said that re-issuance of an Ordinance on the same matter is illegal. In utter disregard to the decision of the Supreme Court, the present Government had issued the Ordinance on the Indian Council of World Affairs thrice. It got lapsed two times and now for the third time they have brought a Bill. The difficulty is that in the Rajya Sabha, the Government is in a minority and they could not replace the Ordinance there. So, that is the present position.

Why I emphasise all these points is to bring to your notice the casual way in which the Government is issuing these Ordinances. As a matter of fact, the founding fathers never expected such a situation. During Pandit Nehru's time, he was very particular that no Ordinance should be issued to the extent possible and only in exceptional cases Ordinances were issued. That was the order of that day. Now, issuing of Ordinances in utter disregard to the powers of the House is the order of the day. The Executive is usurping the powers of the Legislature and making the Legislature a rubber stamp, which could not be appreciated and which should not be allowed.

Of course, the Speaker is bound to conduct the business of the House, not to conduct illegal business. This is an illegal business. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA (MAVELIKARA): Madam, the hon. Member is casting an aspersion on the Chair. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am listening it very carefully.

Shri Radhakrishnan, you have made the point.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : This is an illegal business in the sense that the Supreme Court made it crystal clear that re-issuance of Ordinance is not permissible.

Another thing is that this is a self-made evil. We were all definite and we had all advised the Government that the WTO agreement should not be entered into without sufficient safeguards. Now, they have given a blank cheque to the World Trade Organisation. As a result of this, we are bound to import to India anything that is contaminated outside. It started in 1985. Who is at fault? The Government is at fault. They ought to have taken sufficient protection as a precautionary measure to see that contaminated foodstuffs are not imported. Such a protection was not provided. As per the provisions of the previous Act, nobody could import anything and that was amended. To make the course easier, all restrictions were done away with. Previously there were restrictions and those restrictions helped the prevention of diseases in India. New diseases are coming into India. The provision, which was there earlier, was taken away to suit the authorities of the World Trade Organisation. All the restrictions were removed and we have free trade and free import. So, mad cow disease and such other international diseases came

to India and now we are thinking of bringing in the old provision. Who is at fault? It is not the fault of the Legislature. It is the fault of the Executive. They ought to have taken precautions and care to see that diseases do not come to India. In all these matters, the Government has failed. Now, instead of all these things, they have resorted to this emergency provision of issuing an Ordinance at our expense.

This cannot be allowed. So, I strongly appeal to the Members of the House that my Resolution for the disapproval of the Ordinance may kindly be accepted and make it a lesson for the Executive not to bring in such Ordinances twice or thrice before this House. With these words, I conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan, you forgot the most important point that the live-stock can come. Only live-stock products cannot come. So, Mad Cows can still come.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN: Mad Cow can also come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only Mad Cow products cannot come.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Mad Cow can come but Mad Cow disease cannot come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is another question.

DR. DEBENDRA PRADHAN: Madam, the QRs on several animal products were removed only on 31st March, 2001. The reasons for promulgating the Ordinance have already been given in the statement under rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. Meat products in particular, on which the QRs were removed only recently, are liable to bring diseases like Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE), commonly known as Mad Cow and Foot and Mouth diseases. Some diseases which are not seen in India can come through the meat or meat products or milk or milk products. That is why, this promulgation of the Ordinance was required. We have to seek the permission of the House. So, I appeal before the House to consider the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motions moved:

"That this House disapproves of the Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001 (No.5 of 2001) promulgated by the President on 5 July, 2001.

That the Bill further to amend the Live-Stock Importation Act, 1898, be taken into consideration. "

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY (BERHAMPORE, WEST BENGAL): Madam Chairman, I rise to deliver my opinion on the Bill under the nomenclature of Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Bill , 2001, which has been introduced by Shri Ajit Singh, the hon. Minister.

The Bill is set to replace the Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Ordinance 2001. I am very much associated with the feeling of hon. Member, Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan. I do not find any substantial merit for invoking the promulgation of Ordinance by the President because the House was scheduled to be commenced on the 23rd July. It is being found that this Government is becoming prone to promulgation of Ordinance. However, I do not oppose the Bill in principle as the Bill is related to food safety and sanitary measures. In the Statement, it has been observed that an emergent need was felt to have a suitable mechanism for regulating imports and for monitoring food safety. So, as far as the health of animal and human being is concerned, we cannot compromise with the food safety and sanitary measures.

In the same vein, I must say that the Bill has failed to evince any holistic view considering the wide spectrum of our environment and health hazards.

This Bill has been introduced in a most amateurish way ignoring all possible ominous dimensions. We know that on the 1st April, 2001, the last vestige of quantitative restrictions has been removed. As per the commitment given by India to the world community, India had agreed to lift the ban by 2003. The world community including the European Union, Australia and Canada had supported our commitment. We do not know what extraneous reasons compelled this Government to lift the ban on the 1st April, 2001 in pursuance of a secret deal made between India and the USA on the 28th December, 1999.

It is widely believed that India was so desperate to mend the fences with U.S. Govt. in the wake of sanctions imposed by the USA After the Pokharan-II explosions, we know that the US Government had imposed sanctions on India. So, India decided to dance to the tune of the USA and all quantitative restrictions have been removed in an unusual hurry.

Everybody knows that since Independence, we have accomplished three revolutions. One is called the 'Green

Revolution'. We had become self-sufficient in the production of foodgrains. However, in recent years, the growth of agriculture has dropped to 0.9 per cent from the average of 3.9 per cent in the 1980s and 3.3 per cent in the 1990s. Our production of foodgrains has suffered a shortfall from 3.54 per cent to 1.8 per cent. A total of 65 per cent of our workforce is involved in the agriculture sector. It continues to contribute to the tune of 26.8 per cent of our GDP.

The second revolution that we accomplished is called the 'White Revolution'. It is related to milk production. We have become self-sufficient in the production of milk. At present, ours is the largest milk producing country in the world. ...(*Interruptions*) Third in Blue revolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have only 12 minutes, Comrade. You have to finish quickly.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY : This Bill particularly deals with the livestock sector, which affords employment to 18.4 million people of our country and contributes 28 per cent of our total agricultural output.

Therefore, you can easily conceive the dimension of this particular legislation. As far as SPS, that is Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary, is concerned, I think you just extract one component from SPS. Here, you are specifically dealing with sanitary measures, that is food safety measures. But this total piece of legislation smacks of frustration and shortcoming. Do you know that now in the European countries, a trade war is being waged against the U.S. because of genetic engineering food? It is not only the European countries but also the American people are demanding a label for the genetic engineering-originated, transgenic food and DNA-recombinant food which will be available in India if this Bill is passed.

I do not know whether this food will have any detrimental effect on health or not. But I would like to ask from this Government whether any safety measures have been taken by you as far as the genetically modified food is concerned. You are well aware that there is a bug namely e-coli-0157 and the animals can carry that bug without suffering ill-health. The clinical signs of e-coli-0157 are not usually identified in the animals which are ill. If the e-coli-0157 bug could come through the meat contamination, what will be your safeguard? Will you have adequate infrastructure to protect from the lethal dose of food additives, preservatives, chemicals and pesticides? How will you deal with such unforeseen dangers? Do you have the infrastructure to protect the people? You yourself are dismantling the existing laws which may prevent this adulteration.

Therefore, you should further look into the SPS issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Chowdhary, please cooperate. We have to complete this Bill by 4 o'clock.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY: Yes, Madam. I have one last point. I will just refer to a few lines from the journal called "New Issues". I quote:

"However, even though the SPS Agreement lays considerable emphasis on countries using international standards in their SPS regulations, curiously enough, the SPS Agreement does not define in precise terms when a standard should be considered as an international standard. The criteria adopted for determining an international standard is rather general and broad-based. All standards, guidelines and recommendations developed by an international standardising body or system are required to be treated as an international standard and a standardising body has been simply defined to be international if its membership is open to at least all Members of WTO. It is, therefore, clear that in the absence of a precise definition of an international standard, a standard adopted by the standardising bodies is deemed to be an international standard even if only a limited number of countries may have participated in the technical work on developing the standard, and even if it may have been adopted, not by consensus, but by a slender majority vote.

It needs no emphasis that 89% of the countries of the world fall in the category of developing / least developed countries. In spite of this, various committees or expert groups, based on a majority decision of the countries attending the meetings of these bodies, adopt international standards. In the absence of most developing countries, these meetings are naturally steered by developed countries and very often and safety limits which are decided by these bodies are those which are felt to be appropriate by the developed countries, without necessarily taking into consideration the conditions prevailing in the developing countries. Consequently, the developing and least developed countries find it difficult to comply with sanitary measures that are based on such standards, particularly since the safety limits in many cases are prescribed without conducting any clinical study in the developing countries with regard to contaminants, pesticides, animal disease etc."

These are to be specially clarified. With these words I conclude.

SHRI ANADI SAHU : Madam Chairperson, I rise to support the Bill. The imperative need of the day has been to regulate, to monitor and to prevent import of live-stock, which are not conducive to the health, morale and other

factors of Indian society. Madam, I call it an imperative need because from 1993 to 2001, from the General Agreement on Trade and Tariff, GATT to the WTO Agreement and removal of the quantitative restrictions on 1429 items relating to imports, it has become absolutely necessary to have certain preventive measures, particularly relating to live-stock.

Madam Chairperson, you had just mentioned about import of mad cows. May I, with your permission, refer to the Act which was passed in the year 1898 which prevented import of contagious and infectious animals? But it has not prevented import of any raw materials, processed food or any other matter relating to live-stock. That is why, this amendment has been proposed today.

As I said, it was an imperative necessity to issue an ordinance also. I think, the apprehension of hon. Member Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan could be belied in the sense that when there is an urgency, there is necessity of an ordinance, and when we are thinking of the well-being of the society at large, an ordinance is absolutely necessary. And the ordinance is followed by the Bill which has been brought in.

Now, I dwell upon the imperative necessities which are required to have certain prohibitory measures. Madam Chairperson, you are quite aware that the quantitative restrictions also have certain safeguards for us and the GATT Agreement also. I invite attention to article 20 of GATT Agreement wherein four measures have been mentioned. In the Agreement on Agriculture, which is called AOA, there are four basic matters which need to be deliberated upon here itself. They are domestic support, market access, export subsidies, agreement on sanitary and phyto-sanitary issues. Some people were talking about subsidies earlier also. Export subsidies, which are WTO compatible, can be given so as to see that when we are sending articles outside, we can give subsidies. But when we are bringing in articles from outside, there are many factors which have to be taken into account as per article 20 of the GATT. Article 20 says that the Agreement shall not be construed to prevent the adoption of certain measures. This includes public health.

I would give the example of chicken. There have been some apprehensions that chicken could come to India at a very cheap price. It is known that in the USA and other countries, which produce chicken, people do not like leg-pieces; they like breast-pieces or neck-pieces. In the USA, breast-pieces and neck-pieces of chicken are available in the range of three dollars to three and a half dollars whereas the leg-pieces are available for 45 cents a kg, and that would be equivalent to about Rs. 22 in India.

So far as the price is concerned, even if the leg pieces come to India, it will not create any problem for us. On the other hand, if the neck pieces and breast pieces are sent outside, it can fetch good foreign exchange. That is why, in the Agreement itself, so many factors have been indicated to see that on the WTO Agreement we are not disadvantaged *vis-à-vis* developed countries and for that matter these sanitary measures have been incorporated in the Livestock Importation (Amendment) Bill, 2001.

Certain things have to be taken into account when the Bill is passed. The Government has to take into account the fact that the animal products have to be of such type that it would not affect human or animal health. As Shri Chowdhary had slightly indicated, animal health is also quite important. If we import some finished product in which certain antibiotics are there or certain things on which the animals have been fed -- for example, the elephant grass which is grown in the USA using insecticides and pesticides, which is eaten either by a cow or any other animal, and if it is brought to India -- it would come under the purview of this Act. I am giving one or two instances wherein a number of restrictions could be imposed to ensure that we in India are not disadvantaged because of import of certain finished products or raw products or certain articles which are related to animal products.

That is why, it has been thought that this legislation should be brought forward in an Ordinance form and later on the Bill should be passed by the Parliament itself in order to regulate, restrict and prohibit these things. These are the three things which are most important -- to regulate, restrict and prohibit. Prohibition is most important. Whenever we find that certain articles which are coming into India are not to our liking, there is a certain provision in the Agreement. If it is not to our liking, it can be prevented from being brought into India. Section 3 (a), which is being amended now, is very important for us because that is the Section which will give us more powers to prevent any sort of import of any article and to ensure that we get the best of food articles. We can prevent the entry of articles which are disease-borne. Mad cow disease, foot-and-mouth disease and all other things can be covered within this Act itself.

I think the time constraint is there. I am reminded of a novel which I had read long back '*The Hawaii*' where it was said that Leprosy went to Hawaii because the white people went to that area. The Hawaiians were not having leprosy. Similarly, if we import certain articles from the white people, it is most likely that we may get diseases and to prevent the import of those articles from the European Community or from the USA, there is a necessity of keeping these provisions to prevent such occurrence that took place in Hawaii. That is why, many such measures have been indicated, but the most important will be, after the Bill has been passed, a regulatory mechanism has to be set up, laboratories have to be set up and comprehensive rules have to be framed to ensure that there is no

loophole in our system itself, and we should be able to see that diseased articles of animal origin do not come to India. That is why, this is a very good piece of legislation and I support it.

श्री महबूब ज़हेदी (कटवा) : मैडम चैयरपर्सन, यह विधेयक और अमेंडमेंट तो बहुत अच्छा है लेकिन इसका इम्प्लीमेंटेशन कैसे होगा, असली बात तो यह है। आपको मालूम है कि जितने अंतर्राष्ट्रीय वायरस हैं वे बाहरी वायरस हैं और भीतरी वाले वायरस जो आये हैं वे 9 हैं और भी दो-चार चले आ रहे हैं। मेरा डर है कि अगर इस विधेयक का इम्प्लीमेंटेशन नहीं हुआ तो यह तो एक कोरा कागज ही बनकर रह जाएगा। वेटेरिनरी विशेज कहां हैं? 32 हजार से 34 हजार वेटेरिनरीज जो हैं उनका वायरस पकड़ने के लिए कोई बंदोबस्त नहीं है। बहुत लम्बा बार्डर है। चारों नेशनल एयरपोर्ट्स पर चैक करने के लिए यंत्र लगे हुए हैं लेकिन बाकी के पोर्ट्स पर नहीं हैं लेकिन जिन पोर्ट्स में हैं भी वहां भी उनको सहयोग देने के लिए प्रयोगशालाएं नहीं हैं। एग्रीकल्चर कमीशन ने कहा था कि 1900-2000 स्पेशल वेटेरिनरीज रहने चाहिए जो इनका इस्तेमाल ठीक से कर सकें। लेकिन हालत यह है कि आज 600 से 800 लोग रिटायर होते जा रहे हैं। अगर यही करना है तो **We have to wait for 30 more years.** देखिये क्या हालत है अभी की, जो मैड-काऊ बोले हैं वह बहुत खतरनाक है। **I wrote a letter to the Minister in Great Britain asking about the disease of mad cow.** माइकल जैक हमें बी.ए.सीज और इन्फ्लाइंग लिटिस के बारे में लिखे थे यह वही है। यह इतना खतरनाक चीज है। इससे एक ही समय में जानवर और आदमी दोनों मर जाएंगे। अभी तक ग्रेट-ब्रिटेन, जर्मन और फ्रांस का हाल यह हुआ है कि वहां पर 50 लाख जानवरों को गोली मारकर जला दिया गया है। मैड-काऊ के बारे में कहते हैं कि अगर इसके विषाणुओं को मिट्टी में दबा दिया जाए तो मिट्टी भी विषाक्त हो जाएगी और उसके कीटाणु आदमियों में चले जाएंगे। डब्ल्यूटीओ के दबाव में हमें यह ले आना पड़ा है लेकिन हमें इस बारे में क्या-क्या करना है यह भी हमें समझ में आना चाहिए। मेरे दादा रघुवंश प्रसाद जी यहां बैठे हैं **he was a Minister for Animal Husbandry.** बात यह है कि **Consequently for four years, the Standing Committee on Agriculture**

में हम सब इस पर एक स्वर में इकट्ठा बोलते रहे हैं कि आप यह काम करो।

हम बार-बार सरकार से कहते हैं कि मैन पावर बढ़ाई जाए और मैटिरियल को समय-समय पर चैक किया जाए जिससे देश की स्थिति में सुधार आए। **Viable research and development work can be done by establishing an all india institute exclusively devoted to veterinary research and education under a separate Ministry with cabinet rank, Ministry of Animal Husbandry.** ताज्जुब है कि पांच मिनिस्टर चले गए और सभी ने कहा कि हम इस काम को करेंगे। पहले वाले आए तो उन्होंने कहा कि हम करेंगे लेकिन दुख की बात है कि किसी ने इस काम को नहीं किया। **Rs.550 crore is coming from animal husbandry.** यह आय का स्रोत भी है।

यदि आपने इस तरफ ध्यान दिया तो गवर्नमेंट एक्सचेंजर में बहुत पैसा आएगा। हमने बार-बार इस बात को कहा कि आईसीवीआर को बेहतर बनाओ और उसे आईसीएआर के अन्दर मत रखो। हमने कहा कि प्रदेशों में वेटेरिनरी कालेज और लैबोरेट्री खोली जाएं लेकिन दुख की बात है कि आपने कुछ काम नहीं किया। मुझे इस बात का डर है कि आपका यह कानून केवल कोरा कागज बन कर न रह जाए। जगह-जगह चैक पोस्ट बनाए जाएं। हम जानते हैं आपकी क्या कमजोरियां हैं और आपके ऊपर कौन से दबाव हैं? आपके ऊपर डब्ल्यूटीओ का दबाव है। आप आईसीवीआर की अलग से मिनिस्ट्री बनाएं। हर राज्य में यह मिनिस्ट्री अलग से है। **Fisheries is looked after by one Ministry, animal husbandry is looked after by one Ministry, and agriculture is looked after by one Ministry.** ताज्जुब की बात है कि सेंटर में एक ही मिनिस्ट्री इन सब कामों को देखती है। एनिमल हसबैंडरी से आपको बहुत आय हो सकती है। यह रबड़ के समान है। आप उसे जितना खींचेंगे, उतनी आय बढ़ती जाएगी। सरकार खुले दिमाग से इस बात को सोचे। यहां अजित सिंह जी नहीं बैठे हैं। एजेंडा पेपर में इस बिल को मूव करने के लिए उनका नाम था लेकिन वह यहां नहीं आए। वह यहां रहते तो अच्छा था। इज्राइल जैसे देश ने एनिमल हसबैंडरी के क्षेत्र में बहुत अच्छा काम किया।

अमेरिका में मुर्गी की टांग नहीं खाई जाती हैं। वहां कोई भी मुर्गी की टांगें नहीं खाता है, लेकिन हमारे यहां खाते हैं। वहां मुर्गी की टांग कुत्ते को खिलाई जाती है। **Quantity restriction** जब उठा लिया गया तो वहां का सामान यहाँ आना शुरू हो गया।

जब बार्डर खुलते हैं, तो वहां का सामान यहां आता है

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, please conclude. I am calling the next speaker.

SHRI MAHBOOB ZAHEDI: Madam, through you, I want to request the Government that they should think of having an ICVR where universities, colleges will be there.

With these few words, I conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Prof. Ummareddy Venkateswarlu.

Before you start, let me tell you that the time allotted for your party is very limited. It is just three minutes. But I will give you five minutes. Kindly confine your speech to five minutes.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI A.C. JOS (TRICHUR): Madam, he is from the largest supporting party to the Government....(Interruptions)

PROF. UMMAREDDY VENKATESWARLU (TENALI): Madam, I will take the time in proportion to the time taken by my predecessor as against his allotted quota.

Madam Chairperson, the present Bill -- Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Bill, 2001 -- which is in replacement of the Ordinance promulgated on the 5th July, 2001 to regulate the importation of live-stock and its products, is a timely Bill. I support this Bill on behalf of my party.

Madam, to me, it appears that even bringing of this piece of legislation is a delayed one simply for the reason that the quantitative restrictions were lifted as a part of the Agreement by WTO on 31st March, 2001. There was a long gap

between 1st April, 2001 and 5th July, 2001. There was no regulatory mechanism during this particular period.

Earlier to that, till 31st March, 2001, there was a Bill regulating the total importation of live-stock and also its products under the Live-Stock Regulatory Bill, 1898. That Bill was there for almost 103 years. The total regulatory mechanism was functioning. It was well-known that the quantitative restrictions were going to be lifted by 31st March, 2001. So, this could have been conceived in advance and the Government could have brought forward this particular Bill to make it effective right from 1st April, 2001 so that it could have the continuity of the regulation.

Now, there has been a break-down during this period. We do not know the reason. The hon. Minister has to apprise this House as to how many animals or animal products have been imported without any regulation during this particular period, from 1st April, 2001 till the time of promulgation of the Ordinance. I do not know how this particular aspect has been neglected. It could have been well conceived earlier. That is the reason why I said that it is a delayed attempt. This gap could have been avoided.

However, we must congratulate the hon. Minister for having got the Ordinance promulgated. Now, that Ordinance is being replaced by the Bill.

It is a fact that all the animal products are highly perishable commodities.

It is also a fact – historical events are there – that several products were rejected at the Ports, when they are not up to the sanitary and phyto-sanitary measures. They were not allowed. Here, names of certain diseases have been mentioned. One of our colleagues has mentioned about foot and mouth disease. It has more or less devastated several areas. Now, we have a new virus, Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE), which is causing mad cow disease. It is a dangerous disease. We do not know whether during that period of gap, those products had been imported along with other products.

So, importation is one area, which is to be well taken care of. At least, this particular regulatory mechanism which is going to be brought in, through this legislation, will certainly take care of such issues.

Germplasm and genetic material such as semen, ova, embryos, etc. are highly vulnerable issues. It is not merely animals or some of the animal products that will be eaten, but some products are going to be utilised for improvement of animals, through germplasm and genetic materials. This is one of the areas where a lot of care is to be taken. Even earlier, we have allowed for exportation of some of the products. Even Brazil has exported Ongole cows and in Brazil, Ongole cow has got multiplied like anything and now Brazil has got more or less 15 million such cows, whereas in India it is almost extinct. Similarly, even when we import embryos from other countries for upgradation of our own stuff, we have to take care of several aspects, particularly sanitary and phyto-sanitary measures. This will not only speak of the health and progeny, but also on the health of human beings.

As such, the Bill that is now being brought forward by the hon. Minister is a welcome Bill. I congratulate him for that and I support this Bill. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Very good. Thank you very much.

I just want to announce that the hon. Speaker has asked that we take 15 more minutes and complete this Bill, before we go on to the next item. So, I am just trying to finish this. We have two or three speakers on this. Please take not more than three minutes.

एक माननीय सदस्य : सभापति महोदय, चार बजे दूसरा विय लिया जाना है।

सभापति महोदय : यह 10-15 मिनट में पूरा हो जाएगा। स्पीकर साहब ने इसे खत्म करने के लिए कहा है।

SHRI P. KUMARASAMY (PALANI): Thank you, Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to present my views on the Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Bill.

First of all, I wish to record my disapproval of the Government's attitude of promulgating Ordinances. This Bill seeks to replace the Ordinance that was promulgated on the 5th July 2001, barely 19 days before the beginning of this Monsoon Session.

This Bill seeks to empower the Union Government to regulate, restrict or prohibit the import of animal products into our country. We have to see why this situation arose. It is because from the 1st of April 2001, the Government dropped import curbs on 715 items. Animal products are also among this list. It is strange that the Government thought it fit to bring in this legislation only in July this year. The Government had made a commitment before the WTO to remove import curbs on or before 1st of April 2001. Therefore, it should have studied the pros and cons of dropping of import curbs, well in advance. Accordingly, necessary legislation should have been thought of in

advance.

This amendment aims at regulating the import of animal products such as meat and milk products, since there is a fear that diseases could be brought into India through import of these items. In countries like U.K., already there are diseases such as mad cow disease, unknown in India. Such diseases could spread here also. It is also possible that cheap quality animal products are dumped here, endangering the health of the people.

So, it is necessary to have a strict vigil at all the import points.

In India, we already have phyto-sanitary check in respect of certain items exported from India. Huge quantities of agricultural products are rejected by phyto-sanitary department causing huge loss to farmers. There are reports of arrival of terminator seeds in India. We should have a proper monitoring agency to prevent bad stuff and diseases from entering the country.

There are lakhs of people in the country engaged in the traditional animal product industries. For example, there are nearly 20 lakh poultry farmers and about 1 crore people depend on poultry for their livelihood. Many of them have already lost their job due to free import of chicken and meat. Rest of the people in this industry are also under constant threat. So, I request the hon. Minister to make use of this amendment and minimise the import of animal products and save the domestic industry and workers.

There are a lot of dairy farmers and poultry farms in Tamil Nadu, particularly in Namakkal, Dindigul, Periyar, Salem, Coimbatore and Tehni Districts. These farms provide employment at the village level, preventing migration of rural labour to the already over crowded cities. The Government of Tamil Nadu under the able leadership of my leader, Dr. Puratchi Thalaivi is doing its best to protect and develop dairy and poultry farms through cooperation and by providing the necessary assistance and expertise. I take this opportunity to invite the attention of the hon. Agriculture Minister to a demand made by Tamil Nadu Government.

A proposal has been sent by Tamil Nadu for sanction of the centrally sponsored scheme of National Project for Cattle and Buffalo Breeding at a cost of Rs.100.20 crore. I would request the hon. Minister to kindly sanction the above amount without delay. The hon. Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has already taken the initiative to implement a plan based on recommendations of experts for improving the population mix of our milk cattle. A special plan is being prepared for encouraging farmers to run hybrid sheep farms, aquaculture farms and poultry farms as additional avocations for generating supplementary income. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister to sanction the above-mentioned project, submitted by the Government of Tamil Nadu, immediately.

सभापति महोदय : श्री अरुण कुमार, आपकी पार्टी का टाइम बहुत कम होगा।

श्री रघुनाथ झा (गोपालगंज) : पूरी पार्टियां साथ में हैं, सब का टाइम है।

सभापति महोदय : मैं बोल रही हूँ कि जरा जल्दी खत्म करिये।

श्री अरुण कुमार (जहानाबाद) : माननीय सभापति महोदय, यह विषय बड़ा ही गम्भीर है और खासकर इस देश के परिप्रेक्ष्य में, क्योंकि भारत कृषि प्रधान देश है और यहां की 80 प्रतिशत आबादी गांवों में रहती है, खेती पर निर्भर है। आर्थिक दृष्टिकोण से भी और सामाजिक दृष्टिकोण से भी पशुधन इसका सबसे महत्वपूर्ण अंग है, इसलिए सरकार यह जो बिल लाई है, यह ठीक ही है, लेकिन यह विलम्ब से लाया गया है। आज जिस तरह से विदेशों से अर्थ को केन्द्र में रखकर हाईब्रीड नस्ल की चीजें आ रही हैं, उसकी वजह से कितनी ही तरह के वायरस जन्म ले रहे हैं। निश्चित तौर से इसके नियंत्रण से हमारे गांवों की जो अपनी नस्ल है, इससे संरक्षित होगी। मूल विषय यह है कि हमारे यहां की जो पशुधन की जातियां हैं, इनमें वायरस से फाइट करने की ज्यादा क्षमता है।

हम कहना चाहेंगे कि जो हमारी नस्लें हैं, उनके संरक्षण का प्रबंध करना चाहिए। विदेशों में पशुओं में कई तरह की बीमारियां फैल रही हैं। यह तो एक पक्ष है, दूसरा पक्ष यह है कि मनुष्य के स्वाभाविक जीवन में एक पूरक के रूप में पशुधन है। हमारे वातावरण के हिसाब से, प्रकृति के हिसाब से और हमारे भूगोल के हिसाब से उसमें वायरस से लड़ने की क्षमता है। यही नहीं, वह आयातित वायरस को भी रोकने में सक्षम है। इसलिए साइंटिफिक विश्लेषण भी कई पाइंट्स पर इनका किया जाना चाहिए और इस बारे में शोध की जानी चाहिए। एक बात का ख्याल रखना चाहिए कि इन पाइंट्स पर यदि वैज्ञानिक विश्लेषण नहीं होगा तो इसका दुपरिणाम हो सकता है। हमारा जो ट्रेडिशनल पशुधन है, आयातित हाईब्रीड्स की वजह से बर्बाद हो रहा है, जबकि उनमें भी रोगों से लड़ने की क्षमता है, जो कि अन्य में नहीं है। इसलिए इनके संरक्षण का पूरा प्रबंध होना चाहिए। इसके साथ ही मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करते हुए अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI ADHI SANKAR (CUDDALORE): Madam, Chairperson, on behalf of DMK Party, I support the Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Bill, 2001 introduced by the hon. Minister.

Madam, there is a need to take immediate action to protect the health of human and animal population of the country. Therefore, there is a very urgent need to pass this Bill unanimously.

Here I want to say that the Central Government must take immediate action to regulate, restrict, and prohibit the import of animal products into India. Then only we would be safeguarded from various diseases.

I would like to say that the Government must take action to protect human and animal health through adoption of food safety by way of regulatory measures based on import risk analysis.

Madam, after the removal of import restrictions, the Central Government should take extra care. This year, a number of animal products are introduced. Many scientists believe that maximum diseases are spread by animals eating infected tissue from other animals in the form of meat and bone meat or other products. The human form of the disease is believed to be contacted by eating contaminated beef.

Madam, here I would like to congratulate our Minister of Commerce, Thiru Murasoli Maran, as he announced that all the agricultural product imports would have to comply with sanitary and phytosanitary norms and would require clearance from the Ministry of Agriculture.

I would like to say that the importers should obtain permit from the Department of Animal Husbandry. Then only, contaminated products can be restricted for import. It is a welcome step taken by our Ministries of Commerce and Agriculture.

Sir, most of the farmers are suffering and their livelihood is at risk. A number of people in Southern States like Tamil Nadu, depend on poultry for livelihood. The farmers are already under the clutches of traders, since the farmers own very small units. If cheap imported chicken is allowed, the burden on these farmers will increase. If cheap imported chicken is introduced, definitely our domestic industry will be destroyed. The poultry industry gives more employment at the village level. As India is having large population, we cannot mechanise everything and cut off their source of income. We must safeguard this employment generating industry and provide them basic food security. This point must be taken into account. Already, there is not enough demand. Vast quantity of imported chicken would be entering the market but the traders are not having cold storage facilities.

The earning of the farmers are very low. In Tamil Nadu, it is difficult to establish a market for chicken and chicken meat is sold for as low as Rs.30 per kilogram. And, mostly, it is consumed by the middle class people.

Here, I would like to say that the previous Government of Tamil Nadu headed by our eminent leader Dr. Karunanidhi announced, introduced and implemented a scheme for animal health care known as "Kalnadai Padukappu Thittam" by which nearly ten lakh domestic animals have been safeguarded.

Sir, to protect the human and animal population of our country and to safeguard them from various diseases caused due to contaminated animal meat, I strongly support this Bill.

With these words, I conclude my speech.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : सभापति जी, मुझे घोर आपत्ति है। अध्यक्ष महोदय ने कहा था कि पार्टीवाइज बहस होगी। आप बताइए कि हर पार्टी को किस आधार पर मौका नहीं मिलेगा जब हम मुस्तैद हैं? (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : आप मेरी बात सुनिए। आपकी प्राटी का टाइम जो मेरे सामने रखा है, उसमें एक मिनट है। लेकिन मैं आपको तीन मिनट देती हूँ। आप अपनी बात जल्दी से कहिए क्योंकि स्पीकर साहब ने 4 बजकर 15 मिनट पर इसे खत्म करने के लिए कहा है।

(व्यवधान)

श्री खारबेल स्वाई (बालासोर) : जो चिल्लाएगा, क्या आप उसी को टाइम देंगी? हर विाय पर ये जबर्दस्ती बोलते हैं। (व्यवधान)

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : सन् 2000 में 714 और सन् 2001 में 715 और कुल 1429 सामान के डब्ल्यू.टी.ओ. में आने पर प्रतिबंध खत्म हुआ है। (व्यवधान) उससे इस देश का मुर्गी पालन किसान, दूध पालन किसान चिंतित हैं। (व्यवधान) अब बाहर से दूध, दही, अंडा सब बाहर से आएगा। इससे यहां का मुर्गी पालन किसान और दूध पालन किसान आतंकित हैं। मैं चुनौती देता हूँ कि यह सरकार जो इस तरह का कानून बना रही है, इससे देश के किसानों की रक्षा नहीं होने वाली है। (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : यह बंद करने के लिए है।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : किसानों के साथ जो अन्याय हुआ है और आप कहते हैं कि गेट खोल दिया है। (व्यवधान) बाहर से सामान आने का गेट खोल दिया है। (व्यवधान) यह हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों के साथ अन्याय है और इससे किसानों का हित नहीं होने वाला है। (व्यवधान) इन्होंने कहा कि हम इम्पोर्ट ड्यूटी बढ़ाकर उसे कम करेंगे। लेकिन यह कम नहीं कर सकते हैं। (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : इम्पोर्ट ड्यूटी की बात ही नहीं है।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : क्या वे लोग बाहर से मुफ्त में दूध का पाउडर भेजेंगे? (व्यवधान)

हिन्दुस्तान में बाहर से कृषि उत्पादित और पशु धन से उत्पादित सामान आएगा, (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : मंत्री जी उत्तर देंगे। आप बैठिए। रघुवंश जी, आप चेयर को एड्रैस करके बोलिए।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : इससे देश के मुर्गी पालन किसान और दूध उत्पादक किसान त्राहि-त्राहि कर रहे हैं। (व्यवधान) इन्होंने कहा है कि बीमारियों को रोकेंगे और सामान को आने देंगे। जहेदी साहब ने कहा, (व्यवधान) बाहर से यहां सामान आएगा और यहां का पशु धन और पशु पालक किसान का गला घुटेगा?

सारे हिन्दुस्तान के किसान (व्यवधान)

श्री राधा मोहन सिंह (मोतिहारी) : 27 तारीख को सुप्रीम कोर्ट में चारा घोटाले पर बहस होने वाली है। (व्यवधान)

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : (Interruptions) *â€

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions) *â€

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing is going on record.

(Interruptions) *â€

सभापति महोदय : कुछ भी रिकार्ड में नहीं जा रहा है।

*Not recorded.

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन (फिरोजाबाद) : सभापति महोदय, हम पशुधन आयात संशोधन विधेयक, 2001 पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं। श्री वरकला राधाकृष्णन और दूसरे साथियों ने जो जिक्र किया, यह बिलकुल सही है कि गलत परम्परा लगातार कायम हो रही है। 5 जुलाई, 2001 को अध्यादेश जारी हुआ, जबकि सरकार को यह जानकारी थी कि 23 जुलाई को लोक सभा का सत्र शुरू होने वाला है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि ऐसी क्या परिस्थितियां थी, जिनमें यह अध्यादेश जारी किया गया। यह काम कोई नया काम नहीं हुआ है, लगातार यह काम सरकार कर रही है। यह दुरुस्त है कि हमारे देश में आयात हो रहा है, खास तौर से मांस, दूध इत्यादि, जिन चीजों का संबंध किसानों से है। किसान का काम चौपट हो गया है और उसकी रोजमर्रा की जिन्दगी पर असर पड़ रहा है। मैं कहना चाहूंगा, सरकार ने चार महीने पहले आयात पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाया था, बगैर इसकी चिन्ता किए कि आयात का परिणाम क्या होगा। हम तत्काल आयात पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाने की बात कह रहे हैं। नब्बे के दशक में सरकार की नीति मुक्त व्यापार कि थी और आयात पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाने की बात हो रही थी। सरकार की नीति और प्रतिबन्ध, दोनों, में विरोधाभास है। इसलिए सरकार को इस मामले में जरूर विचार करना चाहिए। मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि नियन्त्रण की आड़ में भ्रष्टाचार को प्रोत्साहन तो नहीं मिल रहा है। सबसे महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है, ऐसा कौन सा तन्त्र है, कौन सी प्रशासनिक व्यवस्था है, जिसके चलते चीजों पर नियन्त्रण लगायेंगे। यह नियन्त्रण कहां लगेगा, कब लगेगा, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि नियन्त्रण के साथ दंड की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। ऐसे उत्पादन जिनका आयात हो रहा है और जिनसे बीमारी फैल सकती है, हिन्दुस्तान के लोग मर सकते हैं, सरकार उस पर जब तक दंडात्मक व्यवस्था नहीं करेगी, तब तक उसका कोई अर्थ नहीं है।

सभापति जी, मैं एक निवेदन और करना चाहूंगा कि हिंदुस्तान में जो चीजें उपलब्ध हैं उनका आयात हमारे देश में हो रहा है, अगर उनके दाम हम कम करने की कोशिश करें, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि अच्छे परिणाम निकल सकते हैं। हमारे यहां जिसके यहां गाय या भैंस है उसके यहां तो दूध के दाम 6 से 8 रुपये लीटर तक हैं लेकिन उपभोक्ता को वही दूध 20 रुपये लीटर मिलता है। इसका मतलब यह है कि जो बिचौलिये हैं वह लाभ कमा रहे हैं और आम उपभोक्ता परेशानी झेल रहा है।

हमारे देश में पहले से जो चीजें उपलब्ध हैं अगर हम उनको प्रोत्साहित करने का काम करेंगे तो इसके कुछ अच्छे परिणाम निकल सकते हैं। नियंत्रण की आड़ में कहीं लालफीताशाही को खुला खेल खेलने का मौका न मिल जाए, इस पर सरकार को गंभीरता से विचार करना चाहिए।

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले (मालेगांव) : महोदय, भारत के आत्मसम्मान को बढ़ाने में भारत के किसानों और मजदूरों ने बहुत बड़ा योगदान दिया है लेकिन क्या कारण है कि आज किसान और मजदूर की हालत खराब हो गयी है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि भारत सरकार ने इस पर सोचा और यह अध्यादेश लाई। मंत्री जी ने राठ ट्रपति के पास अध्यादेश भेजा, राठट्रपति ने उसे सही कर दिया और वह यहां पेश हो गया - यह ठीक नहीं लगता है। यह तो सचमुच महत्वपूर्ण बात है, देश और किसान के रक्षण की बात है। इसलिए विधेयक लाना चाहिए था, अध्यादेश का मैं कड़ा विरोध करता हूँ। यह राखी चीन से आई, मुर्गों की टांग अमरीका से आई। इसी पर बंधन लगाने के लिए भारत सरकार यह अध्यादेश लाई है लेकिन इसकी जगह पर बिल लाना चाहिए था, यह मेरी विनती है।

DR. DEBENDRA PRADHAN: Madam, at the outset, I would like to say that with the removal of quantitative restrictions, some items need not require any permit. So, there is an emergent need to evolve a suitable mechanism for regulating imports of these items to our country.

It is a question of the health of human and animal life. Some doubts were raised by the hon. Member Shri Chowdhary regarding genetically modified food as well as the e.coli problem. We are bringing forward this Bill for the purpose of monitoring, regulating and restricting these. Meanwhile, another hon. Member told that some virus bacteria and e.coli are cause of important diseases, in order to examine these things, he wanted to know whether we have sufficient mechanisms or not.

We should know that. Bhopal laboratory is one of the ten best laboratories in the world. We have sufficient equipment and mechanism to monitor....(Interruptions)

SHRI LAKSHMAN SINGH (RAJGARH): I do not agree with this. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not disturb.

DR. DEBENDRA PRADHAN: We are trying to expand our facilities and develop the infrastructure to examine the produce which are imported to India. There are some doubts about the domestic producers. If we restrict the imports, it would help the domestic producers. I hope that we should not worry that the domestic producers will be affected by it. We cannot allow products which would cause Mad Cow Disease, Foot and Mouth Disease, etc. The diseases which are not found in India and which we have to examine are Foot and Mouth Disease of South African origin, namely, SAT-1, SAT-2, and SAT-3; Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy, Virulent Newcastle Disease of Poultry, African Swine Fever, Avian Influenza (Hongkong Avian Influenza) and Nipha Virus (Swine Disease).

These diseases are not found in India. With these restrictions, we can stop these diseases entering into India. I am thankful to the hon. Member, Shri Anadi Sahu, who has supported this Bill. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY : The Minister is talking at variance with the stand taken by his Government. ...(*Interruptions*) His Government has expressed concern in the WTO but here the Minister is talking that everything is all right. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not disturb.

...(*Interruptions*)

श्री लक्ष्मण सिंह : सभापति महोदय, भारत की कृषि आज खतरे में है। मंत्री जी के जवाब से ऐसा लगता है कि वह भारत के किसानों के प्रति गम्भीर नहीं है। (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती भावनाबेन देवराजभाई चिखलिया (जूनागढ़) : आपने तो सेंटर में 50 साल तक राज किया।

(व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : आपके मंत्री जी उत्तर दे रहे हैं। आप क्यों इंटरप्ट कर रहे हैं?

DR. DEBENDRA PRADHAN: In this regard, it was mentioned that red-tapism would hamper the progress. We would take care of red-tapism. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Adhir Chowdhary, I have not allowed you to speak.

...(*Interruptions*)

DR. DEBENDRA PRADHAN: So, I would appeal the House to pass this Bill.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN (CHIRAYINKIL): The response of the Minister is not convincing. He has not explained the circumstances under which the Ordinance has been issued.

Firstly, the danger was there for years. But the same has not been properly explained by the Minister as to what prompted him to by-pass the legislation by issuing the Ordinance.

There was sufficient time, there was sufficient warning and circumstances were such that the Government could have brought the Bill before the House and got it passed. But without doing that, the Minister took the short cut route of bypassing the Legislature, which is highly precarious and cannot be justified. So, I still stick to my Resolution disapproving the Ordinance, because the Minister could not convince me as to what prompted the Government to come out with such a course of action. With these words, I again press for the Resolution.

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : सभापति महोदय, मैं आपकी अनुमति से, मंत्री जी से एक सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय : आप अपोज करिए। You were not here for the whole debate and now, at the end of the debate, you want to ask a question. आपने कुछ सुना भी नहीं है। यह ठीक नहीं है। आपने इसके ऊपर होने वाली बहस को भी नहीं सुना है। इसलिए आप क्या सवाल उठाएंगे ?

I will now put the Resolution moved by Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That this House disapproves of the Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001 (No.5 of 2001) promulgated by the President on 5 July, 2001."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put the motion for consideration of the Bill to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Live-Stock Importation Act, 1898, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

The question is:

"That clauses 2 to 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 4 were added to the Bill.

Clause 5 Insertion of new section 3 A

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are three amendments to be moved by Shri Mahboob Zahedi to Clause 5.

SHRI MAHBOOB ZAHEDI (KATWA): I beg to move:

Page 2, line 20,--

after "affect"

insert "directly or indirectly" (1)

Page 2, line 19â€”

after "of any" insert "livestock or" (2)

Page 2, line 20,--

after "health" insert "and normalcy" (3)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the amendments to vote.

The amendments were put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the long Title were added to the Bill.

DR. DEBENDRA PRADHAN: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.
