

an>

Title: Regarding Discussion Under Rule 193 and reply by Ministers.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Members, as you are aware, discussion under Rule 193 on "Natural calamities in various parts of the country with special reference to rains and floods in Jammu and Kashmir, cyclone Hudhud in Andhra Pradesh and Odisha and drought in Maharashtra" was deferred yesterday to facilitate reply by the hon. Minister of Agriculture to certain clarifications.

Hon. Minister is present in the House. I will now call the Members who want to seek clarifications. You can ask only one question each.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE (GULBARGA): The Agriculture Minister is here. Yesterday, it was promised in the House. This subject has come again in the agenda because yesterday the Minister was not here. You had promised that we would get the reply from him. We are waiting to listen to him as to what he is going to say about Maharashtra and other things. ...(Interruptions)

श्री जय प्रकाश नारायण यादव (बॉका) : महोदय, इस पर बोलने का मौका दीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member from your Party has already spoken.

...(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SKILL DEVELOPMENT AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY): Here, I would just like to make a small clarification about what Shri Kharge said that the Minister was not here. The fact is that the Minister did intervene and had given a reply on the subject. When he had done that, they were not present in the House. Still we were very generous. We decided to ask the Minister to come back again and reply. So, this should be put on record, instead of saying that the Minister was not there. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE : Sir, if you are convinced, we will sit. You are a senior Member of Parliament. You know that. When the debate is not concluded, discussion is not concluded, how can he give the reply? At the most, he can intervene. It cannot be called a reply. It can be called a reply when the entire discussion is over. After discussion, all those who are connected to the subject, they can reply. You tell us the rule, then I will sit. ...(Interruptions)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not quoting any rule.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE : Yesterday, the House was adjourned because of this. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY: Sir, it is just not a matter of scoring a point. It is a simple matter. We just want to flag an issue. Possibly what the Minister in his intervention said would have been easier for them to understand if they were present in the House. They chose not to be present in the House. Now they are taking a cause to say that the Minister of the Government was at fault, which is not correct. They will have to put the record straight. The Minister was not present because it was listed in a different Ministry altogether. Let us put it on record for the future also. ...(Interruptions) Let us put the records correct. If this is going to be the system, it is going to be a problem for any Government. Let me put the record straight. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY: I am not arguing with him. ...(Interruptions)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let him finish.

SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY: The initial discussion was only on Hudhud and Kashmir floods on natural calamities. ...(Interruptions) Why do you not have the patience to listen? The initial discussion was listed virtually on Natural Calamity which was to be responded by the Minister of Home Affairs. Subsequently, when the Members of Maharashtra raised the issue of drought, then we said, yes, we would take it into account. So, it was not the substantive business of the House... (Interruptions) Then we added. So, there is virtually no Department where two Ministers come to answer one debate. It is generally one Minister who comes to answer one debate. Since this was an additional gesture on the part of the Government, we took up the issue and that should be placed on record.

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB (CUTTACK): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, actually a piquant situation has arisen and this House is supreme to settle this issue. As the hon. Minister just now mentioned, the original notice for consideration of a discussion under Rule 193 related to cyclone in Andhra Pradesh and Odisha and flood in Jammu and Kashmir. It did not mention the flood in North-East also. The original notice which was moved by Shri Kalikesh Singh Deo was relating to these two natural calamities relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs. There was no mention in that about the drought situation of Maharashtra or any other State which has been affected. Later on we were really surprised because yesterday when the

Member from Maharashtra and some other Members from the Congress Party also raised this issue that why not there is a response from the Agriculture Minister. Agriculture Minister had replied, or intervened in between. At that time because of certain other circumstances the hon. Members from this side were not present.

We have to settle it and you have to give a direction in that respect. Yesterday when I stood up and said, should we say that the Home Minister or the Minister of State for Home Affairs is concluding this issue and Agriculture Minister will intervene tomorrow, there was a direction, that was the question which I asked towards the end of the deliberation that let us conclude what Home Minister has to say. That is why the questions were replied. ...(*Interruptions*)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I allowed Mr. Mahtab to speak. Not all others. Let him conclude.

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB : That is why I said it is a piquant situation. It is a piquant situation because agriculture came in, drought situation came in.

I would say, Sir, the Secretariat can help us out, there was no notice relating to drought situation in Maharashtra.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is why he wants to know and he has a right to ask.

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB : It was done because of the request of some hon. Members from Maharashtra. The original notice was relating to flood, relating to cyclone. Our notice was relating to Home Affairs. It had nothing to do with agriculture. If the House could have taken up drought situation, then there are other areas which are affected by drought which could have been deliberated upon.

Therefore, I would say that you take the view of other Members. Let the House deliberate and you take a decision. But as far as I understand with my limited knowledge of Parliamentary practice, yesterday the Home Minister had replied to the deliberation relating to the notice and partly Agriculture Minister was supposed to reply to the affairs that were relating to Maharashtra.

SHRI JYOTIRADITYA M. SCINDIA (GUNA): Mr. Mahtab has tried to enlighten the House. The fact of the matter is that he may be right insofar as his particular party Member's notice was concerned. But as far as this topic of debate is concerned, it was a consolidation of a number of notices that were put together. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB : That was on the second day, not on the first day.

SHRI JYOTIRADITYA M. SCINDIA : I was not interrupting you while you were speaking, Mr. Mahtab. I would appreciate if you did the same.

There were a number of notices that were consolidated together to make this topic. Once a topic is printed in the List of Business and it does include the drought issue in Maharashtra, then it is incumbent on the Government to respond to that issue as well, which you yourself, Sir, had ruled yesterday that the hon. Agriculture Minister will respond on the issue of the drought situation. The Agriculture Minister is here, we would like to hear his response so that this debate is concluded. But let us not get into the technicalities. The Minister is here and we should hear his response. Let us not try and score points and dig ourselves deeper in the process. The country requires a discussion and a response from the Government which is what they are willing to offer and we should accept it and go ahead.

SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY: Sir, what Mr. Scindia is saying is absolutely correct. When Mr. Kharge pointed out that the Minister was not present here yesterday, that is our only objection because it was not the substantive business. ...(*Interruptions*) This will happen again and again. (*Interruptions*) This debate was to conclude yesterday, but the Government was generous enough to say that we will ask the Agriculture Minister to reply. (*Interruptions*) To say that he was not present yesterday, is a wrong statement and that is what I am saying. (*Interruptions*) The business of the House cannot be changed to the tune of some people who decide it. (*Interruptions*) What you have introduced today has never happened before in this House.

PROF. SAUGATA ROY (DUM DUM): HON. Deputy Speaker Sir, I request you to urge the Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs who is newly appointed, not to be like a Jack in the Box. (*Interruptions*) At every opportunity, he jumps up and says something. He may say something, but he cannot intervene again and again. (*Interruptions*) Jack in the Box is a parliamentary word. (*Interruptions*)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are a senior Member, you can speak whatever is right. At the same time, you cannot hurt others. Any aspersion will be expunged.

PROF. SAUGATA ROY : Let me complete my submission. I point out to one factual inaccuracy in the Minister's statement. He said that never in this House in a discussion on 193 two Ministers reply. Even in the 15th Lok Sabha, there were six different discussions on price rise issue and on every occasion, two Ministers- Shri Pranab Mukherjee, then Finance Minister and Shri Sharad Pawar, the then Agriculture Minister replied. This is a standard practice. If you take a holistic motion, there is no difficulty, no bar on two ministers speaking. Secondly, for the first time I am hearing in this House discussion on the history of a motion. I can understand Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab's eagerness to glorify his own party that they had given the motion. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB : This is not glorification. ...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAUGATA ROY : Sir, you were here yesterday. What does the motion read? ...(*Interruptions*)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Mahtab, please take your seat

...(Interruptions)

PROF. SAUGATA ROY : We do not discuss the history of a motion. ...(Interruptions)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please allow me to run the House.

...(Interruptions)

PROF. SAUGATA ROY : It says: Further discussion on the natural calamities in various parts of the country with special reference to rains and floods in Jammu & Kashmir, cyclone Hudhud in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa and drought in Maharashtra. So, drought in Maharashtra is very much a part of the motion.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay, you may please sit down. It is over. Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions) â€¦*

SHRI ARVIND SAWANT (MUMBAI SOUTH): Thank you very much. I am really hurt. Thousands of farmers are waiting for the relief to be given by the Government, but we are scoring points against each other. The late Mahatma Gandhi said: spiritualize politics. But we are politicizing every issue, even the spiritual aspects. I am really hurt. What Shri Rudy said is definitely right. At the same time, I would like to ask Shri Kalikesh Ji, when he has put this issue, it says: Further discussion on the natural calamities in various parts of the country with special reference to rains and floods in Jammu & Kashmir, cyclone Hudhud in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa and drought in Maharashtra. When this issue was incorporated in the motion, why should we debate such issues, when farmers are waiting for the relief?

So, I request that instead of going into technicalities, respecting the sentiments of the farmers, let the hon. Minister reply now. Kindly permit him to reply.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Since Shri Kalikesh is the initiator of the debate, I am permitting you. What do you want to say now? He is the initiator and he wants to say something.

SHRI KALIKESH N. SINGH DEO (BOLANGIR): With due respect to my colleagues from the Congress, the TMC and of course, the Ruling Party, I had given a notice on cyclone Hudhud and Philain and also flood in Kashmir. I had given a separate notice on drought in Orissa. My objection is that if you include the drought in Maharashtra – I have full sympathies for my friends from Maharashtra – why did you not include my notice on drought in Orissa also? We could have discussed about drought in Orissa also. I had given both the notices. This is my objection. Since we are discussing an issue of great importance, I would request you to allow the hon. Minister to give his statement in response to my friend's request.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Whenever a discussion involving two Ministers is there, the reply to the debate is given by only one Minister. The other Minister only intervenes in the debate.

Anyhow, since the Minister wants to say something in response to whatever is raised yesterday, he may please answer.

...(Interruptions)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. It is not allowed. Nothing will go on record, except the hon. Minister's reply.

(Interruptions) â€¦*

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: After the ruling, I cannot allow; hon. Minister can reply. I cannot listen to anything else. Mr. Minister may reply now. Hon. Minister may address the Chair.

...(Interruptions)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may address the Chair and I will manage the House.

...(Interruptions)