

Bye-Laws, 1987. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—7990/89]

- (3) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Inland Waterways Authority of India for the year 1987-88 along with Audited Accounts.
- (ii) A copy of the Review (Hindi and English versions) by the Government on the working of the Inland Waterways Authority of India for the year 1987-88.
- (4) A statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (3) above. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—7991/89]

12.22 hrs.

[English]

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha:—

- (i) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha 11th May, 1989, agreed without any amendment to the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Amendment Bill, 1989, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th May, 1989."
- (ii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 11th May, 1989, agreed without any amendment to the Chandigarh

Disturbed areas (amendment) Bill, 1989, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th May, 1989."

- (iii) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1989, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th May, 1989, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this house has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."
- (iv) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 115 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 12th May, 1989, agreed to the following amendments made by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th May, 1989, in the Punjab Pre-emption (Chandigarh and Delhi Repeal) Bill, 1988:—
- Enacting Formula*
1. Page 1, line 1, — for "Thirty-ninth" substitute "Fortieth"
- Caluse—1*
2. Page 1, line 4, — for '1988' substitute '1989'."
- (v) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Union Duties of Excise (Distribution) Amendment Bill, 1989, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th May, 1989,

and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state thank this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

(vi) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Additional Duties of Excise (Good of Special Importance) Amendment, Bill, 1989, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th May, 1989, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

(vii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 12th May, 1989, agreed without any amendment to the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1989, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th May, 1989."

11.23 hrs.

RULING RE: QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE
RAISED BY SHRI V. KISHORE CHAN-
DRAS. DEO.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: On 10th May, 1989, Shri V. Kishore Chandra S Deo gave notice of a question of privilege against the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri Buta Singh, for allegedly misleading the House on 8th May, 1989, while replying to the discussion regarding communal situation in various parts of the

country. In his notice, Shri Deo stated *inter alia* that Shri Buta Singh misled the House wilfully and deliberately by stating that a 'three-judge Division Bench of the Allahabad High Court would decide the Babri Masjid—Ram Janambhoomi dispute by taking up the case on July 10, 1989, which is false information as reported in the Indian Express dated 10th May, 1989."

The *Indian Express* of 10th May, 1989, carried a news report captioned "Buta misleads Parliament" which read *inter alia* as follows:

"The facts are not in keeping with what the Home Minister told the Lok Sabha. Neither has any bench been constituted, nor is the case being taken up by any bench of the Allahabad High Court on July 10.

A two judge division bench of the Allahabad High Court at Lucknow is seized of an application made by the State Government for transferring four cases relating to the Ayodhya shrine pending in Faizabad courts to the High Court for their disposal. The arguments before the bench on the petition moved in February remained inconclusive on May 3 and the next date fixed by the Court for the hearing is July 10.

The division bench is yet to decide whether the petition of the Government for withdrawal of cases from Faizabad civil courts to the Lucknow Bench, their consolidation and disposal here should be admitted or not."

The Minister of Home Affairs while replying to the discussion regarding communal situation in various parts of the country on 8th May, 1989, had stated as follows—the original was in Hindi and it has been translated:

"After discussing the matter with the Uttar Pradesh Government, we said that the dispute—the whole consolidated case—should be placed before the High Court of Uttar Pradesh and a Division