

12.02 1/2 hrs.

STATEMENT CORRECTING REPLY TO  
SQ. NO. 295 DATED 1.12.1988 RE:  
ANIMAL AND BIRD SACRIFICE

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV): Sir, I invite the attention of the House to the reply given to Starred Question No. 295 in this House on 1-12-88. In reply to part (a) of the original reply in the 2nd line, the name of the State of Haryana is to be deleted.

The original Statement was based on the information furnished earlier by the Director, Department of Animal Husbandry, Government of Haryana. While going through the information received subsequently from the Director, Animal Husbandry, Haryana, it was noticed that the State Government of Haryana had not enacted a legislation for Prohibition of Animals and Birds Sacrifice. Director, Animal Husbandry, Haryana was, therefore, requested to clarify the position.

Although the Question was answered in the last week of the Session, the Statement could not be laid on the Table of the same Session due to paucity of time.

I, therefore, crave the indulgence of the House to the extent mentioned above.

[Translation]

SHRI CHARANJIT SINGH ATHWAL (Ropar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a Bill was introduced in the U.S. Senate which states that human rights do not exist in India... (*Interruptions*)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing doing.

[Translation]

SHRI CHARANJIT SINGH ATHWAL:  
Then we walk out.

*At this stage Shri Charanjit Singh Athwal and some other Hon. Members left the House.*

12.03 hrs.

## COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

[English]

Extension of Time for Presentation of  
Report

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North Central): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do further extend up to the last day of the first week of the next session the time for the presentation of the Report of the Committee of Privileges in regard to allegation made by Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan, M.P., against the Minister of State in the Ministry of Commerce (Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsri) on 10th December, 1987, during discussion on 'No Confidence Motion'."

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Kurup.

SHRI SURESH KURUP (Kottayam): Sir, on December 15, 1987, you, in your wisdom had rejected a Privilege Motion regarding the very same subject and again a motion was brought from back-door. During the last Budget session, again a motion was brought before this House from back-door ignoring all procedural objections raised by Members of this House and ignoring all parliamentary practices. Now I want to know why exactly they seek extension of time for

[Sh. Suresh Kurup]

presentation of the Report of this Committee. Why this waste of time and energy? All this is to save the face of the Prime Minister who threw a challenge on the floor of this House without understanding its implications. It was reported in a section of the Press that the Commerce Ministry is taking its own time for replying to some of the queries raised by the Members and by Shri Unnikrishnan himself, and they have not yet produced some of the files asked by Shri Unnikrishnan and some other Members. Another thing is that any inquiry conducted in this land should be according to the law of this country. I would like to know whether the Committee is examining the witnesses which Shri Unnikrishnan and some other Members have asked to be examined...  
(Interruptions)

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK (Panaji): What is this submission, Sir. This is only a motion for extension of time.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): No, no, there is opposition. There is a notice. You do not know the procedure.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: Sir, if there is to be a proper enquiry, then they should examine none other than Shri Amitabh Bachchan and his brother. Are they going to examine them? I would like to have from Shri Sharad Dighe a categorical reply to all these questions. Otherwise they are seeking time just to save their face.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, with previous notice, I am rising to oppose the extension of time and I would like to place before you some arguments so that they will also guide about the extensions in the future. Permit me to remind you that Shri P.R. Kumaramangalam had already put before you a notice of privilege motion. (Interruptions) Sir, how does he anticipate what I am going to say... (Interruptions) I am not challenging. Please listen to me. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: I shall look into it and do the needful. Why do you bother?

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, I want your ruling. Have I challenged?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Thank you, Sir. So, Sir, on that occasion I had already pointed out to you that you had rejected the privilege notice and after that the matter arising out of the allegations made by Shri Unnikrishnan against Shri Das Munsii had been referred to the Privilege Committee. You draw a fine distinction in your fine way that a matter referred to the Privilege Committee is not necessarily a privilege issue. Sir, really it was a great revelation to us that a matter referred to the Privilege Committee is not a privilege issue. To someone it is to be given for investigation and you found that here is a Committee available and you referred it to it. I am very happy that it was not referred to the Consultative Committee attached to the Ministry of Health. Anyway it was referred to the Privilege Committee. So, having been referred to the Committee...

MR. SPEAKER: The only thing, Professor, you missed is that it was done with the consent of the House. It is the decision of the House, not mine.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: A Member may say anything. Ultimately your wisdom must prevail in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I am a medium through which collective expression takes place in this House.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: So, Sir, what I was pointing out to you is this when Dr. Dighe is going to seek extension for the Committees' report to be placed before the House, I want to point out to you how the

demand is irrelevant. Sir, in the very nature of things, the Privilege Committee will not be able to proceed further to investigate into this matter. Really it was not a privilege issue. They have tuned their mind to work upon the privilege issue and they are given an issue which is extraneous to the privilege issue. So they started from the beginning with an inherent difficulty. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Sir, he is making an insinuation (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you interrupting?

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: There is no insinuation (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I can take care of myself.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That is right, Sir. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: You are wasting the time of the House unnecessarily.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I can overrule it and I can take a decision on my own. I have taken that decision and I can take a decision on this also. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: So, Sir, you agree that there is no insinuation.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I am getting threats over and over again!

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: So, Sir, what I am trying to point to out to you is that I will place certain facts by which the House will know that even if the extension is given till the end of the Lok Sabha or even if it is spilled over to the next Lok Sabha nothing is going to emerge out of this and the reason is like this. Sir, Mr. Unnikrishnan had made certain submissions to the Committee. This Committee has not given any time, had not applied its mind to consider his submissions and give him the necessary reply. He had also demanded certain witnesses to be called. Even those obligations have not been fulfilled and if the Committee is functioning in that particular manner, we can't cast aspersions on the Committee but we can refer to the manner in which it is functioning because that will decide whether the extension of time is necessary whether the extension of time can be given. This is the manner in which it is functioning. Sir, my contention is Shri Unnikrishnan and the concerned party make certain submissions, there is no response; he asks for certain witnesses, no response; he asks for certain problems to be investigated, no response. If it is a non-responsive Committee, it does not deserve the extension of time and therefore, I suggest to the mover and demand that a clean burial be given to this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: In spite of the fact that you were also a party to that! Now, Mr. Sharad Dighe.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: Sir, may I say on whatever Mr. Dandavate has raised? As you have rightly said, Sir, that this House has already referred this matter to this Committee and the Committee is seized of the whole matter. All these points were also raised by Mr. Unnikrishnan before the Committee and the Committee will decide on those points also. Whatever is happening in the Committee is, of course, a confidential matter, I cannot disclose everything. I do not know how Mr. Dandavate has come to know that such and such thing has happened in the Committee. (*Interruptions*). Sir, the Report will be submitted to this House. There had been 12 Meetings so far and I may inform my

[Sh. Sharad Dighe]

friend that out of these, five Meetings were adjourned because of the request of Mr. Unnikrishnan himself and in the other seven Meetings the proceedings were very well going on. Written submissions have been made by Mr. Unnikrishnan, and the remarks had been asked from the Ministry, they have also been received and the Committee is seized of the matter and it will be decided. Therefore, this extension is necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do further extend upto the last day of the first week of the next session the time for the presentation of the Report of the Committee of Privileges in regard to allegation made by Shri K.P. Unnikrishnan, M.P., against the Minister of State in the Ministry of Commerce (Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsri) on 10th December, 1987, during discussion on 'No Confidence Motion'."

*The motion was adopted.*

12.12 hrs.

#### BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[English]

#### Sixty-fifth Report

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-  
TARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF IN-  
FORMATION AND BROADCASTING  
(SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Sixty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 22nd February, 1989."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Sixty-fifth Report of the Business Advi-

sory Committee presented to the House on the 22nd February, 1989."

*The motion was adopted*

12.13 hrs.

#### RAILWAY BUDGET, 1989-90

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Madhavrao Scindia.

[Translation]

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, just look, how the hon. Minister has stood by rolling up his sleeves. Please protect us from him.

MR. SPEAKER: It seems the confrontation will be a very good one. It is better to roll up one's sleeves well in time than doing so later. One should be always prepared in advance.

SHRI BALKAVI BAIRAGI (Mandsaur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the matter relates to Railway Budget. We have high regard for Shri Madhavraoji who is very popular. Before this Budget is presented, I would like to make a submission through you

Ham safar hamdam rahe par mera dam  
nikale nahin  
Rel patari par rahe, bas patarian badale  
nahin

(Interruptions)

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE  
MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI  
MADHAVRAO SCINDIA): Mr. Speaker, Sir,  
I rise to present the Revised Estimates for  
the year 1988-89 and Budget Estimates for  
the year 1989-90 for the Indian Railways.