

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: They cannot take away our freedom of speech in this House and our privilege by majority vote.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not allowed.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, it cannot be tolerated.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN: Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, what is your point of order?

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN: Sir, my point of order is that this is a very serious question... (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I did it.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN: Sir, just one minute. I won't take even one minute, Sir. Sir, this question is involving interpretation of the Constitutional provisions... (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: I have done it.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN: Sir, just a moment. Please let me complete. All those who have given the notice of privilege, have got information from Lok Sabha Secretariat only this morning. I think this matter is too serious.

Sir, this matter is most serious....

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir I have given a notice. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Matters under Rule 377—Mr. Namgyal; (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Mr. Speaker, I have given a notice that under Rule 227 the hon. Speaker may refer the question of privilege to the Privileges Committee.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, we appeal to you. (*Interruptions*). That is not for the House, that is an appeal to you.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: You can decide, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I can't. It is for the House now.

(*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: I have given my permission. What they asked me was to seek permission to raise it in the House and I have done it. Now, it is for the House to decide what to do about it.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Should it be put to the vote?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I have received a motion which says.... (*Interruptions*).

At this stage, Prof. Madhu Dandavate and some other hon. Members left the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Matters under Rule 377, Mr. Namgyal.

15.02 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

[*English*]

Demand for reviewing priority allocation of seats in Indian Airlines Services operating in Ladakh Sector

SHRI P. NAMGYAL (Ladakh): Twenty seven priority seats of Indian Airlines already stand allocated to various State and Central Government organisations located in the Ladakh sector, such as Deputy Commissioner of Leh and Kargil, the ITBF, the ITBP, the BSF, the Special Bureau and the Army etc. Recently the Indian Airlines authorities have allocated another 40 seats to the Army thereby

making the total allocation of priority seats to 67 leaving only 28 seats to the general public including those for tourists; the total capacity of a Boeing Plane operating in the Ladakh sector being only 95 passengers as against 126 on the other sectors. The Leh-Srinagar road being closed to traffic due to snow at the Zojila, the public has no other alternative other than the Indian Airlines for exit from Ladakh. This is causing extreme difficulties and inconvenience to the public. Besides, the Army have their own regular flights to and from Ladakh.

I, therefore, urge upon the Government to restore the earlier position by releasing the 40 seats for the general public.

(ii) Demand for Funds for Operation Flood for Bhandara District of Maharashtra.

SHRI KESHAORAO PARDHI (Bhandara): Bhandara district of Maharashtra is being neglected under the operation flood programme of National Dairy Development Board in spite of the fact that it is a backward district and has great potential for dairy development. NDDB continues to post its officers and finance heavily in favour of the already well developed districts of Maharashtra like Kolhapur, Pune, Jalgaon. It has not only withdrawn its officers from Bhandara, but also stopped financing it. It has financed Kolhapur to the tune of Rs. 10 crores but has not provided even one per cent of that for Bhandara.

Hence, I appeal to the hon. Minister of Agriculture to advise suitably the Operation Flood authorities to pay full attention without any delay towards the development of Bhandara.

[Translation]

(iii) Demand for reconsidering the proposal for intertransfer of certain villages of Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh

SHRIMATI VIDYAVATI CHATURVEDI (Khajuraho): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we have come to know that there is a proposal to amalgamate several villages of Chhatarpur, Panna and Tikamgarh districts in Bundelkhand area of the State of Madhya Pradesh with Uttar Pradesh and to give certain villages of Uttar Pradesh to Madhya Pradesh in lieu thereof. It is totally improper and unjustifiable. It is because most of the villages of Madhya Pradesh which are being given to Uttar Pradesh are more developed and also very important from agricultural and industrial point of view. But the villages of Uttar Pradesh which are being given to Madhya Pradesh are totally undeveloped and back in electricity, road and other basic amenities.

As such the people of Madhya Pradesh are not at all prepared to give the villages of their area and to take the proposed villages of Uttar Pradesh. A big conference of village Panchs, Sarpanchs, Presidents of the Districts, Chairmen of the district panchayats and other representatives of the people was held on 3 December, 1987 at Niwari in Tikamgarh district (Madhya Pradesh) in which the proposal of this amalgamation was vehemently opposed and condemned while expressing strong resentment and anger against this proposal, the Sarpanchs maintained that an injustice is being done to them by transferring developed villages of their area to Uttar Pradesh in lieu of the undeveloped villages of Uttar Pradesh.

Earlier also several princely States of Bundelkhand had been merged with Uttar Pradesh at the time of reorganising the States.

If it is considered necessary to inter-transfer certain villages of Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh, those villages of Uttar Pradesh viz. Maurani-pur, Sakrar, Baruasagar and Lalitpur; etc. falling within the boundary of Madhya Pradesh may please be given to us.