[D. M. Farooq Abdulla]

totally incorrect and misleading. I arrived as per my earlier schedule the day after the raid started. As M.P. from Srinagar constituency, I was informed by my constituents of the high-handed behaviour of the raiding parties. I visited these places in the morning and mob fury that was unleashed by the people happened in the evening.

The time of raid was most unfortunate because after nine months of lean season and winter people get ready to welcome tourists and had situation got out of hand, it would be poor unfortunate who would be starving for bread.

(Interruptions) **

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please do not interrupt, Mr. Tewary. These things will not go on record. This is said without my permission.

(Interruptions) **

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, please take your seats. Without my permission if anybody gets up and speaks, that will not go on record. You must hear all sides. Why are you so intolerant?

(Interruptions) **

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Kurian , please sit down; Mr. Tewary, please sit down. Only the personal explanation by Dr. Farooq Abdullah will go on record.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: I and my party are not against unearthing black money wherever it lies. I sympathise with the Enforcement Directorate people who sustained injury in mob fury.

(Interruptions) **

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneshwar): On a point of order. Is it for Government of India, Income tax Department to decide as to at what time of the year, the raids should be conducted or it is the Member who has to decide about this?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It has been stated very clearly by the Finance Minister that the Government has nothing to do with all these raids. That has already been said.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Finance Minister has already replied that the Government has nothing to do with these raids.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): (Then, who is conducting the raids? Has the Government nothing to do with the Enforcement Directorate?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Government do not direct anybody to carry out these raids; Government is not a party in that. Some information is received by the Income tax Department and on that they act. This was the reply given by the Government; the Government do not interefere in these things.

14.25 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SIXTEENTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): Sir, with your permission I beg to move the following:

"That this House do agree with the Sixteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 28th April, 1981."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That this House do agree with the Sixteenth Report of the Busi-

---

**Not recorded.

ness Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 28th April, 1981."

PROOF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Under Rule 290 with your permission, I beg to move:

'That' for the original Motion, the followng be substituted:

"The Sixteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee which was presented to the House on April 28, 1981, be referred back to the Committee, since the Committee had not allotted any time to discuss the inadequate statement made by the Home Minister in the House on April 27, 1981 on the serious issue of the alleged attempt to sabotage the Air India Boeing by which the Prime Minister was expected to leave on her foreign tour on May 5, 1981."

Under Rule 290 I have been permitted to speak and I would like to make a few observations.

Sir, I had given this notice only after going carefully through the newspapers of this morning. In the *Times of India* I came across a write-up by Shri K. N. Malik, under the heading "Puzzling Aspects of Episode", in which a number of technical problems have been raised and as a result of that, a suspicion has been created in the minds of many people that the Statement that had been made by the Home Minister regarding the alleged sabotage had a number of lacunae, and probably there are certain motivations that have also been attributed.

Sir, firstly the Union Home Minister's statement completely ignores all norms of aviation engineering and safety check procedures. There are certain check procedures which are to be gone through. It appears very much unlikely that a damage to four control cables in that aircraft would not have come to light before the Prime Minister's departure on May 5, 1981. Normally, the aircraft which is designated for a VIP flight is given a complete and a thorough check up three days prior to the flight. In addition to that even half-an-hour prior to the flight, again a fresh detection is made. And therefore, it appears rather strange that if the motivation of the alleged sabotage is to cause damage to the Prime Minister of this country, which both the sections of the House do not want at all, why they should indulge in an exercise sixteen days prior to the departure of the Prime Minister by that particular aircraft which is meant for the VIP.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is known to the people who are the saboteurs.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North-East): Your internal warfare may be responsible for this.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I know very well who are the hijcakers and who are the peace-lovers, Sir.

Sir, I would like to come back to you as far as these cables are concerned.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am on a point of order. He has moved a substitute Motion to refer it back to the Business Advisory Commitee. Sir, as for the Rule he has quoted, Rule 290, the Hon. Member should note that not more than half an hour shall be allotted for discussion of the Motion and no Member will speak for more than five minutes on such a Motion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Professor knows the time.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I have studied that rule and come here.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: He should be confined to five minutes and let us not go into the merit of the whole matter.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, according to Rule 290, the last part says that even half-an-hour discussion can be there and nobody can speak for more than five minutes I confirm that and I have not exhausted five minutes. I require less than five minutes. I do not even require five minutes. I was looking at the watch.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Time should not be counted from now onwards. The time when you move the Motion. Please complete it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: According to relativity, you will always find that time expands with velocity. That is why the time...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: And no two watches also agree.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Therefore, I want to point out to you, Sir, that a very important technical aspect is that on 15th, 16th and 17th of April already the detection of various control cables had taken place and it is probable that those who had failed to detect this failure, might have reconstructed this theory of sabotage and tried to put it forward through the Home Minister. And therefore, as a result of that, I feel that it is an entirely inadequate and unsatisfactory statement, on which a full-fledged discussion should take place. Therefore, I think that this report should be referred back to the Business Advisory Committee.

MR. Deputy-SPEAKER: No;

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No; only the mover.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Who says that?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No; there is no general discussion. Only the mover can make a statement. That is the rule. No.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Please listen. The substitute motion is not on the Order Paper. I have sent a chit that I want to speak on it. Who is going to stop?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: He need not threaten me, Sir. I am not going to.. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Unnikrishnan, if you have also moved the substitute motion, I will allow you to speak. You have not. No.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: The motion for consideration means for the consideration of the House. I am as much entitled as anybody else. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No; he is the mover. He has already moved. Government will reply.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I am entitled as much, as it is for the consideration of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will not allow a discussion. The Minister will reply.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: On a point of order, Sir. Please open the book, rule 290, paragraph 2. It says:

> "Provided that an amendment may be moved that the report be referred back to the Committee either without limitation or with reference to any particular matter;
>
> Provided further that not more than half an hour shall be allotted for the discussion on the motion and no member shall speak for more than five minutes on such motion."

It means five minutes for each Member.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: That should be read with... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: There have been so many occasions. Let me tell you: you are violating the precedents. There have been clear precedents in this House when substitute motions have come up for Business Advisory Committee's recommendations. Discussion has been

allowed. Discussion is never precluded by the Chair; and it means other Members—those who have given their names.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: All right; you speak—because you have quoted some precedents.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Sir, I have also quoted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No. Only he has given notice. I am not allowing. Don't make it a general discussion. He has already given.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: The point I have mentioned is this: as a member of the Business Advisory Committee, I have never spoken in this House on anything that happened in the Committee, to this day. But since Prof. Madhu Dandavate has moved the substitute motion, I want to say that even yesterday in the Committee, I had specifically suggested that there should be a discussion not only on...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Whatever happens in the BAC, you must not say it on the floor of the House.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I know. I am fairly familiar with the rules, as much as you are.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Come to the motion proper.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Please...you don't have to tell me about it. Hon. Speaker had promised the House earlier that on all Demands which were guillotined. Members would be given an opportunity, if time can be found, to express themselves.

This is a very serious matter. We are as much concerned as the rest of the House belonging to the other side, viz. the treasury benches, about the safety not only of the Prime Minister but of all the Ministers for whom we have great affection and regard—as well as for the Members themselves. Apart from that, the question of air safety is very important; the question of sabotage is very important. But here he find from hat statement that was laid on the Table of the House the other day—or made by the Home Minister when some of us were absent—that many extraordinary things have bene stated in that statement. I am not only referring to the news that has appeared today in the Times of India. I am sure Mr. Sharma, the hon. Minister of Civil Aviation and Tourism who is here, is aware that all Boeing designs have what they call 'Fail Safe Stand-by Method'. The basic design incorporates what is called 'Fail Safe Stand-by Method.' Whenever failure of any kind occurs, it is immediately reflected. I do not know—Mr. Rajesh Pilot is not here--it is immediately on the panel. Now, every aircraft, you will agree with me, according to the Indian Aircraft Act 1934 and the rules thereunder and the Aircraft Manual as well as Manufacturers' Manual, is subjected to certain tests. He is aware of transit 'a' check, transit 'b' check, 125 hours check and so on. Now, each of these checks is based on the approved check list. Even the check list has to be approved which is written down in the Manual; and it is prepared on the recommendation of the manufacturers. That is how a certificate of air worthiness is given to an aircraft (a) in general and (b) for its journey. That is how it is certified by the Federal Aviation Authority in the United States. The question here is regarding Boeing 707 Aircraft. Now the Boeing Aircraft, as I mentioned earlier, has a design, a particular method whereby there is no fault which is undetectable. The existence of undetectable damage or snag is an antipathy to fail safe design.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are coming to the subject.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Yes. Since this is important, that is why I am saying that it must be discussed. (*Interruptions*) He is here. He cannot escape. (*Interruptions*) Only responsibility will come up. (*Inter-*

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

ruptions) These checks, were they carried out?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please come to the question. Your five minutes are over.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Only for five minutes, you can speak.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No no.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: The question is that sabotage was intended against a VIP. (*Interruptions*) Now we are entitled to ask certain questions. The question is who examined this aircraft?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, no. I am sorry you cannot ask any question.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: There should be a discussion in the House. We are suggesting a discussion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are supporting the substitue motion. That is all. Now you can reply.

(*Interruptions*)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Is Mr. Rajiv Gandhi.....

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Mr. Subramaniam Swamy is always relevantly irrelevant. This is not concerned with Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and Mr. Subramaniam's trip abroad. (*Interruptions*) I am not prepared to accept the substitute motion of Prof. Madhu Dandavate for certain reasons. The Home Minister had already made a statement here. If any further facts are brought to the notice of the Home Minister in his wisdom wants to make a statement, he would do it. This need not be referred to the Business Advisory Committee.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

'That for the original Motion, the following be substituted—

"The Sixteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee which, was presented to the House on April 28, 1981 be referred back to the Committee since the Committee had not allotted any time to discuss the inadequate statement made by the Home Minister in the House on April 27, 1981 on the serious issue of the alleged attempt to sabotage the Air India Boeing by which the Prime Minister was expected to leave on her foreign tour on May 5, 1981."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Sixteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 28th April, 1981."

The motion was adopted.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar): Dr. Subramaniam Swamy mentioned the name of a person who is not a member of this House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What do you want?

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: He mentioned the name of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. It must be deleted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Don't be very sensitive.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is all right.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: He mentioned the name of a person who is

not a member of the House. It is not connected with the House. It must not go on record.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already said on some other occasion that anybody making any remark while sitting will not go on record.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already said it.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: He also did not seek the permission of the Chair. (*Interruptions*) May I make a submission? In your earlier ruling you had said that those members who have not taken your permission, if they start speaking, that should not go on record.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now matters under rule 377. Now, anybody getting up without the permission of the Speaker, if he speaks, it will not go on record. It is the ruling of the Speaker. Now matters under rule 377. Shri Harish Chandra Singh Rawat. That applies to any hon. member in this House including Mr. Tewary.

14.40 hrs.

Matters under rule 377

(i) DEVELOPMENT OF FOREST AREAS IN HIMALAYAN REGION.

श्री हरीश चन्द्र सिंह रावत (अल्मोड़ा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं नियम 377 के अधीन निम्नलिखित महत्वपूर्ण वर्षों की ओर सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं—

"माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी द्वारा बार-बार वनों के संरक्षण व संवर्धन के महत्व पर जोर दिया जा रहा है, विशेषकर हिमालियन रिजन के वनो के राष्ट्रव्यापी महत्व के सन्दर्भ में। बावजूद इसके उत्तर प्रदेश के पर्वतीय क्षेत्रों में वनों का अंधा-धुंध कटान किया जा रहा है। इस भाग में राष्ट्र के पर्यावरण के सन्तुलन को बनाये रखने के लिये 67 प्रतिशत वनाच्छादित क्षेत्र होना चाहिये, लेकिन आज यहां मात्र 22 प्रतिशत वनाच्छादित भाग रह गया है। इस अंधाधुंध कटान का सबसे दुखद पहलू तो यह है कि कटान के कार्य को सरकार की एजेन्सी "वन निगम" के द्वारा बिना किसी वैज्ञानिक आधार पर किया जा रहा है। लकड़ी के लट्ठों को लुढ़काया जाता है जो भयंकर भू-क्षरण करता है। लकड़ी को मंडियों में ढो कर या तो नीलाम किया जाता है या एक अनुबन्ध के तेहत स्टार पेपर मिल, सहारनपुर को सस्ते दामों पर बेचा जाता है। समस्त कच्चा माल यहां से प्राप्त होने के बावजूद यहां के 1 प्रतिशत लोगों को भी इस मिल में रोजगार प्राप्त नहीं है। स्थानीय जनमानस इस करार के किये जाने के प्रारम्भिक दिनों से ही उद्वेलित रहा है। चूंकि वर्तमान करार की अवधि समाप्त हो रही है, अतः सरकार पुनः करार को न करे तथा इस रिजन में वनों के कटान पर पूर्ण प्रतिबन्ध लगाया जाय ताकि सारे देश के पर्यावरण व जलवायु सन्तुलन पर पड़ने वाले कुप्रभाव को रोका जा सके। बाढ़, सूखा, भू-क्षरण तथा सिल्टिंग के कुप्रभावों को नियन्त्रित किया जा सके।

वन-संरक्षण के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा विगत दिनों जो अधिनियम पारित किया गया है, वह उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार की एजेन्सीज के माध्यम से वनों के कटान पर रोक लगाने में असमर्थ है। इस अधिनियम का उपयोग स्थानीय सार्वजनिक विकास के कार्यों के क्रियान्वयन में व्यवधान पैदा करने के लिये किया जा रहा है। सड़क, भवन, पुल, पेयजल आदि निर्माण की योजनायें इस अधिनियम के कारण स्थगित हो गई हैं। स्थानीय जनता यदि एक खाली भूमि को मकान बनाने के लिये चाहती है तो स्थानीय अधिकारी इस अधिनियम का हवाला दे कर उन्हें इस अधिकार से वंचित कर रहे है। यह अधिनियम मात्र केन्द्र की सरकार की बदनामी का कारण बन कर रह गया है। अतः इस वर्तमान अधिनियम में उपरोक्त अवरोधों को दूर करने के लिये संशोधन आवश्यक है, अन्यथा स्थानीय जनता वनों के संवर्धन के प्रति और अधिक उदासीन हो जायगी।