

Sixteenth Series, Vol. X., No 34

Tuesday, May 12, 2015  
Vaisakha 22, 1937 (Saka)

# **LOK SABHA DEBATES**

**(English Version)**

**Fourth Session**

**(Sixteenth Lok Sabha)**



*(Vol. X contains Nos.31 to 35)*

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**

**NEW DELHI**

**© 2015 Lok Sabha Secretariat**

None of the material may be copied, reproduced, distributed, republished, downloaded, displayed, posted or transmitted in any form or by any means, including but not limited to, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of Lok Sabha Secretariat. However, the material can be displayed, copied, distributed and downloaded for personal, non-commercial use only, provided the material is not modified and all copyright and other proprietary notices contained in the material are retained.

---

“Disclaimer: The content of the 16th and 17th Lok Sabha Debates available on this website has been translated from the original text using Artificial Intelligence tools for reference purposes. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy, users are advised to refer to the official floor version of the Lok Sabha Debates available under the “Debates” weblink on the Lok Sabha website as the authoritative text.”

## CONTENTS

**Sixteenth Series, Vol. X, Fourth Session, 2015/1937 (Saka)**

**No. 34, Tuesday, May 12, 2015/Vaisakha 22, 1937 (Saka)**

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
<b>REFERENCE BY THE SPEAKER</b>	10
Reported death of about 24 persons and injuries to 30 others when a bus fell into a deep gorge	10
<b>PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE</b>	12
<b>MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA</b>	18
<b>AND</b>	
<b>BILL AS PASSED BY RAJYA SABHA</b>	
<b>STATEMENT BY MINISTER</b>	24
Cancellation of Shaktiman Mega Food Park, Amethi by the Ministry of Food Processing Industries	24
Shrimati Harsimrat Kaur Badal	24

**MOTION RE: CONCURRENCE IN  
RECOMMENDATION OF RAJYA SABHA  
RELATING TO WITHDRAWAL OF  
MOTOR VEHICLES (AMENDMENT) BILL,  
2014** 29

**SUBMISSION BY MEMBER** 53

Re: Clarification from the Government on 53  
financial irregularities mentioned in a CAG Report  
on loan secured by a sugar factory

**MOTION RE: SUSPENSION OF RULE 388** 108

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: 115  
DISAPPROVAL OF RIGHT TO FAIR  
COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN LAND ACQUISITION,  
REHABILITATION AND RESETTLEMENT  
(AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 2015**

**AND**

**RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND  
TRANSPARENCY IN LAND ACQUISITION,  
REHABILITATION AND RESETTLEMENT  
(AMENDMENT) SECOND BILL, 2015**

Motion to Consider	116
Shri Chaudhary Birender Singh	116
Shri C.N. Jayadevan	118
Shri Rahul Gandhi	138
Shri Dileep Singh Bhuria	144
Dr. P. Venugopal	156
Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay	160
Shri Balbhadra Manjhi	165
Shri Arvind Sawant	170
Shri Jayadev Galla	177
Shri N.K. Premachandran	179
Shri B. Vinod Kumar	185

Shri Mohammad Salim	187
Shri Mekapati Raja Mohan Reddy	195
Shri Tariq Anwar	198
Shri Jai Prakash Narayan Yadav	204
Shri Dharmendra Yadav	210
Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav	212
Shri Ranjit Singh Brahmmpura	215
Shri E.T. Mohammed Basheer	217
Shri Kaushalendra Kumar	218
Shri Raju Shetty	221
Adv. Joice George	225
Shri Jyotiradiya M. Scindia	227
Shri Asaduddin Owaisi	237
Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu	242
Statutory Resolution – Negatived	269

<b>MOTION RE: REFERENCE OF RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND RESETTLEMENT (AMENDMENT) SECOND BILL, 2015 TO JOINT COMMITTEE</b>	270
Adopted	275
<b>BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b>	203
19 <sup>th</sup> Report	203

**OFFICERS OF LOK SABHA**

**THE SPEAKER**

Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER**

Dr. M. Thambidurai

**PANEL OF CHAIRPERSONS**

Shri Arjun Charan Sethi

Shri Hukmdeo Narayan Yadav

Shri Anandrao Adsul

Shri Pralhad Joshi

Dr. Ratna De (Nag)

Shri Ramen Deka

Shri Konakalla Narayana Rao

Shri Hukum Singh

Shri K.H. Muniyappa

Dr. P. Venugopal

**SECRETARY GENERAL**

Shri Anoop Mishra

## LOK SABHA DEBATES

---

---

LOK SABHA

-----

Tuesday, May 12, 2015/Vaisakha 22, 1937 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[**HON. SPEAKER** *in the Chair*]

**REFERENCE BY THE SPEAKER**

**Reported death of about 24 persons and injuries  
to 30 others when a bus fell into a deep gorge**

*[Translation]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Hon. Members, about 24 persons are reported to have died and 30 others sustained injuries when a bus fell into a deep gorge in Marothi village of Udhampur district about 140 km from Jammu on 11 May, 2015.

The House expresses its profound sorrow on this tragic incident which has brought pain and suffering to the bereaved families and wishes speedy recovery to the injured.

The House will remain silent for some time in honour of the departed souls.

**11.01hrs**

*(The Members then stood in silence for short while)*

---

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Members, I have received notices of Adjournment Motion from Shri Mekapati Raja Mohan Reddy, Shri Deependra Hooda, Shri Jyotiraditya M. Scindia, Shri RaJiv Satav, Kumari Sushmita Dev, Shri S.P. Muddahanume Gowda, Dr. P. Venugopal and Shri Ravneet Singh. The matters, I know, are important enough, but they do not warrant interruption of Business of the Day. The matters can be raised through other opportunity which I will definitely give. I always give you the opportunity. I have, therefore, disallowed all the notices of Adjournment Motion. Shri Deependra Hooda, I will allow you after papers have been laid.

*...(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** I will allow you.

*...(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** I will allow you in Zero Hour.

*... (Interruptions)*

**11.02 hrs**

**PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE**

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now papers to be laid.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FORESTS AND CLIMATE CHANGE (SHRI PRAKASH JAVADEKAR):** I beg to lay on the Table:-

- (1) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Central Zoo Authority, New Delhi, for the year 2013-2014, alongwith Audited Accounts.
  - (ii) A copy of the Review (Hindi and English versions) by the Government of the working of the Central Zoo Authority, New Delhi, for the year 2013-2014.
- (2) Statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (1) above.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 2656/16/15]

**THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF POWER, MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COAL AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF NEW AND RENEWABLE ENERGY (SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL):** I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding (Hindi and English versions) between the North Eastern Electric Power Corporation Limited and the Ministry of Power for the year 2015-2016.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 2657/16/15]

**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):** On behalf of Shri Jayant Sinha, I beg to lay on the Table:-

(1) A copy of the Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India-Accounts of the Union Government (No. 1 of 2015)- Financial Audit for the year ended March, 2014 under Article 151(1) of the Constitution.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 2658/16/15]

(2) A copy each of the following papers (Hindi and English versions):-

(i) Finance Accounts of Union Government for the year 2013-2014.

(ii) Appropriation Accounts of Union Government (Civil) for the year 2013-2014.

(iii) Appropriation Accounts of Union Government-Defence Services for the year 2013-2014.

(iv) Appropriation Accounts of Union Government-Postal Services for the year 2013-2014.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 2659/16/15]

(3) A copy of the Central Bank of India (Officers') Service (Amendment) Regulations, 2010 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. CO:HRD:IRP:2014-15:702 in Gazette of India dated 11<sup>th</sup> December, 2014 under sub-section (4) of Section 19 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 2660/16/15]

(4) A copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under Section 53 of the Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority Act, 2013:-

- (i) The Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority (Subscriber Education and Protection Fund) Regulations, 2015 published in Notification No. PFRDA/12/RGL/139/1 in Gazette of India dated 27<sup>th</sup> January, 2015.
- (ii) The Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority (Procedure for inquiry by adjudicating Officer) Regulations, 2015 published in Notification

No.PFRDA/12/RGL/139/1 in Gazette of India dated 7<sup>th</sup> January, 2015.

- (iii) The Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority (Pension Advisory Committee Meetings) Regulations, 2015 published in Notification No. PFRDA/12/RGL/139/1 in Gazette of India dated 27<sup>th</sup> January, 2015.
- (iv) The Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority (Redressal of Subscriber Grievance) Regulations, 2015 published in Notification No. PFRDA/12/RGL/139/1 in Gazette of India dated 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2015
- (v) The Pension Fund Regulatory and Development Authority (Procedure for Authority Meetings) Regulations, 2015 published in Notification No. PFRDA/12/RGL/139/1 in Gazette of India dated 27<sup>th</sup> January, 2015.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 2661/16/15]

(5) A copy of the Prevention of Money-Laundering (Maintenance of Records) Amendment Rules, 2015 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 288(E) published in Gazette of India dated 15<sup>th</sup> April, 2015 under section 74 of the Money Laundering Act, 2002 together with an explanatory memorandum.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT 2662/16/15]

---

**11.03 hrs**

**MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA**

**AND**

**BILL AS PASSED BY RAJYA SABHA**

*[English]*

**SECRETARY GENERAL:** Madam Speaker, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary General of Rajya Sabha:-

- (i) ‘I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on Monday, the 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2015, adopted the following motion in regard to the Coal Mines (Special Provisions) Bill, 2014 which was passed by the Lok Sabha on the 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2014 and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2014:-

**MOTION**

“That leave be granted to withdraw the Bill to provide for allocation of coal mines and vesting of the right, title and interest in and over the land and mine infrastructure together

with mining leases to successful bidders and allottees with a view to ensure continuity in coal mining operations and production of coal, and for promoting optimum utilization of coal resources consistent with the requirement of the country in national interest and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto which was passed by the Lok Sabha on the 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2014 and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2014.”

2. Thereafter, the Bill was withdrawn.’

(ii) ‘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 following amendments made by the Lok Sabha in the Constitution (One Hundred and Nineteenth Amendment) Bill, 2013, at its sitting held on the 7<sup>th</sup> May, 2015, were taking into consideration and agreed to by the Rajya Sabha and the Bill, as amended by passed by the Lok Sabha, was passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2015, in accordance with the provisions of article 368 of the Constitution of India:-

### CLAUSE 3

1. That at page 2, line 22, for “Constitution (One Hundred and Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 2013”, substitute “Constitution (One Hundredth Amendment) Act, 2015”.
2. That at page 2, line 25 and 26, for “Constitution (One Hundred and Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 2013”, substitute “Constitution (One Hundredth Amendment) Act, 2015”.
3. That at page 2, line 30, for “Constitution (One Hundred and Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 2013”, substitute “Constitution (One Hundredth Amendment) Act, 2015”.
4. That at page 2, line 34, for “Constitution (One Hundred and Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 2013”, substitute “Constitution (One Hundredth Amendment) Act, 2015”.
5. That at page 2, line 39, for “Constitution (One Hundred and Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 2013”, substitute

“Constitution (One Hundredth Amendment) Act, 2015”.

6. That at page 2, line 43, “Constitution (One Hundred and Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 2013”, *substitute* “Constitution (One Hundredth Amendment) Act, 2015”.
  7. That at page 2, line 46, *for* “Constitution (One Hundred and Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 2013”, *substitute* “Constitution (One Hundredth Amendment) Act, 2015”.
-

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now Statement by Minister Shrimati Harsimrat Kaur Badal. If you want to lay it, you can do so.

*[Translation]*

**DR. KIRIT SOMAIYA (MUMBAI NORTH EAST):** Madam Speaker, with regard to the matter that I had raised, I have learnt that Shri Rahul Gandhi had inaugurated that park in October, 2013. ... *(Interruptions)* Shri Rahul Gandhi carried out an illegal inauguration. ... *(Interruptions)*

**11.04 hrs**

*At this stage, Shri Mekapati Rajamohan Reddy, Shri Jyotiraditya M. Scindia and some other Hon. Members came and stood on the floor near the Table.*

*... (Interruptions)*

**THE MINISTER OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (SHRIMATI HARSIMRAT KAUR BADAL):** Why do they not want to listen to the reply? ... *(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** You can lay it on the Table of the House.

... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**SHRIMATI HARSIMRAT KAUR BADAL:** Please listen to the reply. Why are you getting perturbed? ... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** If you want, you can lay it on the Table.

... (*Interruptions*)

**11.06 hrs**

**STATEMENT BY MINISTER**

**Cancellation of Shaktiman Mega Food Park, Amethi**

**by the Ministry of Food Processing Industries\***

**THE MINISTER OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (SHRIMATI HARSIMRAT KAUR BADAL):** The Ministry is implementing a Mega Food Park Scheme to create modern infrastructure for food processing sector in the country... (*Interruptions*). Under this Scheme, a Mega Food Park was granted and in-principle Approval was given on 24.09.2010 to M/s. Shaktiman Mega Food Park Private Limited for setting up a project at Jagdishpur now in district Amethi, Uttar Pradesh. As per the Scheme guidelines, the promoter of the park was required to submit a Detailed Project Report (DPR) of the project with possession of minimum 50 acres of land in the name of promoter company within six months from the date of issue of in-principle approval... (*Interruptions*). The promoter submitted its DPR of the project on 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2011 which was appraised by professional Programme Management Agency appointed by the Ministry under the Scheme. The appraisal of the

---

\* Placed in Library, See No. LT2663/16/15.

DPR revealed that the promoter company was not in possession of required minimum 50 acre of land along with permission to set up the Mega Food Park Project. ... (*Interruptions*). The promoter company, therefore, granted extension several times to enable it to complete the pre-conditions for final approval. The last extension was granted up to 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2014 to the promoter to meet the pre-conditions for final approval as per the scheme guideline. ... (*Interruptions*)

The promoter company proposed to acquire land for the project from M/s. Indo-Gulf Fertilizers Limited, a fully owned subsidiary of M/s. ditya Birla Nuva Limited. The said land was a portion of 800 acres of land allotted to M/s. Indo-Gulf Fertilizers Limited by Uttar Pradesh State Industrial Development Corporation (UPSIDC) on a long lease exclusively for the purpose of setting up fertilizer production facility. ... (*Interruptions*). Therefore, UPSIDC's permission was required for M/s. Indo-Gulf Fertilizer Limited for subleasing this land to Mega Food Park Promoter company with conversion of land use for setting up of Mega Food Park on this land. Permission of UPSIDC was also required for further subleasing of plots by the promoter company to prospective food processing units which would come up in the Mega Food Park. UPSIDC informed *vide* letter dated 19.07.2012 that permission to sublet the land by M/s.

Indo-Gulf Fertilizers Limited has been approved and they have been asked to complete the necessary formalities. ... (*Interruptions*). The permission to sublet the land was subject to payment of lease rentals as per the revised rates and completion of the formalities as required according to UPSIDC's bye-laws. However, the promoter company could not complete the formality of acquiring of the requisite land in its name. Therefore, the SPV was issued a show cause notice on 8.10.2012 asking it to explain as to why in-principle approval accorded to the project would not be revoked for failing to meet the prescribed pre-conditions for final approval as per the scheme guidelines. ... (*Interruptions*)

In response to show cause notice, the promoter company apprised that apart from the land issue which need to be resolved, they have also applied to the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for allotment of gas at an administered price for setting up a captive power plant in the Mega Food Park which is necessary to supply uninterrupted power and which is a pre-requisite for the success of the Mega Food park. ... (*Interruptions*)

The Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas *vide* their letter dated 18.12.2012 communicated that considering the acute shortage of domestic gas in the country and lowest priority accorded to captive

power plant for allocation of any domestic gas, it would not be possible to allocate domestic gas for the proposed mega food park. ... (*Interruptions*) However, supply of imported LNG through GAIL for meeting the requirement of captive power plant could be feasible. This was communicated by the Ministry of Food Processing Industries to the promoter company on 2.01.2013. However, the promoter company *vide* their letter dated 16.01.2013 informed the Ministry that using imported LNG for captive power generation would be totally uneconomical and would therefore make the project financially unviable. The promoter company also conveyed that they cannot go ahead without domestic natural gas being allotted to them for captive power plant at the administered price. ... (*Interruptions*)

The progress of the project was reviewed in the Ministry on 9.06.2014. During the review meeting, the representative of the promoter company informed that without supply of the gas to the project at administered price, the promoter company would not consider the project to be viable. In the absence of availability of gas at the administered price, the promoter company expressed its inability to pursue the project. ... (*Interruptions*)

The promoter company *vide* their letter 26.06.2014 informed that it is yet to acquire the required land as changes in UPSIDC guidelines

for subleasing was still under consideration. The promoter company requested for further extension of time till 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2014....

*(Interruptions)*

The matter of inordinate delay in meeting the necessary pre-conditions for Final Approval by the promoter company was considered by the Inter Ministerial Approval Committee (IMAC) chaired by Secretary, Food Processing Industries on 30.06.2014....

*(Interruptions)* In view of inordinate delay by the promoter company in meeting, these pre-conditions for final approval, the in-principle approval accorded to the project by the Ministry was cancelled. The decision of the cancellation was conveyed to the promoter company on 11.07.2014. ... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Only the Minister's statement will go on record. Please take your seats.

... *(Interruptions)*\*

---

\* Not recorded.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Nothing will go on record. Please go back to your seats.

... *(Interruptions)*... \*

---

**11.15 hrs**

*[English]*

**MOTION RE: CONCURRENCE IN RECOMMENDATION  
OF RAJYA SABHA RELATING TO WITHDRAWAL OF  
MOTOR VEHICLES (AMENDMENT) BILL,2014**

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ROAD  
TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS AND MINISTER OF STATE  
IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING (SHRI PON  
RADHAKRISHNAN):** On behalf of my senior colleague Shri Nitin  
Gadkari, I beg to move:

---

\* Not recorded.

“That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Rajya Sabha that the Lok Sabha do agree to leave being granted by the Rajya Sabha to withdraw the Bill further to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 which was passed by the Lok Sabha on the 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2014 and laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on the 19<sup>th</sup> December, 2014.”

**HON. SPEKAER:** The question is:

“That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Rajya Sabha that the Lok Sabha do agree to leave being granted by the Rajya Sabha to withdraw the Bill further to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 which was passed by the Lok Sabha on the 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2014 and laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on the 19<sup>th</sup> December, 2014.”

*The motion was adopted.*

---

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now, 'Zero Hour.'

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please go back to your seats. I will allow you.

... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE (GULBARGA):** Where is the rule? This is the third time that she is responding. ... (*Interruptions*)

Nobody is following the rule. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** I will allow you. You please go back to your seats. Now, 'Zero Hour.'

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** What is this? No placards can be shown. You have to go back to your seats. Nothing can be done like this.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** The House stands adjourned up to 11.30 a.m.

**11.17 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Thirty Minutes  
past Eleven of the Clock.*

---

**11.30 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past  
Eleven of the Clock.*

(Hon. Speaker *in the Chair*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now, we take up `Zero Hour`.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE (GULBARGA):** Madam Speaker, the statement made by the Minister is known to you and to all of us. The issue relating to the Amethi Food Park has been discussed here three times. On one occasion, Shri Kirit Somaiya raised the matter during Zero Hour, and at that very time, the Minister of Food Processing Industries replied. Thereafter, the Home Minister also spoke on the matter. Despite this, *[English]* everyday, this statement is coming. I want to know as to how it is repeated and under what rule ... *(Interruptions)* You have got full powers. You should use your power judiciously. This is what I want to say ... *(Interruptions)* Just because there are powers, one should not give permission repeatedly. We are raising this issue ... *(Interruptions)* I am ready to take any... *(Interruptions)* You punish me. You remove from the

Membership. I am ready ... (*Interruptions*) I am ready to face any action. ... (*Interruptions*) I am ready to go. I am ready to vacate my seat but injustice should not be tolerated.

[*Translation*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** Kharge Ji, please speak to me. I am listening to you.

...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE:** Injustice cannot be tolerated like this. We are patiently hearing. It does not mean that five times in this House it is repeatedly raised. ... (*Interruptions*) It is allowed just to defame. ... (*Interruptions*) Then, Madam, you do one thing. You take up this issue for discussion tomorrow. We all will participate. We would know how many Food Parks are there, in what manner. Let us see ... (*Interruptions*) If everybody requests you, you allow them. But when we request you, you reject our request. Then, what should I say? When we gave Adjournment Motion, you did not give us time. But you asked the concerned Minister. This is not good. This is not fair. We are very much hurt, Madam. We cannot tolerate such things.

[*Translation*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** Kharge Ji, please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Kharge Ji, now please listen to me.

...(Interruptions)

**THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT; MINISTER OF HOUSING AND URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION; AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU):** Do not issue such threats. ... (*Interruptions*)

Do not issue threats to the Chairperson in this manner. ...

(*Interruptions*) The issue was raised by the Congress side, and it is the

same issue to which the Hon. Minister has replied today. You had raised the issue, and the reply has been given to that very issue. Do

not threaten anyone like this. It is not appropriate. ... (*Interruptions*)

Please calm down. ... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** Hon. Members, please take your seats.

[*Translation*]

Please calm down. Deepender Ji, you too please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

**SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU:** Your leader has already spoken. Now please take your seat. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** You have said something about me. If you are angry, would you like to listen to me or not? I can understand. You may be angry or whatever it is, but why has it happened and what has happened. You have directly said something to me, not to me as Sumitra Mahajan, but to the Chair. You have said something to the Chair. Why is the Chair allowing this?

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Kharge Ji, please also have a little patience to listen now. I will explain to you.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please take your seat. I will explain everything one by one. The first point is that Hon. Rahul Gandhi had raised a matter. One thing that is being repeatedly said is that adjournment motions are given and time is not allowed for them. After the adjournment motions are disallowed, today I am compelled to say all this because I have everything recorded in writing. If you want, I will give you the records. At all times, even if it was during Zero Hour, I have given your Members, whoever submitted adjournment motions,

an opportunity to speak. Many a time, the adjournment motion was so routine that it could have been raised every day during Zero Hour or through some other method. Still, I have given time. Sometimes, even when the adjournment motion did not come on time, I still allowed Members to speak. Kharge Ji, I have the records in writing, contrary to what you have said that I do not give time.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please take your seat and kindly listen to me. Kharge Ji, please do not speak while seated. Kindly calm down a little. Please do not be so angry. The second point is that even yesterday, I had stated that I would allow Deepender Hooda Ji to speak on his adjournment motion, and I do keep allowing Members to speak. It is not that I do not allow Members to speak. You may verify the record yourselves.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please take your seat. This is not the proper way. As far as today's statement is concerned, one point is that when a Minister submits something to me in writing and a written statement comes before me...

...(Interruptions)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please listen first. If you only want to keep questioning me, then, if you do not want me as Speaker, I have nothing to say. But such repeated interruptions should not take place. Please take your seat.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Deepender Ji, please listen first. That is not the case.

... (*Interruptions*)

**[English]**

**HON. SPEAKER:** Nothing will go on record. Now I have to say these.

...(*Interruptions*)\*

**HON. SPEAKER:** I have nothing to say. If you want to go to 'Zero Hour', we can take up that. [*Translation*] As regards the statement that I am referring to, when Hon. Rahul Ji had raised this issue, at that time, perhaps I do not clearly recall whether the Home Minister had stated that the matter would be explained. When the issue was raised

---

\* Not recorded.

again the next day, Kirit Ji once again raised certain points. At that time, the Hon. Minister said that she would explain the matter, but some inappropriate words were uttered by her, there was commotion, and her statement remained incomplete. She later came to me and informed me that she could not place the complete facts before the House at that time. If you read her statement today, it is a comprehensive statement containing full facts and figures. That is why I allowed her to make the statement. If you examine it, you will find that it contains only the complete facts and figures, and therefore I allowed it. Now we shall take up Zero Hour.

Shri Rajamohan Reddy.

... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** What is the rule, is there any rule in zero hour?

... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA (ROHTAK):** Madam Speaker, I want to raise a point of order. Please allow me. ...  
(*Interruptions*)

*[Translation]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** All right, Deepender Ji, you may speak, although this is not normally done.

*[English]*

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA:** Madam, first of all, you are saying it is 'Zero Hour'. It is not 'Zero Hour'. It is listed business which has come in the List of Business last evening. That is number one.

*[Translation]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Zero Hour is not mentioned in the List of Business.

*[English]*

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA:** The point that I am referring to is Rule 356.

**HON. SPEAKER:** No.

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA:** Rule 356 says

“The Speaker, after having called the attention of the House to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance or in tedious repetition”

Madam, this has been repeated not once, twice, thrice, four times but five times. The same day when Rahul *ji* raised this matter, the Minister responded. Then, Kirit Somaiya *ji* was allowed to raise this matter; the Minister responded. Again, Rajnath Singh *ji* had given a promise. This is the fifth time the Government is responding. Is this not repetition? We say once; they say five times. You are allowing their arguments. This is not natural justice. This is not democracy. Our voice cannot be muzzled; our voice has to be heard. You cannot allow repetition. As per the statute, you cannot allow repetition. As per Rule 356, you cannot allow repetition. That is why the Rules are there. You cannot allow the Government to voice their opinion five times in the hope that that will shut our voice. ... (*Interruptions*)

She is also wrong on facts. Madam, you allow a discussion. We will bring out our facts. They cancelled the food park. Now they are resorting to arguments; five times they made their arguments. This is not acceptable. ... (*Interruptions*)

Our humble submission to you, Madam, it is you, it is your Chair who has allowed her to make this argument fifth time. It is your Chair who has allowed them to make this argument fifth time. That is our

contention. It is not a personal aspersion on you ...\* That is our contention. ... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**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):** Madam, the Government has the right to place the truth before the House. ... (*Interruptions*) If the Government has the right to place the truth, then there must certainly be the capacity to listen. ... (*Interruptions*)

**THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI RAJNATH SINGH):** Madam Speaker, when Shri Rahul Gandhi Ji raised the issue of the Food Park, which falls under Amethi, I stood up in the House and assured that I would personally provide him with information on the matter. Immediately after giving that assurance, I spoke to the Minister of Food Processing Industries, Shrimati Harsimrat Ji, and obtained complete information in this regard. She gave me the detailed information. On the very day on which I had

---

\* Expunged as ordered by the Chair

given the assurance, I made that information available to Shri Rahul Gandhi Ji and sent it to his residence. I had fulfilled the assurance that I had given. I fail to understand why there should be any objection if a Minister provides information on a matter raised by a Member in the House not once but twice. This is beyond our understanding. We are unable to comprehend this. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please take your seats.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Deepender Ji, please take your seat. Please all of you take your seats.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** I am being addressed. Please take your seats. Deepender Hooda Ji, you have raised Rule 356. One thing you have stated incorrectly is that there is nothing like five or six times.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please listen to me. I have listened to you fully, and it is also your duty to listen to me in full. If we see the record, and if I am not mistaken, Hon. Rahul Ji had raised this matter in the House on 7 May. As Shri Rajnath Singh Ji has stated, at that time Shrimati Harsimrat Kaur Ji did not say anything.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** It is on record that she did not speak at that time.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** At that time, the Hon. Minister did not speak.

[*English*] He himself is saying 'No'.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now, we will have to see the records.

... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** Rahul Ji is also saying that she did not speak. The second point is that thereafter, perhaps on the 8th, when Kirit Somaiya Ji raised certain matters, he spoke about bringing a privilege motion. I had told him that privilege cannot be raised in the House in that manner. At that point, Harsimrat Ji said that she would like to speak on the matter. Therefore, when she began speaking, some inappropriate words were uttered by her, upon which I immediately stated that this would not go on record. Thereafter, due to the manner in which there was commotion, her statement remained incomplete. That day, Harsimrat Ji spoke only for the first time. Subsequently,

since her statement remained incomplete and the details could not go on record, she immediately wrote a letter to me and, in her capacity as a Minister, submitted a complete statement to me regarding the entire Food Park, stating that her full explanation in respect of the Food Park could not be given on that day and therefore she wanted to make a statement on the matter. I received her letter yesterday. However, nothing could be done in the House yesterday at that time, so I told her to take it up the next day and that I would allow her. If a Minister wishes to make a statement, we allow it. I myself have read the entire statement. It contains a complete explanation of what happened at each stage with regard to the Food Park. I have personally seen it, and you will also get to see the statement. Therefore, today, that is, actually, it is the second time and not the fifth time. Please understand this. You may check the record.

... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please go through the records.

... (*Interruptions*)

*[Translation]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now, the second point is that today she has placed her statement for the second time. Please read that statement and thereafter, if you say anything further, then I will also have to say something, because if it is not on record that Shrimati Harsimrat Kaur made the statement five times, then will you apologise?

*...(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please do not do that.

*...(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** No such thing has happened.

*... (Interruptions)*

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now, Shri M. Raja Mohan Reddy.

*... (Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Are you challenging me? First you go through the records and then come to me. I am sorry.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** First you go through the records and then come to me.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** This is not fair. Please sit down.

... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU:** Madam, this is not the Speaker's personal issue. It is the issue of the House. If my friend Shri Deepender Hooda has quoted Rule 356 then, he must reMember that everyday. ... (*Interruptions*) I am appealing to the Chair. Why do you bother? Please sit down.... (*Interruptions*) I am speaking with the permission of the Chair. Nobody should challenge the Hon. Speaker. Nobody can enter into an argument.... (*Interruptions*) Please expunge what he has said.... (*Interruptions*) He has questioned the Hon. Speaker.... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Deependerji, now, what do you want to say? Please, go on.

... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA:** Madam, three times, she has spoken on the same subject and twice Dr. Kirit Somaiyaji has spoken.... (*Interruptions*) In total, we have had five interventions on the subject from the Treasury Benches. ... (*Interruptions*) All the Ministers are allowed to make two statements on a subject. Give me one example.... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** It is not the issue. You are also saying something everyday. Five times or ten times it happens. Please sit down.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now, Shri M. Raja Mohan Reddy.

... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU:** Madam, it is not accepted at all. It is not the personal question of the Hon. Speaker. It is the question of the House. No Member can question the Hon. Speaker.

... (*Interruptions*) No Member can challenge the Hon. Speaker as per the rules and he is quoting the rules. ... (*Interruptions*) Then, we have to think about it. ... (*Interruptions*)

**THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI ANANTHKUMAR):** Madam, whatever Mr. Hooda said should be expunged.

**HON. SPEAKER:** We will see to it. Now, what to do?

*... (Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 12 p.m.

**11.50 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till*

*Twelve of the Clock.*

---

**12.02 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha reassembled at Two Minutes past Twelve of the  
Clock.*

(Hon. Speaker *in the Chair*)

... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA (ROHTAK):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, the issue that we raised and, while raising it, if any words were used in a manner touching upon the Chair, the Speaker, the decision of the Hon. Speaker of the Lok Sabha or your dignity, that was neither my intention nor my **भावना**. Our intention was to question the decision of the Government as to why the Government is repeatedly bringing this matter before the House, reiterating its position again and again, while our views are not being heard. However, as far as your decision, your dignity, and the authority of your office and the Chair are concerned, it was neither my intention nor my feeling to say anything of that nature. In the past ten years in this House, to the best of my understanding, I have never said anything like this. Nevertheless, if today anything of that sort has been said, I, on my part, express my deep regret for it. ... (*Interruptions*)

*[English]*

**SHRI MEKAPATI RAJA MOHAN REDDY (NELLORE):**

Madam Speaker, at the time of bifurcation of the State of Andhra Pradesh, a promise was made on the floor of the Rajya Sabha by the then Prime Minister Sir of India, Dr. Manmohan Singhji that a Special Category Status would be given to the residuary State of Andhra Pradesh. At that time, the principal Opposition Party, BJP, not only supported that suggestion but they also demanded the Special Category Status for 10 years. Not only that, Madam, BJP leaders went on telling us: “Definitely, we are coming to power. Once we come to power, we will give the Status of Special Category to Andhra Pradesh for 10 years.” Now, they have come to power but they are not able to give special status to Andhra Pradesh for the last one year.

Madam, the State of Andhra Pradesh has been divided very unscientifically without addressing the problems that would arise after the bifurcation of the State in the both the States that is in the State of Telangana and in Andhra Pradesh.

Unfortunately, the special status category was not stipulated in the Bill. The people of Andhra Pradesh are eagerly waiting. The special category status should be given to the State. Then only, the State could

develop and able to come out of the financial problems. Now, the main national parties both Congress and BJP have given their word on the floor of the Rajya Sabha and it is not proper to go back on that word. Actually, the State of Andhra Pradesh is facing financial crisis. The financial deficit is around Rs. 16,000 crore. The State has to develop the Capital and many more things have to be done in the State of Andhra Pradesh.

Once Andhra was the most progressive State and now it has become the most backward State. So, I would request the Government of India to keep up the promises and to have the sanctity and to preserve the democratic values of Parliament. They should keep up their word and should declare the special status category for ten years.

I urge upon the Government of India to declare it immediately. There is a lot of resentment in the people of Andhra Pradesh. I earnestly request the Government of India to declare it immediately.

**SHRI JAYADEV GALLA (GUNTUR):** Thank you Madam for giving us the opportunity to speak on this subject.

Madam, as Hon. Member Mr. Reddy pointed out that it has been a year now since the Government is in power, we have been meeting

the Home Minister, we have been meeting the Finance Minister and we have met the Prime Minister Sir also on this subject.

One thing that this House needs to recognize is that the issue of this bifurcation is only one year old but the crisis in our State has been going on for more than a decade. The issue of bifurcation whether it should happen or not for almost ten years, the entire State was disrupted and now if we have to rebuild a State from scratch with deficit budget, we need clarity. We need to know what we are going to get. We need to know when we are going to get and we need to know how we are going to get it. If you are not able to provide that today itself, please let us know when we are going to get these concessions which both parties Congress and BJP has promised. We asked for clarity. Please provide us with clarity.

**12.08 hrs**

**SUBMISSION BY MEMBER**

**Re: Clarification from the Government on financial irregularities mentioned in a CAG Report on loan secured by a sugar factory**

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA (ROHTAK):** Thank you Madam Speaker for allowing us this opportunity to raise a very important matter which has been brought to light by a CAG Report No. 12 of 2005. This report has unearthed certain serious financial irregularities. ... (*Interruptions*)

*[Translation]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Deepender Ji, please state your point. Do not speak amongst yourselves.

... (*Interruptions*)

*[English]*

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA:** Madam, yesterday, Nishikant Ji was saying there is no point of order in the 'Zero Hour'. Madam has allowed me and permitted to raise this matter.

... (*Interruptions*)

Madam, the CAG in the Report 12 of 20015 has pointed two serious financial irregularities done by Purthi Group. The Group in March, 2002 received a loan of Rs. 84.12 crore from IRDA which Indian Renewable Energy Development Agency. This is a company fully owned by the Government of India, Ministry of Renewable Energy. The principal amount was for Rs. 46 crore and interest amount was Rs. 34 Crore from IRDA towards construction of a 22 Megawatt bagasse based power plant in Nagpur. Eventually, this project was declared as a non-performing asset in 2007. The CAG Report points out certain financial irregularities. Let me point those out.

[*Translation*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** Long speeches are not made during Zero Hour.

... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA:** Madam, I will be very short.No. 1, in 2002, 50 percent of the loan was reimbursed as opposed to 25 percent which is the norm. This is an irregularity not just by the Purthi Limited but by the Government of India in 2002-03 because the

IRDA was fully owned by the Government of India. ... *(Interruptions)*  
Madam, between 2002-03 and 2006, Perti became financially unstable and defaulted ... *(Interruptions)* Yes, IRDA, Government of India in 2003 decided to look the other way, and eventually Perti had become an NPA.

*[Translation]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** You have raised the issue. That is over now.

... *(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA:** Finally, I have two more points.

**HON. SPEAKER:** No two more points.

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA:** In 2003, the Ministry of Renewable Energy gave intra-subsidy towards the bagasse renewable energy project but this intra-subsidy continued till 2009. ...  
*(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** You can ask clarification.

**SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA:** Perti used this towards a 100 percent coal-based power plant but the subsidy was given for a

renewable energy project. They were using it for a coal-based project.... *(Interruptions)* Eventually, this led to a loss of Rs.12.7 crore to the public exchequer. There is a loss of Rs.12.7 crore of public money.... *(Interruptions)*

So, Madam, through you, my demand is, we want to ask that the BJP has always held the C&AG Report as sacrosanct. They had asked for resignation from us. They had asked for resignation from our Prime Minister Sir based on C&AG Report. Now what is their stand? We want to know that. Are they sticking to their same stand? We have not put a demand. Our demand is that the Government has to look into this matter to conduct a probe, to have the C&AG report. ... *(Interruptions)* Till the probe is done to find out the truth, the Minister concerned should relinquish his position. ... *(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Dr. Prabhas Kumar Singh.

*[English]*

Shri Md. Badaruddoza Khan is allowed to associate with the matter raised by Shri Deepender Singh Hooda.

Prabhas Kumar Singh ji, wait a minute.

...(*Interruptions*)

*[Translation]*

**THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT, MINISTER OF HOUSING AND URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU):** Madam Speaker, under Rule 241, you granted permission. You have the authority and therefore you allowed it. I only wish to state that *[English]* this is a normal C&AG report which goes to the PAC. It goes to the PAC. The PAC will examine it. That is the procedure of parliament. That is known to everybody.

Secondly, it has happened during the earlier Government, not during this Government. Thirdly, there is no personal involvement of any person. So, how can they attribute motives to anybody?

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** He has not mentioned any name.

**SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU:** Yes, fourthly, everything is done as per the rules. What has been given to others has been given to this company also. There is no wrong doing that has been done.

... (*Interruptions*)

---

[*Translation*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** There is no discussion on this. Please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Dr. Prabhas Kumar Singh.

...(Interruptions)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Only your statement will go on record.

... (*Interruptions*)...\*

[*English*]

**HON. SPEAKER:** Nothing will go on record except the speech of Dr. Prabhas Kumar Singh.

(*Interruptions*)...\*

**DR. PRABHAS KUMAR SINGH (BARGARH):** Madam, thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak in this 'Zero Hour'.

This year's Rath Yatra of Lord Jagannath, Balabhadra and Subhadra at Puri, Odisha falls on 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2015 and also this year the Nabakalebara festival is going to be held after a gap of 19 years.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Every now and then you cannot force it. Please sit down. When an opportunity is given, then speak. For the present, please take your seat.

... (*Interruptions*)

---

\* Not recorded.

**DR. PRABHAS KUMAR SINGH:** On this auspicious occasion, there is a proposal for releasing a ‘Commemorative Stamp’ depicting the rich cultural heritage of Lord Jagannath Cult. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** No, I will not allow.

**DR. PRABHAS KUMAR SINGH:** The Government of Odisha has already intimated it to the Department of Posts (Odisha Circle) accordingly along with the logo of Nabakalebara and other related information.

Therefore, I would like to urge upon the Union Government to pass necessary orders for early release of the commemorative stamp as the festival will be celebrated on 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2015.... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Yes, the Minister is ready. He will come but not now. Please sit down. Nothing is going on record.

... (*Interruptions*)...\*

**HON. SPEAKER:** No, I am sorry.

**DR. PRABHAS KUMAR SINGH:** It will be appropriate if the stamp is released on an appropriate day before that, suiting to the rituals of the Lord.

---

\* Not recorded

Our Hon. Chief Minister has already requested the Hon. Union Minister of IT and Telecommunication to take steps for release of the commemorative stamp on the occasion of Lord Jagannath. Thank you, Madam. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Bhairon Prasad Mishra is allowed to associate with the matter raised by Dr. Prabhas Kumar Singh.

Now Shri Vinayak Bhaurao Raut.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Nothing is going on record except the speech of Shri Vinayak Bhaurao Raut.

... (*Interruptions*)...\*

[*Translation*]

**SHRI VINAYAK BHAURAO RAUT (RATNAGIRI-SINDHUDURG):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, during Zero Hour, through you, I would like to request the Government that across the country, in at least three and a half lakh post offices, nearly three and a half lakh employees have been working on a temporary basis for several years. These three and a half lakh employees have rendered service for at least 30 to 35 years. They are not being paid salaries in accordance with Government rules. No Government service benefits

or facilities have been made available to them. Whatever benefits they should have received through the Government have not been given to them till date. Even after rendering service for decades, when they retire, they do not receive pension or gratuity. Through you, I would like to request the Government to show sympathy towards post office employees who have been working for 30 to 35 years in India and to provide a secure future to those employees working on a temporary basis. Kindly consider how, through the Union Government, orders can be issued to regularise their services.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Nishikant Dubey, Kumari Shobha Karandlaje, Shrimati Meenakashi Lekhi, Shrimati Santosh Ahlawat, Shrimati Riti Pathak, Shri Prahlad Singh Patel, Shri P.P. Chaudhary, Shri Arvind Sawant, Shri Rajan Vichare, Shri Ram Mohan Naidu Kinjarapu and Shri Gajendra Singh Shekhawat are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Vinayak Bhaurao Raut.

**DR. MAHENDRA NATH PANDEY (CHANDAULI):** Madam Speaker, thank you very much for giving me an opportunity during Zero Hour to raise an issue of public importance. Varanasi is a major sacred centre of the flow of the River Ganga. ... (*Interruptions*) Those who are making noise should remember that when their Government was in power, it was their own leader who initiated the campaign for

freeing the Ganga from pollution there. For a sewage treatment plant in Varanasi, 50 acres of farmers' land were acquired at Dinapur. ...

*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** If you want the Minister to reply, he has assured me that he is ready to give his statement. So, let him come. That time, he will give the statement.

... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** He is ready to give the statement, but not now. Let him come.

... *(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

**DR. MAHENDRA NATH PANDEY:** In the year 1995, the farmers received only 25 per cent compensation. Since 1986, 50 farmers have been affected by this. The Uttar Pradesh construction agency, the Jal Nigam, which was responsible for the treatment plant work, ... *(Interruptions)* this is an issue concerning the Ganga, kindly give me two minutes. To this day, they have not paid compensation to the farmers. ... *(Interruptions)* The farmers approached the District Court. The District Court delivered a verdict in favour of the farmers. The

Jal Nigam went to the High Court against them. The High Court also gave its judgment in favour of the farmers. ... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE (GULBARGA):** Since the Government is not responding, we would walk out. ... (*Interruptions*)

**12.17 hrs**

*(At this stage, Shri Mallikarjun Kharge, Shri P. Karunakaran and some other Hon. Members left the House.)*

[*Translation*]

**DR. MAHENDRA NATH PANDEY:** Thereafter, instead of paying compensation, the Jal Nigam approached the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court again remanded the matter to the District Court for revision. The District Court once again decided the case in favour of the farmers. On 23 March, the High Court again delivered its judgment in favour of the farmers. The farmers have been fighting for 35 to 36 years. Out of them, 17 farmers have passed away, and some have become incapable of pursuing litigation due to poverty and hunger. On 23 March, the Allahabad High Court again delivered a judgment in favour of the farmers affected over 50 acres of land in Dinapur village of Varanasi. However, instead of paying

compensation, the Jal Nigam unit at Varanasi is preparing to approach the Supreme Court again after 36 years. I am placing before the present Government a small example of how officers of the Jal Nigam in Uttar Pradesh function. Roads across the entire city of Banaras have been dug up and underground pipelines have been laid, but not a single connection point has been identified as to where the pipes will be connected in the lanes. The same Jal Nigam, which is spending project funds on distributing salaries, is not paying compensation to the farmers. In Dinapur of Shivpur Assembly segment in Chandauli Parliamentary constituency, farmers are sitting on a dharna. Through you, I demand that their dues be paid. They are only pleading for mercy that compensation be paid at the current rates and employment be provided, in whose favour the High Court has delivered its judgment for the third time. Justice must be done to them so that the second phase of Namami Gange, which is a major project of our Hon. Prime Minister, can be initiated and the campaign for the purity and cleanliness of the Ganga can take concrete shape and be realised. This is my humble submission through you. Thank you.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Bhairon Prasad Mishra, Shri Nishikant Dubey, Dr. Kirit P. Solanki and Shri Ajay Misra Teni are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Dr. Mahendra Nath Pandey.

*[English]*

Shri Babulal Choudhary – not present.

**SHRI RAM PRASAD SARMAH (TEZPUR):** Thank you, Madam. I want to raise a grave issue in respect of blood banks in the country. According to the World Health Organisation, the requirement of blood in the country is 12 million units per year whereas we get only 10 million units per year. The Northeast, particularly Assam is the most sufferer because we do not get blood in time and patients do suffer. Even donors are not properly tested there. There are no proper blood banks created in Assam in the North-East. There is a dearth of blood banks as well as blood donors. The young people, who want to donate blood, should be encouraged through print media, electronic media and hoardings so that we get sufficient units of blood to meet the requirements of patients undergoing treatment in the North-East India.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Nishikant Dubey, Shri Virender Kashyap and Dr. Kirit P. Solanki are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Ram Prasad Sarmah.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI JITENDRA CHAUDHURY (TRIPURA EAST):** Madam Speaker, I have a small issue to raise. In Kalyan Nagar under the Baroda Municipal Corporation, 781 minority families were assured that, under a municipal project, they would be rehabilitated at another location.

*[English]*

Now, at Sayajipura, under the JNNURM, a housing complex has been constructed, but these people, who are all belonging to the Muslim community, are not being given the possession thereof in the name of the law and order situation and other things. Hon. Urban Development Minister is here. I would request him to intervene in this matter. There are 481 families, altogether 2,500 people, and their children are scattered and not getting opportunities to get admission in the schools. Their livelihood has been very much disturbed. These people should be given immediate attention so that they are given the chance to occupy the housing complex constructed by the Municipal Corporation. All other facilities, which are to be provided, should also be extended to them.

It is very unfortunate that on the plea that they belong to the Muslim community, the religious minority, the Municipal Corporation authorities are not giving them the possession. ... *(Interruptions)* this is happening.so,i am requesting. My submission is that acomodation is not being given due to the mafia people of real estate.

This is very unfortunate that it is happening in the State of our Hon. Prime Minister Sir. It should not happen. So, I am drawing the attention of the House and the Hon. Urban Development Minister to this issue.

Thank you.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri K.C. Venugopal. You have already raised this issue. Again, you want to raise it.

**SHRI K.C. VENUGOPAL (ALAPPUZHA):** Madam, this is another thing.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Okay.

... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI K.C. VENUGOPAL:** Madam, I thank you very much. I would like to raise one important point in connection with the suicide incident which happened at the SAI Hostel in Allapuzha.

It is exposed that there is lack of infrastructure facilities and counselling centres in the institutions and the hostels meant for sportspersons. In the unfortunate incident at SAI Hostel in Allapuzha, one female athlete has already passed away. Aparna lost her life and three other students were admitted in the hospital where they still are in a serious condition.

In connection with the incident, the Director-General of SAI visited Allapuzha. I was also there on Saturday. I visited the athletes' hostel and medical college hospital. The Government has already declared some compensation and also distributed it. There is a demand for giving job to a Member of the deceased's family. I am taking it up with the Government to do such things. The police have been enquiring the case.

The incident has shed the light on the pitiable condition of our sports hostels. SAI, being an apex training centre for our emerging athletes in the country, has contributed much to the development of sporting activities in the country. However, many of the sports hostels lack basic infrastructure facilities, which is a serious concern. The athletes going through vigorous training in these training centres, also undergo a lot of mental agony and tensions. It has to be noted that a

successful athlete should be healthy both in mind and body. A distressed mind cannot produce an accomplished athlete.

It is highly painful to note that in many of the sports hostels in the country, particularly, in SAI hostels including in Alappuzha, no counselling opportunities are created. It puts the students under extreme mental tension, and they cannot bear the hardships on many occasions. This lack of counselling has led them to take extreme steps like committing suicide like the one that happened in SAI Hostel, Alappuzha.

Moreover, these hostels also lack basic equipment and other infrastructural facilities. It is shameful to note that the SAI Training Centre in Alappuzha, despite the fact that it has produced National and State-level champions, lack major sports equipment and facilities. The Centre in Alappuzha that is focusing on water sports activities should be equipped with necessary facilities. Furthermore, I would request the Government to take steps to make SAI Centre in Alappuzha as a Centre of Alappuzha.

Madam, the other day also we had raised this issue. We seek a response from the Government because it is a very serious incident.

So far, the Government has not responded to it. Therefore, I am requesting a response from the Government also on this issue.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri M.B. Rajesh, Shrimati P.K. Shreemathi Teacher, Shri P.K. Biju and Shrimati Kavitha Kalvakuntla are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri K.C. Venugopal.

**CHOUDHARY MEHBOOB ALI KAISER (KHAGARIA):** Madam, I am grateful to you for allowing me to raise an important issue regarding my Constituency and indeed probably the whole State of Bihar.

*[Translation]*

In my Parliamentary constituency of Khagaria, for the past several years, works under the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana were allotted to NDCC. NDCC, through tender, awarded this work to Aravali Construction. Three years have passed, but in some places only 10 per cent work has been done, in some places 25 per cent and in others 40 per cent. Thereafter, Aravali Construction abandoned the work and left. I took time twice from the Secretary, Road Construction Department of Bihar, and even had the dates rescheduled, but no action has been taken so far. Since Central funds are involved in this, the Bihar State Government is also unable to invest its funds therein.

As a result, the public is facing severe hardship and is experiencing great difficulty in commuting.

Madam, through you, I would like to appeal that the Union Government pay attention to this matter and issue directions to complete the works in which Central funds are involved. Along with this, I would also request that action be taken against the concerned contractors, because the public has suffered for three years.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Sudheer Gupta -- is not present.

**SHRI GAJENDRA SINGH SHEKHAWAT (JODHPUR):** Madam Speaker, I am sharing the anguish of seven to eight crore people of Rajasthan regarding drinking water. Therefore, even if you give me half the time that you gave my friend Deepender Ji to apologise, it would suffice for me. ... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please state your point.

... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI GAJENDRA SINGH SHEKHAWAT:** Hon. Speaker, Madam, out of 32 districts of Rajasthan, most districts have been placed in the critically dark zone list. Under the NRDWP, that is, the National Rural Drinking Water Programme, we had been receiving funds for many years. When these projects were sanctioned, a

representative of the Union Government was always present in the sanctioning committee. These projects have been approved for several years, as they are long-term projects. As a result, today a liability of Rs. 5,877 crore has accrued on the Rajasthan Government. On studying the present Budget, it is found that under the NRDWP schemes, the Rajasthan Government is to receive only Rs. 300 crore.

Madam, along with these years of accumulated liabilities, we also have to plan for providing drinking water to the people in the coming times. I come from Jodhpur district. There, the first phase of the Indira Gandhi Lift Canal Project has been completed, and the second phase is to be completed within the next three years. If it is not completed and if the Union Government does not provide funds for this project amounting to Rs. 26,877 crore, then thousands of villages and towns associated with this project will certainly be affected, and in the next five years there will be widespread devastation in that region. If from this year onwards and in the coming years these projects are not sanctioned and funds are not released regularly, a serious problem will arise before us.

Through you, I would like to draw the attention of the Union Government to the fact that funds should be provided to meet the liabilities of Rajasthan under the NRDWP head. At the same time,

keeping in view the special circumstances of Rajasthan, additional funds for drinking water should be made available in the coming period.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shrimati Santosh Ahlawat, Shri P.P. Chaudhary, Shri Dushyant Singh, Shri C.R. Chaudhary and Shri Arjunlal Meena are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Gajendra Singh Shekhawat.

**SHRI RADHESHYAM BISWAS (KARIMGANJ):** Hon. Speaker, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on a very important issue.

*[English]*

In my constituency, Karimganj, there was rail connectivity between Karimganj and Kolkota *via* Mohishashan to Bangladesh, even after Independence. However, it was fully closed in the year 1965 due to War between India and Pakistan, as the present Bangladesh was part and parcel of Pakistan, namely, East Pakistan. Now, Bangladesh is an independent country and has friendly relations with India.

Except rail connectivity with the North Eastern Region, connectivity by road and waterways between both countries is in

force. Railway infrastructure of the then period is still in a good condition. The previously laid railway line was very short in distance in comparison with the present connectivity to Kolkata.

Surface transport connectivity *via* Guwahati with Barak Valley of Assam, Tripura, Mizoram, and Manipur is always in a disrupted condition and the carrying cost of essential commodities *via* road is very high.

The Railway Department is doing gauge conversion up to Mohishashan, that is, the last station near Bangladesh border. The connectivity to the above-mentioned region can be improved by reopening the old railway line *via* Bangladesh from Karimganj to Kolkata with very low cost budget, and people of this region also will be economically benefited.

Our Hon. Prime Minister Sir, Shri Narendra Modi, will be probably visiting Bangladesh on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2015. We hope that some new pact will be signed by both the countries. Through this august house, I would request for the immediate intervention of the Union Government in connexion with the above-mentioned proposal so that the people of this region can get a dream-like project for their benefit.

Hon. Member of Parliament Shri S.S. Ahluwalia had too spoken about this.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Kumari Sushmita Dev is permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Radheshyam Biswas.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI ANOOP MISHRA (MORENA):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, I thank you for granting me permission to raise an issue relating to my parliamentary constituency. Cooperation is an important component of the nation and its culture. India's culture has progressed through cooperation. It was in this context that cooperative banks were established, and cooperative sugar mills also came into existence. In Madhya Pradesh, many new districts have been created, but cooperative banks have not been established in these districts. About 70 to 80 per cent of the farmers are engaged in agriculture or allied activities, and they face repeated hardship in travelling 200 to 250 kilometres to the district headquarters. Through societies, fertilisers and seeds are made available in the villages. My Lok Sabha constituency has two districts. In Morena, a District Cooperative Bank already existed. Sheopur became a new district, and it has been fifteen years since its formation. Proposals are repeatedly sent from there, but

it is conveyed that new District Cooperative Banks are not being opened at present. As a result, the people of the area are suffering considerable loss.

Through you, I would like to request the Hon. Finance Minister to kindly grant special permission to open cooperative banks in Sheopur district and in other new districts where cooperative banks have not been established.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri P.P. Chaudhary and Shri Prahlad Singh Patel are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Anoop Mishra.

**SHRI SHARAD TRIPATHI (SANT KABIR NAGAR):** Hon. Speaker, food, clothing and shelter are the basic rights of every person. Various schemes are being implemented in the country for the poor. Since this Government came into office, welfare schemes have become visible on the ground, and the initiatives of the present Government are evident. Hon. the Prime Minister is working day and night to translate numerous schemes into action so as to uplift the poor. Our present Ministers are also working in the same direction. However, during field visits, when we go to villages and rural areas, it causes deep anguish to note that all schemes meant for the poor are determined on the basis of BPL cards. Today, BPL cards are held by

many who are not poor and they are availing all the benefits, while those who are genuinely poor and who should actually receive these benefits are deprived of BPL cards. They do not have BPL cards.

Therefore, through you, I would like to request the Government to ensure a mechanism whereby all welfare schemes meant for the poor actually reach the poor. No one should, through technical means by obtaining a BPL card, usurp the rights of the poor. In this regard, through you, I request the Government to constitute a strong committee so that we may also participate and study this issue, ensuring that benefits reach only those who are genuinely poor, whether it is housing, the Jan Dhan Yojana, foodgrains provided under welfare schemes, pensions, or any other scheme. All ongoing schemes should benefit only those who are truly poor. Thank you.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Bhairon Prasad Mishra, Shri Nishikant Dubey, Shri Daddan Mishra, Shri Kirti Vardhan Singh and Shri P.P. Chaudhary are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Sharad Tripathi.

*[English]*

**PROF. SAUGATA ROY (DUM DUM):** Madam, the Netaji Subhas International Airport, Kolkata happens to be in my constituency, Dum

Dum. I have, on the floor of this House, repeatedly opposed the proposal for privatization of four airports, namely, Kolkata, Chennai, Ahmedabad and Jaipur. The proposal was opposed on the ground that this would mean handing over assets built at public cost to private parties. It would also jeopardize the service security of the employees who worked under the Airports Authority of India. I had mentioned that Kolkata and Chennai Airports were modernized at Government cost, at a cost of Rs.2,300 crore and Rs.2,100 crore respectively only recently in 2013.

The report of the comptroller and auditor general had also mentioned a big scam in the privatisation of the indira gandhi international airport at delhi by GMR. This proposal which was first originated during the later part of the UPA-II Government was dropped in March. 2014 (*Interruptions*) [*Translation*] Yes, a scam also took place in Mumbai in this regard, and the C&AG has submitted a report. [*English*] This is in the public domain. So, all these privatizations lead to big scam. Now the present Government has again initiated the process of privatization of four airports. I have personally represented to the Civil Aviation Minister and the Prime Minister Sir against this move. But the Government is going ahead with formalizing the terms for the Request for Qualification (RFQ)

under pressure from GMR, GVK and other big infrastructure companies. This will be the first step towards privatization.

The workers of the Airports Authority of India led by the recognized Airports Authority Employees' Union and the Joint Forum of Airport Employees had already started agitating against privatization and will ultimately go for a strike. I would urge the Government not to go ahead in the matter of privatization. This will harm the employees. It will also mean more cost for the passengers and harm national interest. I would again demand in this House that this privatization and corporatisation which seems to be a panacea to the new Government should be given up. This would be bad for the national interest.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri P.K. Biju, Shri M.B. Rajesh and Shri N.K. Premachandran are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Prof. Saugata Roy.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI GOPAL SHETTY (MUMBAI NORTH):** Madam Speaker, Maharashtra is geographically the second largest State. For quite some time, the State has been facing a crisis, as a result of which agricultural crops are being severely affected and farmers are being

pushed to the brink of starvation. In Maharashtra, a large number of farmers have taken their own lives due to the extensive destruction of agricultural crops. During the years 2011–2012, crops were badly affected in the kharif season in many parts of Vidarbha, Marathwada and North Maharashtra. In the year 2014–2015 also, out of 353 blocks in the State, 219 blocks falling under 26 districts were severely affected.

Therefore, through you, I would like to request the Union Government to kindly take positive steps to resolve the agricultural issues of Maharashtra that were discussed in the meeting held with the Hon. Union Minister for Agriculture and the Members of Parliament from Maharashtra at Sahyadri, Mumbai, on 16 February, 2015. I also thank the Hon. Union Minister for Agriculture and the Hon. Prime Minister for the fact that, for the first time since Independence, significant changes have been made in the rules to assist farmers and large-scale measures have been taken to provide relief.

**SHRI GANESH SINGH (SATNA):** Madam, through you, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister for Railways to a major accident that was narrowly averted on the Katni–Jabalpur rail section on 7 May, 2015, due to a fault at a single-track point. Train No. 22132, the Mahuva–D Pune–Gyan Ganga Express, had departed from Katni

station towards Jabalpur station. During that time, when the signal showed green, the train moved onto the down track. The signal continued to indicate green. Owing to the presence of mind of the driver, after proceeding about 300 metres, he applied the emergency brake and stopped the train. On the same track, a Mail Express coming from Mumbai to Howrah had already reached near Nivar station. Had the driver not shown prudence, both trains would have collided, resulting in a major accident. Ordinarily, such a fault does not occur at a signal track point whereby a down train moves onto the up track while the signal continues to show green, whereas it should have shown a red signal. If the train had been moving at speed, the accident would certainly have occurred. I have learnt that this signal track point is a technical matter, the design of which is overseen by the Member (Electrical) of the Railway Board. This entire matter warrants a high-level inquiry.

Through you, I demand from the Hon. Minister for Railways that a high-level inquiry be conducted into this potential accident.

**SHRI RAMESH BIDHURI (SOUTH DELHI):** Madam Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to the attempts by the Delhi Government to curb the freedom of the media. This is the first time that a political party, while in power, has conducted a survey relating

to the media. Such an order reminds us of stringent laws like the 'Vernacular Press Act' of 1878. The leaders of Delhi themselves indulge in the politics of agitation and allegations, and when the media or any other institution exposes the truth, circulars are issued to impose restrictions. This is an attack on democracy. They claim the right to prepare lists of leaders, bureaucrats and respected citizens of the country who have contributed to the nation's progress. They brand them as corrupt, insult them, and project themselves as honest like Raja Harishchandra; however, when anyone speaks about their functioning or falsehoods, threats are issued to send them to jail under Sections 499 and 500.

Hon. Speaker, Madam, through you, I would like to inform the House that the brave sons of India made sacrifices to establish democracy in this country. Some faced bullets in their chests, while others were hanged. After two and a half centuries of British rule, these brave sons secured freedom for the nation. Thereafter, under the Constitution, democracy was established on four pillars, namely the Legislature, the Judiciary, the Executive and the Media. The mindset of exerting pressure on the media seeks to ensure that, under pressure, the media is unable to expose the Government's broken promises and anti-people functioning, and is prevented from performing its duty.

This amounts to an assault on individual liberty and the fundamental rights guaranteed by our Constitution. This circular also draws attention to the funds received from a food foundation by that leader to weaken democracy in India. Such a decision has been taken to weaken India and to undermine the roots of democracy in the country. I request the Hon. Home Minister and the Union Government to direct the Delhi-NCR Government to withdraw this arbitrary order at the earliest.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Nishikant Dubey, Shri Bhairon Prasad Mishra, Shri P.P. Chaudhary and Dr. Manoj Rajoria are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Ramesh Bidhuri.

*[English]*

**SHRI J.C. DIVAKAR REDDY (ANANTAPUR):** Madam Speaker, this is regarding the Ganga-Cauvery linkage. In my State, one Godavari river is there. Every year we are losing about 3,000 TMC of water into the sea. In that case, we can imagine how many TMCs of water we are losing from Ganga and Brahmaputra.

Shri K.L. Rao, who was a Minister in Pandit Nehru's Cabinet, surveyed the basin and he gave a report. As per the report, the length of the Ganga-Cauvery linkage is about 2,600 kilometres. We are

losing most of the water by allowing it into the sea. If we can manage this, 60 percent of the land will come into agricultural cultivation.

My submission is that today money is not a problem. Many individuals and countries are willing to spend any amount of money. They can do it. Shri Chandrababu Naidu has already started this concept. He has tried to link Godavari, Krishna and Penna rivers. He wants to bring more land into cultivation. If we do not take up Ganga-Cauvery link project, we will suffer property loss as well as human and animal loss in thousands together.

The Supreme Court has already given a judgment in 2002 that Ganga and Cauvery should be linked by 2016. This Government or the previous Governments never bothered about this linkage. At least they should come forward. Modiji is also having that idea. My request is that the Government should come forward and compete it so that 60 percent of land may come into the cultivation. With this, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI JANARDAN SINGH SIGRIWAL (MAHARAJGANJ):**

Hon. Speaker, Madam, for the past several months, teaching work in schools in Bihar has come to a standstill, as teachers are on strike in

support of their demands. The Government is not accepting their demands and is resorting to lathi-charge against them. This is not happening for the first time; such situations have occurred earlier as well with teachers in Bihar. In the year 2003, about 25,000 Lok Shikshaks were appointed. These appointments were made in compliance with all the rules of the Union Government. The appointed Lok Shikshaks also worked for 26 months, after which all their centres were closed and they were removed from service. After their removal, the Lok Shikshaks approached the Hon. High Court, which decided the matter in their favour. Even thereafter, no concrete action has been taken by the Bihar Government towards the adjustment of the Lok Shikshaks. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** This is a State issue. That is enough.

**SHRI JANARDAN SINGH SIGRIWAL:** They are merely being given assurances regarding adjustment. In this situation, the condition of all Lok Shikshaks has become deplorable. Therefore, through you, I request the Government to consider the plight of the Lok Shikshaks sympathetically and to issue appropriate directions to the Bihar Government at the earliest for their adjustment. Thank you.

**SHRI RAVNEET SINGH (LUDHIANA):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, through you, I would like to draw the attention of the House and the Government to the situation of the steel industry in Ludhiana and Mandi Gobindgarh in Punjab. Recently, when Rahul Ji visited Punjab to enquire about the plight of distressed farmers, a large delegation from the small-scale secondary steel industry of Mandi Gobindgarh came forward. When they came to know of Rahul Ji's visit, representatives of the entire industry met him and expressed their anguish, stating that the scrap-based industry has either already closed down or is on the verge of closure. As a result, many youths in the villages around the cities have become unemployed, leading to an increase in the crime rate, as ...\* has also been stated by others. ...  
*(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Do not take anyone's name. Please state your point.

**SHRI RAVNEET SINGH:** Madam, this is not an incorrect point.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Do not take the names of those who are not present here. Please state your point.

---

\* Not recorded.

**SHRI RAVNEET SINGH:** 80 per cent of the youth there are on drugs. It would have been better if the Hon. Minister, Shrimati Harsimrat Kaur Badal, had spoken on this. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Please state your point.

**SHRI RAVNEET SINGH:** Every parent dreams that their children should get employment and opportunities for work. The small-scale industry is the backbone of the country's economy. This sector not only provides employment to people but also contributes significantly to the export sector.

Madam, today, cheap products from China are posing a very serious threat to our small-scale industry. On the other hand, our large steel industries are also posing a threat to them.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Are you talking about giving a revival package to this industry?

**SHRI RAVNEET SINGH:** Absolutely correct.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Instead of speaking about the entire country, please confine yourself to the steel industry in your area.

**SHRI RAVNEET SINGH:** Hon. Prime Minister Ji has given the slogan of 'Make in India'. Along with that, we also give the slogan that every hand should get work and work should get a fair price.

Therefore, to keep this industry alive, I would like to request the Government that customs duty on material scrap and rerollable scrap should be reduced to zero per cent. A large quantity of finished steel is being dumped in our country, therefore anti-dumping duty should be imposed. At present, the excise duty exemption limit is Rs. 1.5 crore; it should be increased to Rs. 5 crore. At present, these industries are subject to 12 per cent excise duty; for small industries, this should be reduced from 12 per cent to six per cent.

**SHRI BABULAL CHAUDHARY (FATEHPUR SIKRI):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on a very important issue. By your grace, I am a Member of Parliament from the Fatehpur Sikri parliamentary constituency. On 5 May, 2015, in Agra district, in the Dalit village of Banjara Ka Pura, about 100 to 150 influential persons went to forcibly **कब्जा** the lands of the villagers. Using tractors, they ploughed the lands belonging to those poor people. When the poor villagers came to protect their land, they were brutally assaulted. As a result, about 15 persons were injured, including women. An FIR, No. 33/15, under sections 147, 148, 149, 307, 323, 554, 427, 536, 552 and 506 was registered at Shamshabad police station. However, from 5 May till today, no arrests have been made. Against the poor people of Banjara Ka Pura, the

influential persons, under the pressure of power, have even managed to get a cross-case registered against them.

**HON. SPEAKER:** The name will not go on record.

**SHRI BABULAL CHAUDHARY:** Through you, I would like to request the Hon. Home Minister that the influential persons be arrested immediately, police be deployed in the village for security, and the case registered against the poor villagers (Banjaras) be withdrawn. All the villagers have fled the village. I request you that they be resettled in the village at the earliest.

**SHRI JYOTIRADITYA MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (GUNA):** Hon. Madam Speaker, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak during Zero Hour. Hon. Speaker, Madam, the first right over the resources of the Government belongs to the poor of this country, and they should be accorded priority. Based on this very thinking, the UPA Government had initiated the Free Medicines Scheme, and the then Hon. Prime Minister had announced it on the occasion of Republic Day. The former Minister of Health, Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad Sahib, had allocated Rs. 1,300 crore for this scheme. Today, a situation of concern has arisen. On 30 May, 2014, the present Health Minister stated that now only 348 medicines would be provided by the Union Government, at 75 per cent funding, through 23,000 PHCs and 5,000 CHCs. Thereafter, in the month of July, the Health Minister again stated that the scheme would now be restricted to only 50 medicines. Two months later, the Joint Secretary of the Ministry of

Health stated that this scheme has now been dropped and that an incentivisation scheme has been handed over to the States, and that the State Governments would carry out this work. If this is not a cruel joke on the poor, then what is it? When the Congress Government was in power in Rajasthan, it had clearly implemented the Free Medicines Scheme. Lakhs of poor people benefited from it, and due to improvements in the system, many people began visiting Government hospitals. Through you, I would like to ask the Government whether there is, somewhere, pressure from the private sector due to which this scheme has been cancelled. The promises that were made during the elections, have they remained merely electoral slogans? We seek a clarification from the Government as to whether this suit-boot Government will reintroduce this scheme or not. Will the suit-boot Government give the poor their due or not?

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Rajeev Satav is permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Jyotiraditya Madhavrao Scindia.

**SHRI SHER SINGH GHUBAYA (FEROZEPUR):** Madam Speaker, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak. I rise to speak on behalf of those people whose lands lie along the Pakistan border in Punjab, Rajasthan and Gujarat, where fencing has been erected. The previous Government had issued a notification, but

the fencing was not erected in accordance with it. In some places it was put up two kilometres behind, and in others three kilometres behind, as a result of which farmers and small landholders have suffered heavy losses. Due to constraints faced by the Border Security Force, even labourers are not permitted to go there in large numbers. The fencing has now been re-erected within a distance of 150 metres. Through you, I would like to request the Government that the earlier fencing, which exists prior to the newly erected fencing, needs to be dismantled so that cultivation can take place over thousands of acres, especially as paddy sowing is about to begin. Therefore, that fencing should be removed. Secondly, compensation has not yet been paid to farmers for the land that has come under the new fencing, and the same should be paid. Further, fencing that is to be erected at a short distance should be put up immediately so that small and big farmers residing there do not face hardship.

**HON. SPEAKER:** I am giving an opportunity to Hon. Members beyond the List, but Hon. Members should conclude their remarks within one minute.

Shri Nishikant Dubey is permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Sher Singh Ghubaya.

*[English]*

**SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB (CUTTACK):** Madam, there is a Territorial Army 120 Infantry Battalion, Bihar, headquartered in Bhubaneswar. It was started after 1962 India-China war when recruitment of Odias to the Infantry Battalion became very necessary. This Battalion was set up to facilitate entry of Odia people into the Army. But since the Army is holding recruitment rally in far off places like Uttarakhand and other places in the country, the Odias are not getting recruited in 120 Battalion which is stationed in Bhubaneswar.

While Odisha already has a very low representation in the Army, pushing further its interest to the fringes, the 120 Infantry Battalion is holding recruitment rallies elsewhere in the country. In the last four years, not a single Territorial Army recruitment rally has been held in our State. What is surprising is that earlier the zone was confined only to “Odisha and nearby areas” -- at that time, Bihar was not divided – as also certain districts of Jharkhand of today. Things have come to such a pass that the representation of the people of Odisha domicile has now dropped to less than 50 percent in 120 Territorial Army Battalion which is stationed in Bhubaneswar. It used to be 90 percent in the past years.

The situation has worsened in the last 5-7 years. I am given to understand that the recruitment zone for 120 Battalion Territorial Army is expanded now to ten States which are under the Central Command Military Administration. It defies logic. Should we believe that Indian Army does not have any faith or conviction on the valour of Odias? Odias had laid down their lives for the country in 1962, 1965, 1971 and also during Operation Vijay. More than 14 Odias from the Officers' rank to soldiers had laid down their lives in Operation Vijay. Then, why Odias are being ignored? Why the aspirations of Odias are being stymied.

**SHRI RATTAN LAL KATARIA (AMBALA):** Madam, I would like to bring to the kind notice of the Hon. Health Minister that more than 5 million people are suffering with corneal blindness in India and every year 30,000 new patients are added to this number. At least, two lakh cornea donations are needed annually but only about 50,000 such procedures take place due to paucity of donors. Change in the technique of removing the eye from a donor body is a commendable job which has been performed by AIIMS, PGIs and various other hospitals of the country.

**13.00 hrs**

Earlier, most families would reject the possibility of donating the eyes of their relatives citing disfigurement of the body as the reason. But due to awareness and new techniques since 2011, only the corneal disc is removed to keep the overall appearance of the body intact and they do not take out the entire eyes. But alas, preservation of the donated tissues has become another key problem. Due to this problem, nearly 30 percent of the eyes donated go waste as either the tissue gets damaged or infected or the recipient is not available immediately.

Therefore, I demand that a new R&D technique may be developed to preserve the corneas for a longer period of time at a low cost as compared to the imported ones. In spite of religious feelings of disfigurement of the body, relatives of some people have come forward for donating the eyes of their relatives for a good cause.

I, therefore, request that these efforts must not go futile so that more people may come for donating their eyes.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Bhairon Prasad Mishra is permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Rattan Lal Kataria.

**SHRI A.P. JITHENDER REDDY (MAHABUBNAGAR):** Madam, I wish to inform you that villagers, local leaders and the

public are requesting for sanction of a rail over bridge at Shadnagar at Mahabubnagar Bye-pass LC No. 27, Telangana. The villagers are facing a lot of problems due to closure of the Railway Gate at Chetanpalli village in LC No. 27. Earlier, the TVU Report says that it is 75,000 and due to the vast development, the present TVU is around 1,25,000. Many function halls have been constructed and the villagers of Keshampet are to move only from this railway gate which takes a lot of time.

*[Translation]*

**SHRIMATI P.K. SHREEMATHI TEACHER (KANNUR):**

Madam, through you, I would like to place before this House an important issue. In our country, the number of children who are physically and mentally disabled from birth runs into lakhs. This is mostly due to genetic factors, such as Autism, Cerebral Palsy, Down Syndrome and hemophilic, etc. Caring for such children becomes extremely difficult for poor families. To understand them and to look after them, it is necessary for someone to remain with them at all times. The lives of physically and mentally disabled children are full of challenges. They constantly require love and support; otherwise, the possibility of accidents is high and many of them remain confined to bed for their entire lives. Because of these circumstances, their

family members are unable to concentrate on other work and are often compelled to give up their employment. Due to the loss of income, the lives of these poor families become extremely distressing.

Therefore, I humbly request that facilities for medical treatment and pension be provided to such physically and mentally disabled children and to their families, *[English]* respectively for the poor where they are APL or BPL

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri P.K. Biju, Adv. Joice Goerge, Shri Bhairon Prasad Mishra and Dr. Virendra Kumar are permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shrimati P.K. Shreemathi Teacher.

*[Translation]*

**DR. MANOJ RAJORIA (KARAULI-DHOLPUR):** Madam, through you, I would like to draw your attention to National Highway 11B under construction in my parliamentary constituency of Dholpur–Karauli. Madam, work on this highway, which connects Dholpur, Karauli and Gangapur, has been going on for the past one year. Madam, this road passes in front of important locations in Dholpur city such as the Collectorate headquarters, Police Headquarters, courts, Zila Parishad office, temples and other key establishments. Due to the negligence of the officers of the National

Highways Authority of India and the contractors, the roads in the city have remained dug up for the past one year. Clouds of dust rise throughout the day and, as a result, accidents are taking place.

In this regard, I had earlier informed the Hon. Minister in writing that, in the construction of this road, quality standards are being grossly neglected and public money is being squandered.

Therefore, through you, I once again urge the Hon. Minister to have the quality of the said road re-examined and to take the strictest possible action against the guilty officers of the National Highways Authority of India and the contractors concerned.

**SHRI BISHNU PADA RAY (ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, thank you very much for giving me time. Early this morning, I received a notice from the Divisional Forest Officer, Middle Andaman, and a similar notice is about to be issued in North Andaman. According to the notice, about five thousand families have been living on forest land there for nearly 40 to 50 years. Their total population is around fifty thousand, while the total population of Andaman is about four and a half lakh. As per the notice, within one month, the coconut and areca nut trees planted by these families through their own labour will be cut down, their houses

will be demolished and they will be rendered homeless. These five thousand families are undergoing severe mental trauma. They are threatening me and saying that they will commit suicide. Madam, in the year 2003, the Atal Bihari Vajpayee Government, in the Island Development Authority meeting, took a decision regarding such 78 forest families and stated that they would be rehabilitated and provided with an economic package. Fourteen years have passed, but the package has not been fully implemented and the orders have not been complied with.

I would like to demand that the families who have been residing there for 40 to 50 years be allotted 15 bighas of land each and be provided with an economic package. This is the cry of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. I reiterate that a prolonged conspiracy is underway to malign the Government in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and some officials are behind it. I have raised my voice against this. Bharat Mata ki Jai.

*[English]*

**SHRI R.K. BHARATHI MOHAN (MAYILADUTHURAI):** Hon. Speaker, I would thank you for giving me this opportunity to raise this important issue.

According to the norms prescribed by the Reserve Bank of India, the nationalized banks are charging seven percent interest for agricultural loans up to Rs.3 Lakh. Further, for prompt repayment of loans, the Reserve Bank is allowing a concession of three percent interest and the farmers need to remit the loan amount with four percent interest only. But the Reserve Bank announced this rate of interest and concession for the year 2014-15 only and later extended the same up to 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.

Hence, I request the Union Government to intervene in the policy decision of the Reserve Bank of India to make this rate of interest and concession as a permanent feature.

*[Translation]*

**SHRIMATI KAMLA PAATLE (JANJGIR-CHAMPA):** Madam, I would like to place before you an important issue relating to my parliamentary constituency. The manned level crossing No. 349 at pillar Nos. 11 and 13 in village Kapan has been closed since 29 November, 2014, due to which villagers are facing severe difficulties. Seventy per cent of the village's cultivated land, places of worship, the cremation ground, community ponds and other essential facilities lie on the other side of the railway line.

Due to the closure of this level crossing, the daily life of the villagers has been seriously disrupted. People are risking their lives by crossing the railway line, which may result in loss of life and property and any untoward incident may occur at any time.

Madam, I demand that the said level crossing be kept operational with a gateman, or alternatively, an underpass be constructed at the site to resolve the problem. Until the underpass is constructed, the level crossing should be kept operational with a gateman. Thank you.

**SHRI KANWAR SINGH TANWAR (AMROHA):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, I thank you for giving me time. Through you, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the incidents of road rage occurring in the country, particularly the increasing cases in Delhi. Such incidents show no sign of abating. Recently in Delhi, a motorcyclist was beaten to death in front of his children. Just last Sunday, a DTC bus driver was beaten to death in a road rage incident. Such incidents are increasing, giving the impression that people no longer fear the law. Unless a strong message of strict punishment is conveyed and a sense of fear of the law is instilled, such offences will continue to become habitual. People lose their temper over trivial matters, and law-abiding citizens have begun to fear even moving on the roads. In Delhi, road rage cases have increased by 40 to 50 per

cent over the last five years. In 2011, about 34 cases were registered, whereas in 2014 the number rose to 90, and many cases have already been registered this year. These incidents are occurring frequently. I request the Government to enact the strictest possible laws to deal with road rage so that such incidents can be curbed.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Bhairon Prasad Mishra and Shri P.P. Chaudhary is permitted to associate with the issue raised by Shri Kanwar Singh Tanwar.

**SHRIMATI HEMAMALINI (MATHURA):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, I thank you very much for giving me time. The subject I wish to raise is - The plight of elders in India. In our country, there are many schemes for different sections of society, but there are not adequate schemes for senior citizens.

*[English]*

According to a study, 24 percent of senior citizens encounter physical abuse mostly by their kin. A staggering 9 percent of the India's senior citizens or nine crore still work to survive and three crore live alone without any support and five crore sleep hungry. There are nearly 10 crore elderly persons in India and this figure is likely to triple by 2050. Despite this not much attention has been given

to the needs and care of the elderly. There are no dependable community support system, geriatric care or Government welfare schemes except the Indira Gandhi National Old Age Pension Scheme and Indira Gandhi National Widow Pension Scheme. There is no proper social security for India's elderly. Budgets bring only relief to senior tax payers and that is where the thinking stops. The oldest, the old are the worst affected as no health insurance schemes are willing to cover this age group. Physical and economic vulnerability is the highest at this age as are dependency levels. In such a bleak scenario where and whom does a senior citizen turn up for help? The issue of poverty poses additional challenges when it comes to older persons particularly those in rural, and in far flung areas with inadequate access to healthcare facilities.

I, therefore, urge the Government to devise a scheme for free treatment, following by healthcare, financial aid and pension scheme for their requirement. I have also a suggestion that Rs. 5, Rs. 10, Rs. 15 and Rs. 25 may be set aside from income-tax payers according to their slabs to build a corpus fund for their welfare. Thank you so much.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Kumari Shobha Karandlaje, Shri P.P. Chaudhary, Shri Ashwini Kumar Chaubey, Shri Arvind Sawant, Shri Shrirang

Appa Barne, Shrimati Rama Devi, Shri Bhairon Prasad Mishra and Adv. Joice George are allowed to associate with the issue raised by Shrimati Hemamalini.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI BHARAT SINGH (BALIA):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak. Ballia, which is a junction of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar and the birthplace of Loknayak Jayaprakash Narayan, is a historic place that is today under threat. I have repeatedly drawn the attention of the Government to this issue. Lala Tola of Bihar falls in the constituency of the Hon. Minister of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, Shri Rajiv Pratap Rudy Ji. It is also the area of Shri Janardan Singh Sigriwal Ji and Shri Babu R. K. Singh, former Home Secretary, and it is a joint area for us as well. Severe erosion is taking place. Lala Tola has been washed away; thousands of houses in Ibrahimabad and Navbarar have been submerged in the Ganga and the Ghaghara. In the River Ganga, Sherpur Semra, Jagdishpur Busaula, Gardaria and Narda have already been eroded. People have been rendered homeless. They have no electricity and no shelter. Through you, I would like to state that the Union Government should take an interest in this matter. I request that directions be given so that the Hon. Union Minister for Agriculture

may apprise the House about the solution to this problem. If this work is not taken up immediately, these villages will not survive. ...

*(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Since it relates to your area, you may also extend your cooperation.

*[Translation]*

**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):** Madam, this issue is important because Jayaprakash Nagar is located between Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. It includes the Saran Parliamentary constituency and the Ara Parliamentary constituency. The difficulty is that this village is continuously being eroded due to the river's flow. It is a matter concerning two States.

Madam, I request the Ministry of Home Affairs that a Committee be constituted through the Ministry of Home Affairs to examine this entire issue. I urge the Government and the Ministry of Home Affairs to constitute a Committee to prevent erosion in Jayaprakash Nagar, which is located in both Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, so that after studying

the matter, action can be taken regarding the displacement of thousands of people in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh due to this erosion. In this regard, I assure the Hon. Member accordingly.

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** The House stands adjourned to meet again at 14.15 hours.

**13.16 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Fifteen Minutes past*

*Fourteen of the Clock.*

---

**14.18 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Eighteen Minutes past  
Fourteen of the Clock.*

(Hon. Speaker *in the Chair*)

**MOTION RE: SUSPENSION OF RULE 388**

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Item No. 7, Shri Birender Singh *ji* to move Motion under Rule 388.

*... (Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Mr. Minister, wait a minute.

*... (Interruptions)*

**DR. A. SAMPATH (ATTINGAL):** Madam, I have a point of order.... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Under which rule? You tell me the rule.

*... (Interruptions)*

**DR. A. SAMPATH:** Madam, it is under Rule 25. You are well-versed with the Rules but I am not so much. Rule 25 says:

“On days allotted for the transaction of Government business, such business shall have precedence and the Secretary-General, shall arrange that business in such order as the Speaker may, after consultation with the Leader of the House, determine:

Provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation.”

Madam, there have been various occasions this has been there because once we get a List of Business, then the revised List of Business comes. I have written a letter to the Hon. Speaker today that the Hon. Minister, Shri Birender Singh is going to move this motion under Rule 388.

I would like to tell you as to what the Hon. Minister intends to do under Rule 388. Madam, I shall take only half a minute. It is a very important Bill. I have never done this before. This is the first time, I am doing this. Madam, Rule 388 is in page no. 147 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business. It says:

“Any Member may, with the consent of the Speaker, move that any rule may be suspended in its application to a particular motion before the House and if the motion is carried the rule in question shall be suspended for the time being.”

Here, what the intention of the Minister is that:

“That this House do suspend Rule 338 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the moving of motions for consideration and passing of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015, during the current session of Lok Sabha.”

Madam, here he intends to suspend Rule 338. Rule 338 says:

“MOTIONS

### Repetition of motion

338. A motion shall not raise a question substantially identical with one on which the House has given a decision in the same session.”

Madam, Speaker, I may be permitted to use such a terminology. I am not reading the whole Bill. The discussion has taken place in this House and we have sent the Bill to the other House. We all know what happened there. I am not going into the prerogatives of the other House. Now, the Government is intending to come with another Bill. In the meantime, the Ordinance has already been promulgated. Now, today itself, in Item No.4, the Secretary-General has reported two messages from the Rajya Sabha regarding the Coal Mines (Special Provisions) Bill, 2014 and the Constitution (One Hundred and Nineteenth Amendment) Bill, 2013.

Another thing has also happened in this House. The Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill has been discussed in this House and passed. In the same House, it is going to be withdrawn.

Madam Speaker, you are the custodian of the Members. We have done quite a lot of homework. We have burnt quite a lot of midnight

oil in discussing all these matters. This is for our future that we are participating in this legislative process of discussion. It is a part and parcel of all the laws that our forefathers have made. It is not only my feeling but the entire nation feels that whatever discussions taking place in this House becomes a futile exercise. The Government is not doing the homework. As a Member, we are doing our homework but there is no coordination between the Government and the Opposition.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Hon. Member, is it under any Rule? The Rule does not apply here.

**DR. A. SAMPATH:** Madam Speaker, I may be permitted to express my opposition. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** What is it?

... (*Interruptions*)

**DR. M. THAMBIDURAI (KARUR):** Madam Speaker, Hon. Member has raised his concerns regarding the Land Acquisition Bill which we are going to discuss now. As he said, generally we discuss the Bill in this House and pass it. The Rajya Sabha could not do it but that is a different issue. Afterwards, the Government prorogued the Rajya Sabha. Why do they prorogue the Rajya Sabha? It is just to promulgate an Ordinance. After promulgating the Ordinance, what

happened to the fate of this Bill? The Lok Sabha is not prorogued. We have already passed it. Why is there such a futile attempt once again? Under what Rule are we discussing it? We know that the Rajya Sabha is the Upper House and the Lok Sabha is the Lower House. But we cannot treat the Lok Sabha in this manner. Why did the Government prorogue the Rajya Sabha? It is just to facilitate the Government to promulgate an Ordinance and why the Government did not prorogue Lok Sabha to promulgate the ordinance.

**HON. SPEAKER:** No, we cannot discuss that.

... (*Interruptions*)

**DR. M. THAMBIDURAI:** We are again discussing this matter. The Bill that we are discussing has already been passed.... (*Interruptions*) Now, we already discussing this Bill. This Bill had already been passed by this House... (*Interruptions*) Why have the Government brought the Ordinance? Once the House has passed it, why did they bring the Ordinance? That is what I want to know... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**SHRI JYOTIRADITYA MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (GUNA):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, it was for this very reason that the Rajya Sabha was prorogued. ... (*Interruptions*)

*[English]*

**SHRI CHAUDHARY BIRENDER SINGH:** I beg to move:

“That this House do suspend Rule 338 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the moving of motions for consideration and passing of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015, during the current session of Lok Sabha.”

**HON. SPEAKER:** The question is:

“That this House do suspend Rule 338 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the moving of motions for consideration and passing of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015, during the current session of Lok Sabha.”

*The motion was adopted.*

---

... (*Interruptions*)

**14.27 hrs**

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF  
RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND  
RESETTLEMNT (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 2015  
AND  
RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND  
RESETTLEMENT (AMENDMENT) SECOND BILL, 2015**

**HON. SPEAKER:** The House shall now take up Item Nos. 8 and 9 together.

Shri C.N. Jayadeven to move the Statutory Resolution.

*...(Interruptions)*

**SHRI C.N. JAYADEVAN (THRISSUR):** I beg to move:

“That this House disapproves of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Ordinance,

2015 (No.4 of 2015) promulgated by the President on 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2015.”

**THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT, MINISTER OF PANCHAYATI RAJ AND MINISTER OF DRINKING WATER AND SANITATION (SHRI CHAUDHARY BIRENDER SINGH):** I beg to move:

“That the Bill further to amend the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, be taken into consideration.”

**HON. SPEAKER:** Motions moved:

“That this House disapproves of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Ordinance, 2015 (No.4 of 2015) promulgated by the President on 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2015. ”

“That the Bill further to amend the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition,

Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, be taken into consideration.”

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri C.N. Jayadevan.

... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI K.H. MUNIYAPPA (KOLAR):** We want Division...

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**SHRI MOHAMMAD SALIM (RAIGANJ):** Hon. Speaker, Madam, we are demanding a division on the motion. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** How can you call for a division after it has already taken place? You should have asked for it earlier.

. . . (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**SHRI C.N. JAYADEVAN:** Thank you, Madam for allowing me to speak. I would speak in Malayalam. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI JYOTIRADITYA M. SCINDIA (GUNA):** Madam Speaker, we are asking for division.

**HON. SPEAKER:** I have already completed the process. It is adopted. Now, there is no Division.

**SHRI C.N. JAYADEVAN:** Madam Speaker, the Opposition wanted a Division while the Minister was introducing the Bill. When the

Speaker was putting the Motion, the majority was saying 'No'...  
*(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** What is this? Do you not want to speak on the Statutory Resolution?

**SHRI C.N. JAYADEVAN:** Yes, Madam, I would speak after that.  
... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** We have crossed that stage now.

... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** When I put the motion for suspending the rule, at that time you have not asked for Division.

... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** We cannot go back. It does not happen.

... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI C.N. JAYADEVAN:** Madam, how can I speak when the House is not in order? ... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI CHAUDHARY BIRENDER SINGH:** Madam, they are not ready to speak on the Statutory Resolution. Madam, already I have introduced and I have also asked for consideration. ... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri Jayadevan, do you not want to speak?

**SHRI C.N. JAYADEVAN:** I have moved the Statutory Resolution. I am speaking. ... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** After that, you are asking for Division. This will not happen.

... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** The motion was only to suspend the Rule.

**PROF. SAUGATA ROY (DUM DUM):** Madam, according to Rule 338, two identical motions cannot be moved.

**HON. SPEAKER:** They are not identical.

**PROF. SAUGATA ROY:** We were asking to raise points of order. You did not allow us. You suddenly said that those who are in favour may say Aye. We said No. Then, we stood up and said that we want Division. ... *(Interruptions)* Immediately this question was raised whether the Rule will be suspended. ... *(Interruptions)* You check from the record of the House. ... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI CHAUDHARY BIRENDER SINGH:** One Member has raised a point of order. By that time, I had already moved. So, after that, there is no question. ... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** The House stands adjourned to meet again at 02.45 p.m.

**14.30 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Forty Five Minutes past  
Fourteen of the Clock.*

**14.45 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Forty-Five Minutes past  
Fourteen of the Clock.*

(Hon. Speaker *in the Chair*)

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Shri C.N. Jayadevan.

...(Interruption)

**THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT, MINISTER OF HOUSING AND URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU):** Madam, I want to share with the House that the Government is willing to refer this Bill to a Joint Committee of Parliament. ... (*Interruptions*)

That being the case, there is no need for an elaborate discussion. That is what I am suggesting. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI K.C. VENUGOPAL (ALAPPUZHA):** No. We want a discussion. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU:** You go through the rules. When we are referring it to a Committee, what discussion do they want to have? I do not understand. ... (*Interruptions*)

Ordinances have been issued 452 times earlier. That is known to everybody. ... (*Interruptions*)

If you do not want a Committee and you want to have a discussion and voting, it is okay. ... (*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):** You do not want a Committee. Tomorrow, you do not get up and say ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI JYOTIRADITYA M. SCINDIA (GUNA):** It is our right to ask for a discussion. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY:** No. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI JYOTIRADITYA M. SCINDIA:** Yes. ... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE (GULBARGA):** Let us see how it is done. The rules are there and Madam is also there. Ultimately, she will decide your fate and our fate. Madam, I have only one appeal to make. Under Rule 338, two Members placed their views in the House regarding the suspension of that Rule and sought a ruling on it. The Deputy Speaker also rose and asked about it. Thereafter, Shri Saugata Roy also raised the issue. Even after two or three Members raised it, no ruling was given. Shri Sampat Ji also asked, but no decision came. The Members want to know that in such a doubtful

situation, what would be the view of the Hon. Speaker and what do the Rules say.

The second point is that when this issue was raised, the Hon. Minister for Rural Development and Panchayati Raj presented his Bill. At that time, you asked how many were in favour and how many were against. The House went through the 'Ayes' and 'Noes'. Then we immediately rose and asked ... (*Interruptions*) that a division be taken on this Bill. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** This is not the Central Hall. When one person is speaking, allow him to speak. Members keep speaking simultaneously from this side and that side.

...(*Interruptions*)

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE:** Madam, they are showing their respective majorities. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Everyone is showing it.

...(*Interruptions*)

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE:** Madam, we asked for a division. It was correct to ask for a division. At that time, perhaps they did not have the numbers and therefore at that moment... ...

*(Interruptions)* That is why we have felt hurt, because even under Rule 338 we did not receive a ruling. ... *(Interruptions)* Then we asked for a division and even that did not take place. All these matters are being raised strictly in accordance with the Rules. Even after raising them as per the Rules, if no decision is taken in this House, ... *(Interruptions)* and if the Government is also not prepared, then it means that the Government does not want this Act. ... *(Interruptions)* The Government does not have faith in it. ... *(Interruptions)* That is what it implies. ... *(Interruptions)* Therefore, I request you to give your decision on both these issues so that we may proceed further. ... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** First of all, regarding the Rules that you had raised, I have examined all of them. You can see that work is being carried out accordingly. Yesterday, when this Bill was introduced, it was almost identical to the one that had earlier been passed, and the House was functioning in continuation. Keeping all these aspects in view, the suspension of Rule 338 was sought by the Hon. Minister. That was the very motion which was moved. There is no question of making a separate reference to that Rule. The Minister moved the motion and referred to the suspension of Rule 338. When I allowed it, only then did he move the motion.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** Either you decide among yourselves and inform me, or else continue speaking in this manner. Saugata Roy Ji, please tell us what you want. We have already moved ahead, therefore there is no question of voting now. What do you want? Do you want a discussion or not, or do you want this matter to be referred to a Joint Committee?

... (*Interruptions*)

**PROF. SAUGATA ROY (DUM DUM):** I support the point raised by Kharge Ji that when the motion under Rule 338 was moved, a voice vote was taken. We were not satisfied with the voice vote and therefore we demanded a division. ... (*Interruptions*) While we were demanding a division, the House was adjourned. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. SPEAKER:** You will not say that.

... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**SHRI K.C. VENUGOPAL (ALAPPUZHA):** It is true. ... (*Interruptions*)

*[Translation]*

**PROF. SAUGATA ROY:** Madam, I cannot speak while so many people are speaking at the same time. I can speak before you. ...  
*(Interruptions)*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Saugata Roy Ji, first of all, incorrect statements should not go on record. Please allow me to complete my statement first. You have raised two points; I will first speak on those.

... *(Interruptions)*

**PROF. SAUGATA ROY:** Madam, I will not sit down merely on such gestures. ... *(Interruptions)* I am not a school child. I know the law. ... *(Interruptions)*.

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** This is not the way.

... *(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

**SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU:** Saugata Da, what do you want? ...  
*(Interruptions)*

**PROF. SAUGATA ROY:** Madam, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has just said that since the Bill will now go to a Joint

Parliamentary Committee, there is no need for debate or detailed discussion. His Minister of State went a step further and said that if you do not want a Joint Committee, then have a discussion. This is not the proper manner of speaking. ... (*Interruptions*) We say that the discussion should be completed first. Thereafter, if the Government wants a Joint Committee, the Opposition will be part of it. However, the Business Advisory Committee has allotted four hours for discussion. Let the discussion take place. Thereafter, a motion may be moved. The statutory resolution moved by Jayadevan Ji should also be put to vote, and voting should be conducted in a proper manner by pressing the button. That is how it should be done. The process of pressing the button should have been followed earlier as well, but you are saying that we raised our point later. To my understanding, we raised our point simultaneously.

Finally, I will abide by your view, but everything should be done in a proper manner. This is my humble request to you. Whatever you say politely, we will accept.

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Do you want to start the discussion or not?

... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE:** Yes, Madam. ...

*(Interruptions)*

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS:** Yes, Madam.

*[Translation]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** When I had called upon Jayadevan Ji to speak, you asked for voting thereafter. By that time, I had already moved ahead. Now, I cannot go back.

... *(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

**14.50 hrs**

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF  
RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND  
RESETTLEMENT (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 2015  
AND  
RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND  
RESETTLEMENT (AMENDMENT) SECOND BILL, 2015 –  
Contd.**

*[English]*

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now, Shri Jayadevan.

*... (Interruptions)*

**\*SHRI C.N. JAYDEVAN (THRISSUR):** Thank you madam for allowing me to participate in the discussion.

**HON. SPEAKER:** Now eight and nine we will be taking together.

---

\* English translation of the speech originally delivered in Malayalam.

**SHRI C.N. JAYADEVAN:** I will be speaking in Malayalam, my mother tongue. Madam this Bill, has already been passed in the Lok Sabha and then referred to the other House, became an ordinance, and has again come back to Lok Sabha. The technicalities and the legal issues, involved have already been discussed by several Members. Therefore, I do not want to repeat those issues. Through you madam, I want to ask this Government humbly especially the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, Venkaiah Naidu, and others sitting in the treasury benches for whom are you legislating this Bill?

Is this for the people of this country, or for the poor farmers and farm labourers of India? Is it for the industrial workers, or the educated Indians working in the service sector?

For whom are you bringing this legislation? With so much resolve, time and again you have brought it, without daring to pass it in the Rajya Sabha. You have brought it again with the suggestion of referring it to a Select Committee. For whom are you engaging in this exercise?

I blame you. The banking capital and the industrial capitalists of India, have jointly consolidated themselves into a financial capitalism.

It is to protect the interest of this financial capitalist, that you have brought this Bill to the House, time and time again. Behind that financial capitalist there is not just the strong presence of monopoly companies of India, not just Adanis, Ambanis, Tata, or Birla, Singhania, Godrej, Golchand, or Bajaj, but there are the monopoly companies of foreign countries, who have all joined hands to exert Pressure on a Government democratically elected by the people of India. Pressure is exerted on this Government to bring a legislation against the interest of the farmers and labourers of this country. You are being compelled to bring a legislation against the people of this country. Time and again you are bringing the legislation, succumbing to this pressure. I blame you for this.

I repeat, this legislation is only to protect, the interest of capitalists in India and abroad, I first heard the term, land acquisition in my home state – Kerala. In 1970, the land reform Bill was passed in Kerala as per the legislation, land was acquired by the Government. The Bill was passed when C. Achuta Menon was the Chief Minister of Kerala. The legislation, led to the acquisition of land belonging to the big land lords like Marthandam Kayal, Chiltira Kayal. The Government took over their agricultural land, not to start industries, but to distribute it

to the landless farm labourers. And a poet was inspired to write, “The lands that we sow we ourselves shall own”

Thousand acres of land belonging to *Muppilamma*, was acquired by the Kerala Government, without paying a single paisa to its owner.

These forest lands are still being protected by the Government, as forest land. But for whom are you acquiring the land, sir?

You claim that you want to make industrial corridors and that you want to make innovations in the industrial sector.

While presenting the budget and also while taking part in the discussion on subsequent Finance Bill the Hon. Finance Minister had said, that capital is going to flow in from foreign countries and also from within the country, and it will pave the way for large scale development of our economy. Due to that development, the common man in India, will be empowered, and poverty will be eradicated from this country.

He also said, that some people who were jealous of this achievement, intolerant of Government’s success in eradicating poverty, are the people who are opposing the Land Acquisition Bill.

Arun Jaitely ji, I remember your words to this effect. We are not opposing you, due to any sentiment of jealousy. Day by day, you and

your Government is succumbing to the interests of Indian and foreign monopolist companies. We are questioning you, for this compromise. Your policies are not in the interest of the majority of people in this country. This has been proved, by the huge rally that took place at Jantar Mantar. There were several parties, farmers organizations, and organisations engaged in social work who had assembled at Jantar Mantar, in the heart of the capital.

Protests are brewing up against this legislation, in various states of our country. On May 14<sup>th</sup>, my party, that is the communist party of India is organizing a nation wide strike against this laid acquisition Bill. Left parties, democratic parties, Congress, Trinamol Congress, Aam Adami Party, that is most secular democratic parties in various states and Leftist Communist parties are jointly organizing protest movements.

### **15.00 hrs**

This is a popular uprising against you. Can't you recognise this anger and protest of the people of this country? For whom are you adamantly pursuing this Bill? I want to raise this question time and again. We have a Parliamentary System of Government. I believe that this Parliamentary System has a lot of limitations. I call this a

bourgeois Parliamentary System. That is, the majority of have nots have the right to vote, and the minority of the affluent has the right to rule. The majority votes, and a selected few who protects the interests of a minority Capitalist lobby rules. This lobby, as I said, consists of monopolist companies, and the big land lords of our villages who own over ten thousand acres of land. So, the governance is to protect their interest. The majority of the poor, landless, farm labourers, and the poor industrial workers, self employed poor and several jobless poor who wander in the streets and the starving landless poor, can you legislate for them? I wish that you legislate for millions of these poor. Often the BJP and the Sangh Parivar who support them claim, that they stand for the Hindus of this country. I am not engaging in political discussion. Let me ask the BJP Members as a friend, for the sake of the poor Hindus, atleast in those states were you rule, can't you come up with a land reform Bill that can give land to the landless? Do you have the daring to bring such a legislation? Can you give such a directive to the State Governments ruled by your party? The landless should get land. You should acquire land from those land lords who own thousand acres of land. That land should be distributed among the landless and poor farmer labourers.

That way the labour force of the poor in this country will be used, for their own upliftment. We want a legislation that can herald, such a social change.

Can you bring such a legislation for the poor, in the four remaining years of your tenure in power? Or are you going to acquire and hand over the land to the big monopolist companies in India and abroad, so that they can start their industries here? Is this the responsibility of a Government elected by the people of this country?

Surely, you are going to form a committee. I am demanding strongly, that, I may be the lone Member who is representing the Communist Party of India in this House today. But we are functioning in twenty nine states of this country and in all union territories in this country except Andaman and Nicobar islands.

So the Communist Party being a national party, should have an opportunity to voice their opinion in this legislative process. I am not a vocal Member in this House. But I want to request to this House and to Madam Speaker and to those in the Government, that they must listen to my voice too, even when Members like me, may not create a commotion in the House. I am moving my resolution. Thank you.

**SHRI RAHUL GANDHI (AMETHI):** Thank you, Madam Speaker, for allowing me the opportunity to raise this important matter in the House. I would like to also thank the Members of the BJP who have come in such large numbers to listen to what I have to say thank you. I thought, I would be speaking to empty benches but now all of you are here. I would like to welcome you. ... (*Interruptions*) [*Translation*] Thank you. ... (*Interruptions*) Someone was shopping, someone was having food, everyone came running. Thank you. It felt very good. ... (*Interruptions*)

Madam Speaker, I would like to say something here on the Land Bill. ... (*Interruptions*) I would like to say a little on the Land Bill. ... (*Interruptions*) I say 'a little' because Shri Naidu Ji said that one should speak briefly and that the discussion should be concluded quickly, therefore I will speak only briefly. ... (*Interruptions*) Because I also respect what you have said. ... (*Interruptions*) It took us almost two years to bring the Land Bill, and the NDA Government killed that Bill within just a few days. The first axe was raised and struck here, at the throat. The consent clause, which is the most crucial clause. We had said that if land is to be taken from the poor people, from farmers and from labourers, it should be taken after seeking their consent. But you said no, we will not ask. If we take land, we will take it without

asking. ... (*Interruptions*) It makes no difference who the farmer is or who the labourer is, we will take the land. ... (*Interruptions*)

... (*Interruptions*)

**15.07 hrs**

(Hon. Deputy Speaker *in the Chair*)

The second axe was struck. After the throat was cut and the body fell, you struck a second axe and said that there would be no Social Impact Assessment. ...(*Interruptions*) We said that a Social Impact Assessment must be conducted so that it is known who has suffered and who has been affected by the acquisition of land. You said that there is no need for it. ...(*Interruptions*) They said that there is no need for any Social Impact Assessment. The loss of the farmer and the loss of the labourer make no difference. We had said that the assessment should be completed within six months. But in their Bill, there is no requirement for any assessment at all. Then the third axe was struck, perhaps the most crucial one. We had said that if, within five years, ... (*Interruptions*) you want to speak, you may speak. ... (*Interruptions*) Please stand up and speak; I am listening. ... (*Interruptions*) You are happy. If you want to speak again, you may do so again. ... (*Interruptions*) The third point was this. We had said that if the land of a farmer or a labourer is taken and if, within five years, there is no

progress on the project and the project does not commence, then that land should be returned to the farmer. In their new Bill, this provision has also been scrapped. What will happen now? Whether a project is built or not, whether it takes ten years, twenty years or fifty years, the land will not be returned to the farmer. ... (*Interruptions*) Now see how much hurry the Government is in to pass this Bill. Someone filed an RTI and asked your Finance Ministry to state how many projects are stalled because of land issues. We had thought that perhaps 80 per cent or 70 per cent would be stalled. But your Finance Ministry said that out of a hundred projects, only eight are stalled because of land. ... (*Interruptions*) The Union Government has land. State Governments have land. In SEZs, 40 per cent of the land is lying vacant. Yet, you want the land of farmers. ... (*Interruptions*) Why do you want to take the land of farmers? When the Government has no shortage of land, why do you want to acquire it, and from where all do you want to take land? This is what I wish to tell you. ... (*Interruptions*)

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, land is not acquired in Bundelkhand. It is not acquired in the deserts of Rajasthan. ... (*Interruptions*) It is acquired near cities like Gurgaon and Noida, and near Pune, because the price of this land is rising rapidly. ... (*Interruptions*) The farmers

of India have gold beneath their feet, and these people want to snatch that gold from you. The land which today is sold for lakhs per acre, five or ten years from now will be worth crores of rupees and will be sold per square foot. ... (*Interruptions*) In ten years, fifteen years or twenty years, your children could earn ten crore, twenty crore or even fifty crore rupees from that land. But this Government does not want to give that land to you. This Government wants to give that land to its industrialist friends, to crony capitalists. This is an anti-farmer and anti-poor Government. ... (*Interruptions*) This is a suit-boot Government, and the Hon. Minister is smiling. ... (*Interruptions*) I can see that the Hon. Minister is looking this way and smiling, because at one time he stood with us and said exactly what I am saying today. ... (*Interruptions*) But today he is sitting on the other side, and therefore he has to smile when he looks at us. Senior leaders are sitting with him. Sushma Ji was there earlier, she is not present today. Advani Ji is here, Rajnath Singh Ji is here, and if I remember correctly, they used to sit here and when we passed that Bill, they applauded like this. ... (*Interruptions*) They supported that very Bill, and today, I do not know why they have turned around. There can be two reasons. One, perhaps their hearts have genuinely changed. The other, perhaps they are afraid that if they say something wrong, they may get into trouble.

... (*Interruptions*) Land prices are rising. The benefit should go to the farmer. The benefit should go to the labourer. But you want the benefit to go to your friends. ... (*Interruptions*) We want to tell you that this will not happen so easily. ... (*Interruptions*) If we cannot stop it here, we will stop it on the streets. ... (*Interruptions*) We will stop you by taking to the streets. ... (*Interruptions*) We will not allow this suit-boot agenda to continue. Some time ago, an economist came to meet me. ...(*Interruptions*) Now I am concluding my remarks. Some time ago, an economist came to me. ... (*Interruptions*) He had worked on the Soviet Union. ...(*Interruptions*) He was an economist who had worked on the Soviet Union. ... (*Interruptions*) He worked on the Soviet Union and he said that he used to think that ...\* comes at twelve midnight. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Members, please take your seats.

... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**SHRI RAHUL GANDHI:** They come secretly. ... (*Interruptions*)  
And through the window... ... (*Interruptions*) The economist said, he

---

\* Not recorded.

had worked on the Soviet Union, ... (*Interruptions*) he said that he used to think that they come at night, ... (*Interruptions*) they come secretly, ... (*Interruptions*) they jump in through the window, ... (*Interruptions*) but I realised that the biggest ...\* come in broad daylight, they come before everyone, and they come wearing suits. ... (*Interruptions*) Thank you.

---

\* Not recorded.

**SHRI DILEEP SINGH BHURIA (RATLAM):** Sir, I rise to support this Bill. Just now, Shri Rahul Ji was speaking ... (*Interruptions*) and he said that such a large majority has been given to this side. For that, I would like to congratulate him. Rahul Ji, we do not need your congratulations. We need the congratulations of the people of the country. They have voted for us. We have not come here on the strength of your congratulations. ... (*Interruptions*) Rahul Ji also said that an axe was used. An axe is used on wood, not on human beings. Have you ever seen an axe? We have come here after cutting wood. ... (*Interruptions*) I do not know why you are so worried. This Parliament has been constituted to make laws. Such a large majority has come because that is what the people of the country want. You are misleading the farmers to a great extent. Wherever there is a suicide, you go there and get photographs taken. That is not going to solve any problem. ... (*Interruptions*) Have you even once... ... (*Interruptions*) Rahul Ji goes to tribal areas and to the huts of the poor, but has he ever provided any help? ... (*Interruptions*) Jyotiraditya Ji, please do not join the commotion. ... (*Interruptions*) In Madhya Pradesh, out of 29 seats, you got only two. This time, you will not even get two. ... (*Interruptions*) Kharge Sahib, you are a very senior person, a good

person and a wise person. You are sitting with 44 Members. Why are you creating such a commotion? ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE (GULBARGA):** At one time, you were also only two. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI DILEEP SINGH BHURIA:** When you brought this Bill in 2013, the heart of the BJP was so large that it supported it. Where has your heart gone now? ... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Bhuria Ji, please address the Chair.

[*Translation*]

**SHRI DILEEP SINGH BHURIA:** Hon. Deputy Speaker Ji , today the Farmer of the country also knows, the poor of the country also knows, the youth of the country know, the women of the country know that this country will develop under the leadership of Narendra Modi. ... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Bhuria Ji, please address the Chair.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI DILEEP SINGH BHURIA: Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir,** I am looking only at you, not at them. They are looking at me; I am looking only at you. ... (*Interruptions*)

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, as of today, the Bill that the Government has brought provides four times compensation to farmers. ... (*Interruptions*) Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, they do not even know how much land we will acquire from farmers. We will acquire only 0.5 per cent land. In a country where 75 per cent of the people were farmers earlier, today it has come down to 65 per cent. Today, in the United States there are 12 per cent farmers, in Japan 13 per cent, and in Canada 13 per cent. Who is responsible for the present economic condition of farmers? The Congress ruled for 50 years. What is the condition of farmers today? ... (*Interruptions*) What condition have you reduced farmers to? There used to be a saying that agriculture came first, business second, and employment third. Today, who wants to take up agriculture? How much hard work does a farmer put in? If there is excessive rainfall from the sky or if hailstorms occur, the farmer suffers the maximum loss. Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, what is the condition of farmers? Many Governments have come and

imposed one tax after another on them. From where will the farmer pay these taxes? What is the financial condition of the farmer?

Sir, I come from Jhabua, which is a tribal area. Even today, tribals depend 60 to 70 per cent on labour; they are farmers. At the time of Independence, there was one person who had 20 bighas of land. He had four sons, and now they together have 15 or 16 sons. None of them has even one bigha of land. Why are you opposing this, I do not understand. You will come down from 44 to four. Do not oppose this. Just as we resolved the Bangladesh border dispute and enacted such a good law, which the world is praising today, similarly this Government has been formed under the leadership of Shri Narendra Modi. Shri Modi wants to do good work. One year is about to be completed. Has there been any allegation of a scam anywhere? If I start speaking about your scams, I will have to make speeches for hours. ... (*Interruptions*) Why do you speak about Narendra Modi? Narendra Modi himself says that he sold tea and became the Prime Minister of this country. Why should that trouble you? They have come to serve the people, to work for the people, and to work for the farmers. ... (*Interruptions*) Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, please ask them to keep quiet. ... (*Interruptions*)

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, just now Rahul Ji was saying that this is a suit-boot Government. Then take the name of your own ...\*, he wears suit and boot, we do not. ... (*Interruptions*)

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Rahul Ji was also saying whether we are taking railway lines to those places. Are we taking railway lines to places where vacant land is lying? ... (*Interruptions*) Railway lines will go where railway tracks are required. ... (*Interruptions*) This is a simple and common matter. ... (*Interruptions*) I do not wish to make a political speech here. ... (*Interruptions*) I also have figures, but I am not speaking on figures. ... (*Interruptions*) I am only trying to make you understand this. ... (*Interruptions*) This is a very good law for the country. ... (*Interruptions*) If small industries can be set up, that is a good thing. ... (*Interruptions*) Today, Chinese goods are coming into our markets in large quantities. ... (*Interruptions*) During your rule, how many Chinese goods entered our markets? ... (*Interruptions*)

Jyotiraditya Ji, in the Vyapam matter, your leader apologised. ... (*Interruptions*) The Court rejected it. ... (*Interruptions*) What more do you want? Recently, municipal elections were held in Madhya Pradesh. ... (*Interruptions*) Our party won all the seats in the municipal

---

\* Not recorded.

corporations and all the seats in the panchayats. ... (*Interruptions*)  
What verdict do you want? The people are giving their verdict that  
under the leadership of Shri Narendra Modi, the Bharatiya Janata  
Party should govern this country. ... (*Interruptions*) This is a  
Government of the poor, the Dalits and the farmers. ... (*Interruptions*)  
Farmers themselves want this. ... (*Interruptions*) Those of you who  
are shouting so much, tell us who among you wants to take up  
farming. Come, we want to give you land in Jhabua. ... (*Interruptions*)  
Come and do farming there. ... (*Interruptions*) We want to give land  
to Rahul Ji as well. ... (*Interruptions*) We will give him land for  
farming and, if he wants, we will also give him an axe to cut wood. ...  
(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE:** Sir, I am on point of order.  
While speaking, a Member should not express any words which may  
hurt other Members. He should also not use defamatory or indecent  
words. But he is using such word. ... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

**SHRI DILEEP SINGH BHURIA:** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am  
aware of the law. ... (*Interruptions*) I also believe in the ideals of Dr.

Ambedkar. ... (*Interruptions*) Kharge Sahib is speaking here about the law. ... (*Interruptions*) You cannot mislead the people of this country merely by quoting figures. ... (*Interruptions*)

What did Dr. Ambedkar say? He said that the poor, Dalits and tribals should be educated, organised and made to struggle. That is what he said. That is why, in the elections that have taken place, the largest number of SC/ST Members of Parliament have been elected from the Bharatiya Janata Party. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE:** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Ordinance that we had brought was withdrawn by them. ... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

**PROF. SAUGATA ROY (DUM DUM):** I am on a point of order. I read rule 75(1) – on a Motion referred to in Rule 74 being made, the principle of the Bill and its provisions may be discussed generally.

[*Translation*] I listened to the speech of Shri Bhuria Ji. He has not discussed anything either on the Principle of the Bill or on its provisions. ... (*Interruptions*) There has been discussion about the elections in Madhya Pradesh. ... (*Interruptions*) Is this any kind of discussion? ... (*Interruptions*)

*[English]*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Please take your seat. You have raised certain points.

... *(Interruptions)*

**PROF. SAUGATA ROY:** He should discuss the Bill. ...  
*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

**SHRI RATTAN LAL KATARIA (AMBALA):** Houses have been constructed for the poor.

*[English]*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Mr. Kataria, listen to me. Take your seat. I have not called you.

... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is the prerogative of the Member to speak what he wanted to speak. I cannot direct a Member to speak in a certain way. It is left to the Member to decide as to what he wants to speak. If there is any unparliamentary expression, I would remove the same. That is what I can say.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI DILEEP SINGH BHURIA:** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when this law was brought in 2013, their Chief Ministers had opposed it. They said that this law would not benefit them. They know the names of those Chief Ministers. ... *(Interruptions)* Even today, they want this law to be passed. Who nurtured the industrial houses in this country? We did not nurture them. Our Government has only recently come to power. Sometimes you take the name of 'Tata', sometimes that of 'Birla'. ... *(Interruptions)* Do not do this. ... *(Interruptions)* Just now, Russia was being referred to. Russia failed in its farming system. If anyone tries to impose a farming system here by acquiring land, it will fail. Farming here is individual farming; let farmers farm. Do not provoke farmers. Today, farmers in the country are committing suicide. Parliament and all of us feel ashamed. Why are they dying? A farmer is a self-respecting person. If he is forced to go begging at someone's house, then suicide remains the only option left to him, thinking how he could have gone to someone's door. Big people declare themselves bankrupt and quietly siphon off their assets, and then put their shoes forward, but farmers cannot do this, tribals cannot do this, and Dalits cannot do this. Rahul Ji, I say this to you that you

should not get too deeply involved in this confrontation. ...  
(*Interruptions*) If they go to the homes of farmers ... (*Interruptions*)...\*

[*English*]

**SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. I would like to quote Rule 380 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. Rule 380 says:

“If the Speaker is of opinion that words have been used in debate which are defamatory or indecent or unparliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order that such words be expunged from the proceedings of the House.”

Now he is not speaking on the Bill. He is not speaking about the merits or demerits of the Bill. He is only attacking individual Members and he has not expressed his views on the Bill. Therefore, I request that whatever words he has expressed indecently or in an undignified manner, they should be expunged from the proceedings of the House.  
... (*Interruptions*)

---

\* Not recorded.

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will go through the proceedings. If there is anything objectionable or if there is anything unparliamentary, I will look into it.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI DILEEP SINGH BHURIA:** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we have made a provision in the law that the person whose land is acquired will be given employment. This provision was not there in their law. ... *(Interruptions)* Please do not try to explain this to me. ... *(Interruptions)* During their tenure, large dams were constructed and big industries were set up. Even today, those tribals are wandering. They were given neither land nor employment. ... *(Interruptions)* Whether it is Gurgaon, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Odisha or Haryana, no arrangements were made by them. We have stated that by the year 2022, houses will be provided to everyone. This is what the Bharatiya Janata Party and the NDA Government are saying. Did they build houses? ... *(Interruptions)* Today, the son of a farmer who is studying wants a job and wants to live in a proper house. He understands what the Opposition is doing. They spent 68 years living in huts; now they will live in pucca houses. For that, land is required. Land is required to build houses. If railway lines are to be laid, land is required. If aeroplanes are to fly, land is required. Land is required for colleges,

schools, hospitals and roads. Land will have to be provided for all these purposes. India will not remain what it was in 1947. Under the leadership of Shri Narendra Modi, India will be number one in the world. ... (*Interruptions*) If ponds had not been constructed, would our country have been able to produce so much foodgrain today? There are many such aspects.

This Bill speaks of development, of moving forward, and of taking farmers forward. But these people want to keep farmers backward. They are anti-farmer and are misleading people. If suicides occur anywhere, the Opposition will be responsible for them. I would advise that just as you supported the Bill on Bangladesh and got it passed unanimously, you should similarly support this Bill as well. Send a message to the country that this Parliament is a Parliament for development. The Government under the leadership of Shri Narendra Modi wants to achieve development by helping the poor, the farmers and the Dalits. With these words, I support this Bill.

*[English]*

**DR. P. VENUGOPAL (TIRUVALLUR):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015.

Guided by our beloved leader, Puratchi Thalaivi Amma, I am here to point out the provisions of this Bill that must be reconsidered.

I have already moved an amendment so that consent clause is made mandatory for acquisition of land for private individual industries even if the land is with the Government.

Our Government of Tamil Nadu is for giving protection to the public sector. We have been pressing for a broad consensus particularly about the land acquisition for public-private partnership projects.

Even before this Government could pass its original amendment Bill, it is coming before this House with a second amendment Bill. I wish to point out that a history of sorts is being created by this Government. I fail to understand why this Government puts itself in a bind. It can still take time. This Bill can be sent to a Joint

Parliamentary Committee so that we may gather the wisdom of all the stakeholders.

The health of the Public Sector Undertakings and the welfare of the people whose lands are acquired for establishing such Public Sector Undertakings for public purposes must be taken care of. Blanket exemption from the requirements of Social Impact Analysis (SIA) and 'Consent' provision cannot be permitted.

I would like to point out the concern expressed by our leader, Amma in the case of Neyveli Lignite Corporation. When the previous UPA Government went in for selling away its shareholdings, our Government of Tamil Nadu, in spite of financial crunch, came forward to buy the shares so that it does not fall in the hands of private sector people. In the interest of NLC, the public sector unit and its employees have been protected by the initiatives of our compassionate leader, Amma.... (*Interruptions*)

This (Second Amendment) Bill carries with it the element that gives us apprehension. The insertion of new Chapter IIIA is a matter of great concern. Though the Centre would like to convince the State Governments that they are empowered to consider exemption on a case-to-case basis, we are greatly worried. The power of Appropriate

Government to exempt certain projects intended to be given through this Bill takes away the application of Chapters 2 and 3. This negates the very idea of having Chapters 2 and 3 in this Bill. So, naturally it upsets the right thinking people as a draconian move. That is why, we have been urging upon this Government to reconsider it.

Ours is an agro-economy. Farmers play a vital role. Agricultural workers who may not have land-ownings are also stakeholders. So, the concern for the poor cannot be given a go-bye. That is why, we insist that the Government should not rush through with this Amendment Bill.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, apart from sending this Bill to the JPC, this Bill should be discussed in depth with the Chief Ministers of States both in the National Development Council and in NITI Aayog. I am surprised that the meeting of political parties have not been called so far in this regard.

I would like to point out that our Government of Tamil Nadu has passed a comprehensive Bill to amend the Section pertaining to litigation period to avoid unnecessary disturbance to Government projects.

We must be cautious about forced acquisition. We need to ensure safeguards and appeal mechanism. We cannot afford to be silent on resettlement and rehabilitation of those displaced. Since ‘urgency clause’ is the most criticized Section in the present Bill, the Government must come forward to reconsider it again.

Expressing our serious apprehension about the insertion of Chapter IIIA and requesting the Government to reconsider it, let me conclude. Thank you.

**SHRI SUDIP BANDYOPADHYAY (KOLKATA UTTAR):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, first of all I rise to oppose the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015.

I would like to know as to why it was necessary to bring it again on the Floor of the House which was brought by the UPA Government in 2013. It was debated on 28<sup>th</sup> of August. Both the parties, Congress and BJP, had supported the Bill. The voting had also taken place. The result of the voting on my amendment was ‘Ayes 268’ and ‘Noes 19’. Who were those 19? Those 19 were only from Trinamool Congress. As a result, the Motion was adopted. Who was the main speaker on behalf of BJP in the Lok Sabha? Rajnath Singhji was the main speaker, who spoke on behalf of BJP on this Bill in the Lok Sabha. Who was the main speaker on behalf of BJP in the Rajya Sabha? Mr. Katiyar was the main speaker, who spoke on behalf of BJP on this Bill in the Rajya Sabha. Normally, a question comes up as to what is the necessity of bringing another Bill when one Bill has already been passed on the Floor of the House with division of votes. Everybody has now come to know the role of every party.

The Trinamool Congress is of the opinion that farmers had to be given free hand so far as the Land Acquisition Bill is concerned. We

are totally against the forceful occupancy of the land. Rahul Gandhiji has initiated the debate. He was of the same opinion and, I believe, that everyone of us should protest against the forceful occupancy of the land from the farmers.

We have our own fight in our State under the leadership of our Chief Minister Mamata Banerjee. When the land in Singur was occupied by a very big corporate house, we opposed it. We have seen the hungry farmers fighting with hunger. How can they maintain their livelihood? Land is not elastic that if you stretch it, it will increase. Land is the same but the population is increasing. If the population goes up to a certain height; if the land is grabbed forcefully and all the decisions are taken in favour of the captains of the industries or in favour of the corporate houses; then, gradually the size of the land will be decreased. Today or tomorrow, the food shortage will be there. Scarcity of food will be there in our country if not today, it will be after 20 years or 30 years.

So, Sir, our stand has been very clear from the very beginning. The Standing Committee took a decision with 13 recommendations. The UPA Government accepted 11 recommendations but did not accept the remaining two recommendations. The Trinamool Congress was in favour of acceptance of all 13 recommendations of the

Standing Committee. There were the two points due to which those two recommendations were discarded by the then Minister, Hon. Jairam Rameshji. Those were: (1) that 80 percent of the land would remain with the owner and 20 percent would be taken over by the Government in whatever manner it may be for social sectors, (2) 70 percent would be acquired by the owner and the remaining land would be acquisitioned by the Government in whatever manner it may be. We raised objection at that time and said that the landowner and the farmer should discuss amongst themselves and settle the price. It should be left on the discretion of the farmer whether he is interested or keen to sell his land or not. The price should be fixed in between the discussion of the two; and the Government should not play the role of a mediator. It is not the duty and responsibility of the Government to play a role of a mediator in seeing how negotiation takes place in between the two.

Normally, a farmer feels that when such types of questions or negotiations arise, the attitude of the Government automatically would tilt towards the corporate offices or towards the captions of the industries.

So, naturally, this forceful occupancy at any stage, at any level should be all out opposed by us. Let 100 percent land be occupied by

those who want to buy the land to set up industries with whatever proposals and projects they have. They can take the land on their own in consultations with the farmers. It should be 100 percent without any division. At the UPA time, it was 80 percent and 70 percent; and now, we are hearing that the full land can be taken over by the Government. It is not agreeable.

Sir, we have a belief as to which type of land can be taken over. there can be two types of land. One is barren land. The land which is called barren. the other is mono-crop land, the land where one crop grows. It is not multi-crop land. On those lands where multi-crops are produced, it should never happen that those lands will be allowed to be occupied at any stage, at any level. There should be serious restrictions that multi-crop land will not be allowed to be taken over by any corporate office.

So, we should concentrate on barren land and mono-crop land. That should be the policy of the Government. The Trinamool Congress, from the very beginning, has been opposing since the time of UPA Government: and we still stick to our stand. We thoroughly believe that this Bill will not serve the interests of the common farmers. It will certainly be projected as anti-farmers. So, the Trinamool Congress thoroughly opposes this Bill.

With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI BALBHADRA MANJHI (NABARANGPUR):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Government has brought this Bill after making amendments. Discussion has already taken place on it. As everyone knows, this Bill had also been passed by the Lok Sabha, but our party had objections to certain provisions of this Bill. When it comes to land acquisition, many aspects have to be taken into consideration. Land acquisition is carried out in different ways for different purposes, and we need to pay some attention to this aspect. Railway lines, highway projects, canals and the like, which are known as linear projects, have a different kind of repercussion and impact on society, on farmers and on villagers. Other types of projects are called concentric projects, such as when a steel plant is set up or a dam is constructed. In such cases, an entire village is uprooted. Not just one village, but several villages are uprooted. Villages comprise different kinds of people, including the landless as well as landowners. Society is not just a village; it includes cultural, social and economic aspects, interdependence among people, and many such factors. It is not simply a matter of paying compensation and displacing people. That is not the case. If a village is being divided and fragmented, particularly in tribal areas and backward regions, the mindset of the

people is such that they are very emotional and highly sensitive. Many a time, it has happened that under Government provisions, houses are built for poor people and tribals, but they are not prepared to leave their village and home and settle elsewhere. They are that sensitive. When a village is uprooted, it has very serious repercussions. This relates to social and psychological aspects.

Now comes the issue of compensation. There is talk of compensation being three, four or five times. Money is such a thing that no matter how much is given, it gets exhausted within a few months or a few years. In all land acquisitions that have taken place so far, World Bank studies show that no matter how much money is given, after a few years it is found that those whose land was acquired have become poorer. No person whose land has been acquired has progressed. Their condition has gone from bad to worse. What is the reason? When money comes into one's hands, the mindset is to spend it.

I will give one or two examples in this regard. A few years ago, there was an incident of maxi-cab crime in Gurgaon. Why did this happen? When people there began selling their land at very high rates, they earned a lot of money. But once the money came into their hands, they developed a habit of spending it. Their lifestyle changed. They

started dining in five-star hotels, indulging in luxury and entertainment, and after some time the money was exhausted. They became accustomed to a high-end lifestyle, and in order to sustain it, incidents like the maxi-cab crime took place.

Sir, one day I went to buy fish in my town. Another person standing next to me was also buying fish, and he was drunk. When the fish seller told him that the price of the fish was two hundred rupees, he became angry and said, 'What do you think? I am selling one stand of land for twenty lakh rupees and you are telling me the price of fish.' What I mean to say is that when money comes suddenly into one's hands, such habits develop. I will not take names. In 1985, a steel plant acquired land for Rs. 5,000. At that time, the farmers felt that Rs. 5,000 was a very large amount. People happily gave away their land. Today, when the area developed around the steel plant and a township came up, the value of that land rose to Rs. 1.5 crore. Where is Rs. 5,000 and where is Rs. 1.5 crore? A three-thousand-fold increase. From 1985 till now, that is, over 30 years, the price of land has increased three thousand times. Who benefited from this? What did the farmer get? His land was taken for Rs. 5,000, he spent it, and today he is working as a labourer. Our party's stand earlier was this, and it continues to be the same even now, that no matter how much

compensation you give, money alone is not the solution. If required, you may even slightly reduce the compensation. There is a provision to give employment to one person from a family, which is a good thing. But if you give employment, the other members of the family will not get jobs, because only one person per family will be given employment. If there are four brothers in a family, only one brother will get a job and the others will not. What will the others do? During the elections, our manifesto also stated that when land is acquired for commercial purposes, the family whose land is being taken should have a share in that commercial activity.

### **16.00 hrs**

The Panchayat should also have a share. It has been the consistent stand of our party that the consent of the Panchayat as well as of the concerned person should be mandatory. A provision should be made in the law that there must be a share in commercial projects. Where only a small extent of land is acquired, providing employment may perhaps be sufficient. But in the case of dam projects and irrigation projects, where entire villages are uprooted, there is a need for special provisions. You will find many such examples. Even today, people are still struggling to receive compensation for land that was acquired fifty or sixty years ago for irrigation projects. For such projects, if the

land taken from farmers is compensated by providing them with an equivalent extent of cultivable land, then they will truly benefit from development. If that is not done and they are instead settled in forest areas where there is neither electricity nor water nor cultivable fields, and only a small piece of forest land is given, then that land must at least be fit for cultivation. Farmers should feel that they have given their land for development and that they are stakeholders in the development that has taken place. If development is carried out for the benefit of some by displacing others, in my view, it amounts to grave injustice. On behalf of my party, I oppose this amended Bill. I urge the Government to accept the suggestions that I have placed before the House.

**SHRI ARVIND SAWANT (MUMBAI SOUTH):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when this important issue was discussed earlier, I had also expressed my views. Today, once again, an attempt is being made by our Government to reintroduce this Bill after making changes.

Recently, issues relating to farmers were raised in our House. There was discussion on hailstorms, unseasonal rains and drought. Farmers were being devastated. Thereafter, the Union Government sent assistance. I would like to share with you the experience we had after that assistance was sent. The Hon. Minister would be aware that out of the assistance sent, Rs. 460 crore came back. Why did it come back? Because many farmers who were entitled to compensation did not have bank accounts. There were some farmers who were cultivating the land, but their names were not recorded in the 7/12 extracts. In some cases, joint families were found where there were two or four brothers, and there was a dispute as to who should receive the compensation. As a result, the money was returned. When we talk about land acquisition, I would like to state that we had opposed it earlier as well, but I wish to remind you of a few important aspects.

Our Hon. Prime Minister says, *Sabka Saath, Sabka Vikas*. Whatever progress the country has made so far, irrespective of which party has been in power, has the country not progressed at all? If it has

progressed, do farmers not have any contribution in it? Do they not have a share in it? How much is their contribution? How much land have farmers given? Yes, corruption has taken place. It has taken place in Maharashtra as well. When it comes to dams, entire villages are uprooted. Neither was the dam completed nor was their rehabilitation carried out. The Koyna project was constructed in 1960, but even today, the people displaced due to it have not been rehabilitated. We are unable to understand why our Government is repeatedly exerting such pressure on this issue. Why do we not want to take the consent of the people? When it comes to security, we also say that there is no need for consent. There is one category among ten categories. Leave that one category aside. Whenever land has to be acquired for that purpose, it may be done. But even there, the issue of social impact arises. If we acquire land and entire villages are uprooted, tribals are displaced or our fishermen are displaced, where will you rehabilitate them? I had said this earlier as well. They have a way of life. You cannot reject that way of life, nor can you insult it, and we have no right to do so. Therefore, whenever we acquire land, we must examine the social impact. The same thing happened in the Narmada project. The Supreme Court had to intervene and had to ask on a daily basis how much height was being increased, how many

farmers were being rehabilitated after that increase in height, and how much money was being given to them. We repeatedly say that we are giving four times the compensation. You have experienced it, and I have experienced it as well.

When land was acquired in Pune in Maharashtra for the IT sector, what happened? Farmers received a lot of money, but even ten years have not passed and entire families have been ruined. Sir, money does not last. Now you say that jobs will be given. When will jobs be given? Jobs will be given only when an industry comes up there. How much time will that take, and to whom will jobs be given? If one member of a family is given a job and there are four brothers in that family, how many members will get employment? If there are two dependants in a family and only one gets a job, what will happen to the other? You have not thought through all these aspects, and that is what distresses us. What will happen to a family even after paying four times the compensation? That is why I had said even earlier that if a company is being set up, make the affected persons shareholders, or take their land on lease. The Government should take land on lease, make them lessors, so that they receive an income throughout their lives. There is another issue in land acquisition. In our country, about 75 per cent of farmers have less than five acres of land. Now, when land is acquired,

say one kilometre here and one kilometre there, some will lose their entire land and some will lose half their land. Even here, there are two aspects. Suppose land up to one kilometre is acquired and those whose land falls within that one kilometre are paid four times the compensation. They will be happy. But what will the neighbouring farmer think? He will say, 'He got one crore rupees, my land lies just outside the boundary, I will get nothing', and he will be distressed. Is it only farmers' land within that one-kilometre stretch? There may be some businessmen, some hotels, or even a small factory. What are you going to do about them? Will you remove that industry? If there is a factory standing within that one-kilometre corridor, under this law will you acquire it or remove it? You will acquire farmers' land, but what will you do with that factory? Will you take it over or protect it? If you are going to protect it, then farmers also need protection. I had said this earlier as well. When land is taken, one must consider whether it is barren land, single-crop land or multi-crop land. When we take land, land is a permanent asset. That permanent asset is taken away permanently, and in return I am given a non-permanent job. After how many years will that job come, no one knows. What salary will be paid, no one knows. Whether the next generation will get a job

or not, no one knows. If the factory shuts down, what will happen then? Today, even labour laws are not in place as they once were.

We have created SEZs. Recently, our people from South India informed us that Nokia has shut down its company there. Could the Government stop it? No, it could not. Five thousand people became unemployed. Are you going to increase the number of unemployed youth? It will lead to anarchy. Therefore, I caution the Government not to proceed in this manner. We do not want to lead the country towards anarchism. I would like to say one more thing. When it comes to employment, what kind of security are you providing? What will be the salary, Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 6,000? Will a family be able to survive on such an amount? The farmer is already risking his life; here too, he will be pushed to desperation. It will make no difference to him. I had said this earlier as well. The day farmers get assured income, they will not commit suicide. We keep talking about other countries. Suppose we fix the Minimum Support Price of a commodity at Rs. 1,000, and when the market price falls, the poor farmer is forced to sell it at Rs. 700 or Rs. 800. The farmer suffers a loss of Rs. 200, and that Rs. 200 loss pushes him towards death. The intermediary takes away that Rs. 200. It is the responsibility of the Government to stop this and ensure that the farmer permanently receives the Minimum Support Price.

Then farmers will never commit suicide. We only talk about Minimum Support Price, but what actually happens? When the price of produce falls, tomatoes, onions and other produce are sold at throwaway prices or dumped on the roads. Thereafter, the farmer is compelled to commit suicide. Therefore, this Minimum Support Price remains only on paper. Similarly, employment will also remain only on paper. You say that four times the compensation will be given for land; that too will remain on paper. The family will be ruined. Therefore, we repeatedly submit to you that doing this without consent and without social impact does not go with this Bill. I would submit, with folded hands, that except for defence purposes, please leave this out. For defence, we are prepared. But for all other purposes, we earnestly request you not to proceed in this manner.

We talk about providing houses to farmers, but kindly clarify the size of the houses that will be provided. Houses were also constructed earlier under the Indira Awaas Yojana. The house provided is hardly about 100 square feet. Our tribal communities live in forest areas where even their huts are spread over 300 to 400 square feet, and yet they feel suffocated in the smaller houses provided to them. Therefore, it is necessary to clearly state the area of the houses that will be allotted to them.

Therefore, on behalf of the Shiv Sena Party, I would like to submit that the proposal to refer this Bill to a Joint Parliamentary Committee should be acted upon. Let this Bill be examined and discussed thoroughly there. Until that is done, our opposition to this Bill shall continue.

*[English]*

**SHRI JAYADEV GALLA (GUNTUR):** Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015.

Sir, on behalf of my party, the Telugu Desam Party, and our leader Shri Nara Chandrababu Naidu *garu*, just as we supported the earlier Bill, I stand to support this Bill as well but I just want to make a few points before that.

Sir, the basic problem we are talking about is the agrarian crisis. We are talking of problems that farmers are facing in our country and how this Bill is supposedly anti-poor. But Sir, I would like to point out a very basic fact. Sixty percent of our population is living on just 14 per of our GDP. Until and unless we correct this anomaly, I do not think that anything else is going to bring relief to our farming community. The farmers can improve their yield, they can reduce their input costs, they can mechanise farming and do so many things to improve their results, but as long as 60 percent of our population is living on just 14 percent of our GDP – maybe it can go to 20 or 25 percent – it is unacceptable and it has to change.

Sir, we need to move at least 20 crore to 30 crore people out of agriculture into either manufacturing or services or self-employment. In order to do that, we need to create jobs and in order to create jobs, we need physical infrastructure and social infrastructure. For this, we need land and we need businessmen to develop these projects. I find it very offensive as a businessman myself that businessmen are being painted as only crony capitalists. I am not a crony capitalist and 90 percent of the businessmen in this country are not crony capitalists. It is not fair to categorise us that way. We work for the poor people. In my company, we employ 10,000 people, 90 percent of which come from the farming community. For the first time in the history of their families, for the first time in their lives, they are getting a predictable monthly income which allows them to go through financial planning. So, I do not think that this Bill is required in order to create jobs, in order to provide employment and bring people out of poverty into the mainstream of society. For that reason, I support this Bill.

There has been a thorough discussion earlier and now also and there still seem to be some concerns. So, on behalf of my Party, I would like to recommend that we may please refer this Bill to a Joint Parliamentary Committee with a reasonable deadline to complete it.

Thank you very much.

**SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN (KOLLAM):** Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill on three grounds. Number one, on the grounds of provisions of the Constitution; number two, according to the Rules of Procedure; and number three, factually also I oppose this Bill.

Sir, the Constitutional provisions, which I have mentioned yesterday by virtue of Article 107 and Article 123 in which I have also moved a notice for disapproval of the Ordinance, which is also pending. Here, coming to the facts of the Bill, yesterday also, I have mentioned that I fully accept and abide by the ruling of the Hon. Speaker yesterday.

If that be the case, I would like to highlight one more point that by moving a motion by the Hon. Minister under Rule 338 that it is identical because a Motion has already been moved by the Hon. Minister and now another Motion is going to be moved that is an identical Motion under Rule 338. So, it cannot be moved, and that is why in your wisdom the Hon. Speaker has decided to suspend the Rule under Rule 338. I do agree, but that means the Government admits to the fact that identical Bills are there. If identical Bills are there, then my point is that Rule 112 (2) will be applicable. Yesterday, I have read Rule 112 (2), which states that :

“A Bill pending before the House shall also be removed from the Register of Bills pending in the House in case a Bill substantially identical is passed by the House or the Bill is withdrawn under rule 110.

Explanation – A Bill pending before the House shall include –

(i) A Bill introduced in the House ...”.

So, it is an identical Bill as per your Motion, and the Government is admitting the fact that it is an identical Bill. So, it is against the procedure. Today, they have introduced and admitted that it is an identical Bill. So, it is procedurally incorrect.

Article 123 states that only during extraordinary situations -- in case of emergency and necessity to transact a business; and Parliament is not in Session -- the Ordinance can be promulgated. Here, the promulgation of the Ordinance itself is not -- I am not using the word *bona fide*-- in the proper manner. I am saying this because the other House was not adjourned *sine die* or the House was not prorogued, and instead of proroguing the House, the House was adjourned to a particular date. Subsequently, the other House has been prorogued so as to issue or promulgate an Ordinance. It has never been heard of in

the history of the Indian Parliamentary practice. This was the first time that it happened. So, my question is this. What is the urgency? Even the learned Member from Shiv Sena was also vehemently opposing the Bill; BJD is more or less opposing the Bill; and almost all the sections of this House are opposing the Bill. So, what is the emergency in having this Bill? This is the second question that I would like to highlight.

Coming to the Bill, the proposed Amendment under Section 10 (a), is a very contentious provision. We do accept (a), (b) and even (c) we can accept that no consent is required and no social impact assessment is required. We can accept to that extent, but what about industrial corridor setup by the appropriate Government and its Undertakings and one kilometer on either side. What is industrial corridor? Kindly go through the definition, and the intention of the Bill will be very clear.

Coming to (e), infrastructure projects including projects under Public Private Partnership where the ownership of the land continues to vest with the Government, there also the same thing is applicable. So, in these cases, my point is that these provisions have to be taken out of Section 10 (a), and then definitely the entire House will be

agreeing in respect of having defence production, defence industry, and the entire House will agree on the social impact assessment.

As regards the social impact assessment, we can never get rid of it because the social impact assessment is one of the major issues, which determines the criteria of quantum of compensation. The quantum of compensation is on the basis of the social impact assessment as to what is the loss caused to them; what is the quantum; and what is the social impact assessment? All these will govern in assessing the quantum of compensation. So, the social impact assessment is *pucca* and it is compulsory, but even consent can be given in the case of defence production and in the case of Public Sector Undertakings in the national interest, and we can, to an extent, even waive the consent, but the social impact assessment is a must and highly required and necessary.

I will mention one more point and then I will conclude, and it is regarding the five-year span of time. Supposing a company or whoever it may be, even after getting the land in their favour, if they are not commencing any business even after the land acquisition, they were being given time up to two years as per the original Bill, but now it has been changed to five years. It means that even after completion of the entire procedure of land acquisition, they are now going to be

given five years time. This cannot be accepted. These are my objections.

Sir, I have been given time out of turn as I have to rush back to my constituency for attending to an urgent matter. I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity.

I would like to make one more regarding employment. Clause 7 says, "...including compulsory employment to at least one Member of such affected family of a farm labourer." Supposing, an agriculturist or a Government Servant's land is taken, it means he will not get employment. One subjective clause has been incorporated in the amended provision that *at least one Member of such affected family of a farm labourer* will be given employment. It means that only an agricultural labourer will get employment and an agriculturist or a farmer will not get employment; an ordinary or a common man will not get employment. This is simply an eye-wash.

Therefore, on these three grounds – factual grounds, constitutional grounds as well as procedural grounds – this Bill is to be opposed. I appreciate the stand taken by the Government in sending it to a Joint Committee of Parliament.

With these words, I conclude while once again expressing my gratitude and thanks to you, Sir.

**SHRI B. VINOD KUMAR (KARIMNAGAR):** Sir, today we are once again discussing this Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015. The original Act was passed by this Parliament in the year 2013. Within six months, there were General Elections and a new Government under the leadership of Shri Narendra Modi was sworn in. I did not understand as to what provoked the Government to issue the first Ordinance. Earlier, in the month of March, when we discussed that Ordinance as well as the Bill, on behalf of my Party, we had suggested some points on many clauses in the Bill. Today I am not going into the clause-by-clause details. However, till today the Government has not expressed as to in what way the original Bill hampered the development.

Under Rule 112, many States have to frame rules. Only my State of Telangana, under the leadership of my Chief Minister, Shri K. Chandrasekhara Rao, has framed rules wherein we have given many incentives to the farming community, particularly to those who were losing their land. However, for the last two years, no State Government had faced any problem, at least, on record. They have not brought to the notice of the public at large how acquisition under the original Act of 2013 had hampered the progress of development. In

the event of this Government coming across any issues, though I had asked the Hon. Minister earlier when I had participated in the debate on the first Amendment Bill, the Hon. Minister had not brought anything to the notice of this House as to which State had faced difficulties while implementing the original Act of 2013. We should know about that first, before bringing this Amendment.

This House had already passed this Bill once, but it could not get through in Rajya Sabha. In the event of this Government being serious, it should discuss this issue with all political parties and with all the Chief Ministers.

I also made this proposition earlier. But they have not come forward to discuss this issue with different political parties and with the Chief Ministers of different States. At least now, I would request the Government to refer it to the Joint Select Committee so that they can get some consensus. There are many issues. I am not going into the issues clause by clause. But in order to get the consensus, it is good that if the Government refers this Bill to the Joint Select Committee.

**SHRI MOHAMMAD SALIM (RAIGANJ):** Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill – The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015.

Technically, we are having a futile exercise. That is what we are repeatedly doing, not only on this Bill but on an earlier occasion also. Everyday we find that some Bills are being stuck in Rajya Sabha. The Government is coming out with an amendment, sometimes even to withdraw it. Sometimes the Bill is pending after passing. Then there is another Ordinance and then another Bill. Why is this happening?

*[Translation]*

Sir, through you, I would like to say to the Treasury Benches that before undertaking any action, one must confront both planning and ground realities. Those who have assumed responsibility in Parliament were expected to govern in a planned manner, especially when they speak of Digital India and real-time data exchange. However, what is being revealed is that, on the one hand, the Government is not taking Parliament seriously, and on the other, serious questions are being raised about its capacity to assess realities on the ground. When a bicameral arrangement was provided for in our

Constitution and the respective powers of the two Houses were clearly defined and tested, it becomes imperative that before introducing a Bill, passing it, or referring it to a Committee, the Government undertakes a proper study. In this regard, I express my regret that many Hon. Members on the Treasury Benches were asleep in the afternoon. When there was an uproar here and we demanded a division on the Motion, everyone had to wake up and rush into the House, and then disorder followed. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI ARJUN RAM MEGHWAL (BIKANER):** Sir, that is incorrect. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI MOHAMMAD SALIM:** This is happening repeatedly. ... (*Interruptions*) They are our own colleagues. ... (*Interruptions*) They should seek clarification from their own leadership. ... (*Interruptions*) Hon. Members should ask their parliamentary leadership why this is happening. ... (*Interruptions*) Why is such planning not being undertaken? The Government must know what it is doing and why it is doing it. ... (*Interruptions*) Land is of immense importance to this country, to our society, to our people, to our farmers and to our agriculture. This is not a new matter. It must, therefore, be treated with the seriousness it deserves.

Now I come to the Bill itself. The first question is this. As a Marxist, we take pride in the fact that even before Independence we tried to link the question of freedom with the question of land, that freedom means land to the tillers, that those who cultivate the land should have ownership of it. We fought against the feudal classes, from Telangana to Tebhaga, asserting that the farmer must have the right to cultivate the land. That was a different era, when armies were sent and land up to where the horses of the army could run became their property. Today, in the new system, what we are witnessing across the world and in our country is that instead of armies, capital has taken over. Those who possess more capital acquire more ownership. Within one year, through a series of laws brought by this Government, there is a clear attempt to transfer all natural resources in our country, all natural wealth, from one set of hands to another. ... (*Interruptions*) Whether it is coal, minerals or land, the same approach is being followed. After this, laws relating to water, canals and rivers will be brought. In some States, even river water has already been privatised. Therefore, on fundamental grounds, we oppose this Bill.

Sir, since Independence, the central question has been how land is to be allocated, and how land taken from large feudal landlords is to be distributed among farmers. Those speaking in favour of this law

have not fully understood this reality. When we speak of a thousand acres of land, in some places it may belong to one feudal landlord, and elsewhere to two such landlords. I come from the eastern region, where land redistribution has taken place, whether in West Bengal, Tripura, Kerala or Jammu and Kashmir. In regions where population pressure on land is high and the land is highly fertile, if you acquire a thousand acres, two thousand or even four thousand families depend on that land. Therefore, it is not as simple as stating that land will be acquired up to a distance of two miles on either side of a railway line or an industrial corridor. This is reminiscent of the days of kings and princes, when it was said that wherever the eye could see, that land belonged to the ruler. ... (*Interruptions*) Wherever your projects are located, you propose to acquire two miles of surrounding land. What is the Government saying in this regard? Your leaders are calling Hon. Members and telling them to go and tell farmers that all this is being done in their interest. If it is truly in their interest, why are you stepping back from taking the farmers' consent? Their opinion must be sought. On the very day when the Hon. Prime Minister says that there is no need to take their consent, the World Bank states that even for schemes such as the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana, a social impact assessment and consent are necessary, failing which the

Government will not receive assistance from the World Bank. If you truly respect the fundamental rights granted to citizens under our Constitution, will you not take their consent? Can you take over the capital or factories of a capitalist or a large industrial house without their consent? You are treating the farmer as so helpless that you will bring a law and take away his land without his consent.

Sir, the second issue is that of social and environmental impact. This Government delivers many speeches on the environment, but it will stand accused of sacrificing the environment in the name of capital and development. If this law also excludes provisions for social and environmental impact assessment, the damage being caused to our environment will become even more serious. It is for this reason that we oppose this Bill.

The third point is this. Are you really speaking about the rights of farmers? In law, it is always written *whichever is earlier*. If land has been taken in the name of development and no development takes place within five years, then the provision should clearly state whichever is earlier. However, what has been written here is whichever is later. This means that the process can continue endlessly, for an indefinite period. If you are genuinely concerned about farmers' rights, you should state whichever is earlier, whether it is five years

or even earlier. But you are not doing that. Instead, you are granting such sweeping rights to the party to whom the land is handed over.

Sir, similarly, during the UPA period, we compelled the Government to bring the Forest Rights law. We spoke for tribals and had an agenda to grant land rights to them. What are you giving them now? How much of their rightful entitlements are you actually granting? What have you done in the last one year? How much pressure has the Union Government exerted on State Governments to ensure that tribals are given rights and ownership over forest land? That issue has simply been made to disappear. For us, farmers and agriculture are of utmost importance.

*[English]*

“Industrial corridor set up by the appropriate Government and its Undertakings in which case the land shall be acquired upto one kilometre on both sides of designated railway line or road.”

*[Translation]*

This means that over a thousand square kilometres of land would be affected if you speak of an industrial corridor stretching from Mumbai to Delhi. ... (*Interruptions*) This is not how development is planned. ... (*Interruptions*) This is a grid-based approach. ...

*(Interruptions)* Appreciation of land values and economic planning do not work in this manner. ... *(Interruptions)* Why are you doing this? ... *(Interruptions)* Why are you seeking to bring this into law? ... *(Interruptions)* You are facilitating domestic and foreign monopoly capitalists. How much land have you given to Adani in Gujarat? ... *(Interruptions)* Does the Gujarat model mean that across the entire country, farmers' land will be handed over to Adani and Ambani? ... *(Interruptions)* And then you say this is not the case. I say this very clearly. This law is not for farmers. This law is not for land. This law is to auction off this country to a few of your friends, friends like Adani. That is why we oppose it. You keep bringing Ordinances repeatedly. You do not have the courage to face the people and, respecting democracy, get it passed in Parliament. You bring it as an Ordinance. Once an Ordinance fails, you should feel ashamed. When it fails once, you should bow your head, but instead you come back again. You keep failing repeatedly, yet you want to stand tall and display bravado.

You may suppress our voices in this House, but you will not be able to suppress the voices of the farmers of this country. What were your priorities? Your priorities should have been to stop farmers' suicides, to ensure fair prices for their crops, to reduce the cost of

inputs for farmers. Instead, you want to take away their land. You should be ashamed. ... (*Interruptions*)

For one year, it has been speeches, tours and illusions. For one year, there have been speeches, travel and deception, while farmers have continued to commit suicide.

*[English]*

**SHRI MEKAPATI RAJA MOHAN REDDY (NELLORE):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015. Our Party is in favour of building modern India by way of industrialization, construction of National Highways, building thermal plants, schools, hospitals etc. but we are against taking up lands of farmers forcefully. Our YSR Congress Party headed by Shri Jagan Mohan Reddy is against this Bill in its present form.

We are against taking over multi-crop and very fertile lands. We are against taking over lands of farmers without their consent. We are also against taking over lands without studying the social impact assessment and without studying the environmental effects.

I would like to say that we are very much in favour of building a new capital for the residuary State of Andhra Pradesh. We are very much against either land pooling or taking over or acquiring land forcefully. In our State of Andhra Pradesh, for example, in Guntur district, the Government is planning to build a new capital but it is being done very forcefully. The farmers are agitating because 32,000

acres have been acquired forcefully. The farmers are agitating and we request the present Government to convince the farmers, to take their consent, to pay them suitable compensation, take over the land, and build a new and modern capital. We are in favour of it. Our YSRC Party is in favour of it but they are taking over lands forcefully from poor farmers.

There are several marginal farmers and small farmers who are holding a few acres or even 50 cents of land. They came to Delhi to represent their matter to the leaders of various political parties here. They are really crying. The Government is doing a very wrong thing by forcefully acquiring the land of small and marginal farmers. There are various lands nearby, which are Government lands. They can as well take over these lands in addition to the farmers' lands and build the new capital but they are not doing that. I do not know for what purpose they are doing this. The farmers are in great distress. That should not be the case. That is why we are against taking over lands of farmers forcefully without the consent of the farmers, without studying the social impact and environmental effects and by not paying suitable compensation. We must make them happy and then only take over their lands either for industrial development or for any other purpose. That is why our party is very much against this Bill, as

it is, in the same form. Last time, we moved amendments. This time also, in the same form, our Party is very much against this Bill.

Thank you.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI TARIQ ANWAR (KATI HAR):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, today, I rise to speak in opposition to the Land Acquisition Bill that has been introduced in the House by the Hon. Minister for Rural Development. Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you must have heard the saying ‘Vinash kaale vipreet buddhi’. ... (*Interruptions*) This Government appears to be moving along that very path. When judgment becomes clouded, nothing is visible and nothing is understood. It is only after everything has been destroyed that one realises what a grave mistake has been committed. I understand the Government’s affection for the corporate world. We all understand it. This affection is so obvious and so open that it is visible to everyone, the entire country is watching it, and yet it is being displayed without any hesitation. I had believed, and our Hon. Prime Minister repeatedly states, that there is no lack of political wisdom within them. But today, the anxiety and unrest prevailing among farmers regarding this Bill and the Ordinance are clearly visible, and yet our Hon. Prime Minister seems unaware of it. That anxiety is not being seen or acknowledged.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, just two days ago, the Hon. Prime Minister made a highly controversial statement, which created a political storm even within his own party. He stated that the Bill

brought in 2013 should not have been supported by the Bharatiya Janata Party and that doing so was a mistake. He went on to say that at that time, the then Leader of the Opposition, Sushri Sushma Swaraj Ji, Shri Arun Jaitley Ji and other leaders of the Bharatiya Janata Party lacked proper judgment. According to him, supporting the 2013 Bill was a major mistake, and now the Government wishes to rectify that mistake. This is the Hon. Prime Minister's own statement.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when the law was being framed in 2013, the Chairperson of the Standing Committee at that time was the present Hon. Speaker. That Standing Committee deliberated at great length on all aspects of the matter. Thereafter, a Bill was prepared, and the Government accepted all amendments that came from the Opposition. After a long time, a law was enacted which received the support of all political parties, despite the fact that we represent different ideologies. We are speaking of political parties and organised groups; there may have been individual dissenters. In a parliamentary democracy, such occasions are rare when all parties agree on a single Bill or idea. Yet, on this Bill, there was unanimous agreement, and it was passed into law. The Land Acquisition Act, 2013 had not even been fully implemented when the Government brought forward amendments. Shri Rahul Gandhi has just pointed out

that among all ongoing projects in the country, only about 8 per cent are stalled due to disputed land, while nearly 92 per cent face no such dispute. The Government says it needs land urgently. Why this haste? What kind of pressure is there? Is the Government trying to fulfil promises made to a few, or to repay some old obligation? Why is there such urgency? Ordinance after Ordinance is being promulgated, and attempts are being made to push this Bill through. Such haste can only be under pressure; it cannot be otherwise. All farmers' organisations, irrespective of party or affiliation, have opposed this Bill. Even within the Sangh Parivar, there is no consensus on this issue. I can go so far as to say that if Members of Parliament of the Bharatiya Janata Party were given a free vote on this Bill, more than half of them would oppose it. The day this Bill is passed, these Members will not be able to face the farmers in their constituencies. Farmers will chase them with sticks. The Members understand this very well.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, what kind of justice is this that our land is taken away without our permission, without obtaining the necessary consent? One of our colleagues has rightly said that there is no need for a middleman. The Government need not act as a middleman or intermediary between farmers and industrialists. Farmers and those

who wish to do business can negotiate directly among themselves and decide the terms and the price.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, there is a great deal of barren land in our country, as has already been pointed out. Why, then, is there an attempt to acquire agricultural land? The proposal that the Government has brought forward, to constitute a Joint Parliamentary Committee and to reconsider the matter once again, suggests that some wisdom has prevailed. I believe the decision taken by the Government in this regard is the right one. Once again, all of us will sit together, deliberate upon it, and arrive at a proper conclusion.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, today the farmer is reeling under natural calamities. Unseasonal rains and hailstorms have destroyed crops. At a time when the farmer is in distress, how can we sit here and attempt to frame a law on how to take away his land? ...

*(Interruptions)*

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, in conclusion, I would like to say just this. There is an Urdu couplet. ... *(Interruptions)* I would only appeal to all of you not to be overwhelmed by arrogance. ... *(Interruptions)*

I wish to place an Urdu couplet before the House. ...  
*(Interruptions)*

“Khuda jab husn deta hai, to nazakat aa hi jaati hai.”

(“When God bestows beauty, grace inevitably follows.”)

This aptly reflects the situation. Our colleagues in the Bharatiya Janata Party had made promises to the people, assuring farmers of a better future and better days. Today, those promises remain unfulfilled, and instead, decisions of this nature are being taken and such a Bill is being brought forward. Thank you.

**16.53 hrs**

**BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**19<sup>th</sup> Report**

*[English]*

**SHRI ARJUN RAM MEGHWAL (BIKANER):** Sir, I beg to present the Nineteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

—————  
... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Nothing will go on record.

... (*Interruptions*)... \*

---

\* Not recorded

**16.54 hrs**

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF  
RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND  
RESETTLEMNT (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 2015**

**AND**

**RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND  
RESETTLEMENT (AMENDMENT) SECOND BILL, 2015 –**

**contd.**

*[Translation]*

**SHRI JAI PRAKASH NARAYAN YADAV (BANKA):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak in opposition to the Land Acquisition Bill. We all hum the line, ‘Mere desh ki dharti, sona ugle, ugle heera-moti’. But in the Land Acquisition Bill that has been brought, the intention of the Government is not right. First, an Ordinance was promulgated and then another Ordinance was brought again. When a Government rules through Ordinances, democracy is undermined and parliamentary democracy is reduced to subservience.

The most distressing aspect is the lack of sensitivity. When the food provider is in distress, how can you make him prosperous? Land is our capital. Farmers, youth and land together strengthen our economy. They are the backbone of our economy. In strengthening the economy, the farmer sheds his blood. Hon. Shrimati Sonia Gandhi Ji is seated here. Against this very Ordinance, representatives of fourteen parties marched to the Hon. President of India. On that day, it was not imagined that such a major struggle would erupt. The message conveyed to the Hon. President was a humble appeal with folded hands. In Bihar, Hon. Lalu Ji came out on the streets ... (*Interruptions*) and Hon. Nitish Kumar Ji observed a fast. Why did they do so? Because the farmer is Hari. One must reflect upon this. ... (*Interruptions*) The farmer is Hari of this country. Even the Mahabharata was brought about by Hari. It was said-

“De do keval paanch gram, rakho saari dharati tamaam.

Duryodhan wah bhi de na saka, aashish samaj ka paa na saka,

Ulte Hari ko (yani kisan ko) baandhane chala, Jo tha asadhya, use  
saadhane chala,

Hari ne bhishan hunkaar kiya, apna swaroop vistaar kiya.”

“Grant but five grams of land, keep the rest of the earth entire.

Duryodhana could not give even that, and thus failed to earn society’s blessings.

Instead, he sought to bind Hari (that is, the farmer), attempting to subdue the unconquerable.

Then Hari let out a thunderous roar and revealed the full expanse of his form.”

If anyone is to suffer because of this Government, it will be the farmers and the youth of India. This black law will be responsible for it. ... (*Interruptions*) This is a grave injustice. You may feel offended by what I am saying. ... (*Interruptions*) Laws are being framed for industrialists. Earlier, there were zamindars. Their zamindari ended and the British left, but now a new class of industrial landlords is being created.

Sir, no social impact assessment has been carried out. There is no assessment of the impact on Dalits, the exploited sections and tribals who own two or four kathas of land. If their social impact is not assessed, where will the people of this country go? Where will the poor go? Land far in excess of requirement is being demanded. The UPA Government had fixed a period of five years; you have increased it to fifteen years and say that land will be returned thereafter. Farmers

cannot even approach the District Magistrate. They cannot go to court. What greater injustice can there be than this, that the custodians of the law are not the custodians of farmers? It was said about Shri Rahul Gandhi Ji that he does not know what a tangi is. We know it. We know what an axe is. A son who has worked on the embankments, field boundaries, irrigation channels, soil, fields, threshing floors and orchards is standing here. We know all this, and therefore we will not shy away from this struggle. You know who the tribals are. Remember Sidhu-Kanhu. Remember Birsa Bhagwan, who, even at that time, said that tribal land must not be taken. Even the British could not take it. Can there be any compensation for a mother? Land is like a mother. Become her protectors. Do not hand her over to industrialists. Protect multi-cropped land. Land should not be snatched for companies. You spoke about Smart Cities. We are now beginning to understand what that means. No, this time we do not want Smart Cities; this time we want wheat.

### **17.00 hrs**

Stop land acquisition, that is what we demand. We wish to say this. ... (*Interruptions*) Some Members keep leaving after drinking water. ... (*Interruptions*) If you feel like laughing, you should not laugh. That is why I will say no more. ... (*Interruptions*) One should

not live in arrogance. There should not be a Government by Ordinance. Stop the loot of land. The entire country is mobilising, and the Hon. Minister says that there is misinformation being spread. This is not misinformation. You may enact whatever laws you like, but on the ground your law has already collapsed. ... (*Interruptions*) There has been so much debate. People are saying that the UPA Government was better, and those associated with it were also better. But here something is seriously wrong. This will lead to your downfall. ... (*Interruptions*)

“Jab tak manuj-manuj ka sukh-bhagya na sam hoga,  
Shant na hoga kolahal, sangharsh nahin kam hoga.”

(“Until the happiness and destiny of every human being are made  
equal,  
unrest will not subside, and conflict will not diminish.”)

The struggle is not going to diminish. There was a Government in Jharkhand, a tribal State. You could have made a tribal person the Chief Minister. ... (*Interruptions*) The Hon. Member was speaking. ... (*Interruptions*)

*[English]*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Nothing will go on record.

... (*Interruptions*)... \*

---

\* Not recorded

[*Translation*]

**SHRI DHARMENDRA YADAV (BADAYUN):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Union Government has promulgated an Ordinance in the name of land acquisition not once, but twice, and that too at a time when farmers across the country are crying out in distress because their crops have been completely destroyed due to hailstorms, excessive rainfall and several other reasons. It is for this reason that farmers across the country are in utter despair today.

At such a time, the Union Government ought to have extended assistance to the farmers. Assurances have been given dozens of times, but in the name of assistance, not even a single rupee has been spent by the Union Government till date. ... (*Interruptions*) Not even a single rupee has been spent, it has not been spent. ... (*Interruptions*) The Government of Uttar Pradesh demanded Rs. 7,500 crore, but till date the Union Government has not released even one rupee. ... (*Interruptions*) Why are you misleading the country? ... (*Interruptions*) Instead of providing relief, instead of wiping the tears of farmers, you are repeatedly striking at them with an axe. Shri Rahul Gandhi Ji was absolutely right in what he said. I agree with Shri Rahul Gandhi Ji. ... (*Interruptions*) You are continuously attacking the farmers. You could not get even one Ordinance passed in the Rajya

Sabha. ... (*Interruptions*) If the Leader wishes to speak, I will take my seat. ... (*Interruptions*) Hon. Leader, you may speak on behalf of the Party. I am sitting down. Thank you.

**SHRI MULAYAM SINGH YADAV (AZAMGARH):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you have given us an opportunity to speak. When the Congress Government was in power, this Land Acquisition Bill was brought at that time as well, and we opposed it. At least then, the Hon. Minister acknowledged that Mulayam Singh Ji had raised serious questions, and thereafter it was not pushed through. However, the mistake they made was that they should have withdrawn it altogether. Now, you have brought back the very Bill that the Congress had introduced. Advaniji may say that you speak well, but this issue is extremely serious. Schools are being built, colleges are being built, roads are being constructed, and many development works are taking place.

Land is steadily decreasing while the population is increasing. Earlier, when crises arose, countries like Australia and America used to supply foodgrains, but today such crises have affected Australia and America themselves. If large-scale land acquisition is required, why are wastelands, ravines and barren lands not being utilised? Do not acquire farmers' land. We acquired 65,000 acres of land, and you may verify this. We took barren land between Lucknow and Kanpur, barren land between Hardoi and Lucknow, and barren land in Barabanki. We did not take farmers' land. Even where farmers' land

was taken, it was done through direct dialogue with the farmers. If the farmer was willing, he gave his land; if he was not willing, he did not. Our country is agriculture-based and agrarian in character. If there is any attack on farmers today, it is being carried out by your Government. If farmers are becoming weak today, it means the country is becoming weak. The country where farmers are strong is the country that remains strong.

Please read the history of America. America first focused on its farmers. I have visited Europe. Look at their fields and their crops. I spoke to farmers there. In Europe, farmers were strengthened first. The country that empowers its farmers becomes powerful. Today, China, our neighbouring country, is increasing production through its farmers, while you are standing here to weaken farmers. I would like to tell you that I am not opposed to development. You may proceed. But it should be made clear who the industrialist is, how many people he will employ, and what kind of work he will undertake. If the House is informed of these facts, we too will agree to this Bill in the interest of the country's development. ... (*Interruptions*) A country cannot progress by ruining its farmers. Wherever farmers have progressed, that country has become strong. Advani Ji, I request you to intervene in this matter. Please give your opinion and convene a meeting so that

this proposal is not passed in this form. Call leaders of all parties. We agree that discussions should be held with all leaders. If you feel it appropriate, then get this Bill passed. Otherwise, the same fate will befall you as befell the Congress. I am telling you clearly that if you lay your hands on farmers, tomorrow you will be sitting where they are sitting today. Earlier, they had brought this Bill, but now they are speaking against it. They will not be held responsible now. You will be held responsible because you are in power. I am saying this on record. If you pass this Bill, you will meet the same fate.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, our appeal to the Government is to withdraw this Bill. We are not against industry. Did we not set up industries? When we took farmers' land, we did so through dialogue with the farmers. The District Magistrate and the farmers sat together and arrived at a decision, and a fair price was demanded and paid. Speak directly to farmers. It must be known from the industrialist what work he will undertake and where. We have suggested that ravine lands from Agra to Banda be acquired. Acquire wastelands and barren lands. We converted 65,000 acres into cultivable land. You can see from Lucknow to Hardoi, from Auraiya to Kanpur, and in Barabanki, that wastelands were made cultivable and crops are standing there and production is taking place.

*[English]*

**\*SHRI RANJIT SINGH BRAHMPURA (KHADOOR SAHIB):**

Hon'ble Deputy Speaker Sir, I rise to speak on "The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill,2015". I had expressed my views regarding this Bill in the previous Session too. I had opposed this Bill because the Bill does not seek the consent of the poor farmer at the time of the acquisition of his land.

Sir, the farmer is the owner of his land. It would be sheer injustice if his consent is not sought at the time of acquiring his land. The farmers are bound to feel cheated. It may give rise to anger among farmers against the Government.

Sir, the ruling party Shiromani Akali Dal has also acquired the land of farmers in Punjab for various developmental activities like construction of schools, hospitals and roads etc. However, we have never faced any problem or protest on this issue. It is because we have a very remunerative and pro-farmer policy of land-acquisition. It encourages the farmers to provide more land to the Government for the purpose of acquiring. There has never been any quarrel over this

---

\* English translation of the speech originally delivered in Punjabi.

issue in Punjab. So, the Government must seek the consent of the concerned farmer before acquiring his land.

Some points in this Bill are good and commendable. However, there are other issues that need reconsideration. So, I urge upon this House to send this Bill to Joint Committee for thorough consideration. Thank you.

---

\* English translation of the speech originally delivered in Punjab

**SHRI E.T. MOHAMMAD BASHEER (PONNANI):** Sir, thank you very much. I oppose this Bill on the basis of seven pertinent reasons.

The first reason is that the Government is undermining the greatness of Parliamentary system and enjoy the pleasure of “Ordinance Raj”. The second reason is that on the one side you are giving a red carpet reception to the corporates and on the other side you are digging the ditches deeply and swiftly for industrial workers and peasants. The third reason is that you are not at all concerned about the environmental implications and social impacts. The fourth reason is that you are silent on what real compensation you are giving to the farmers on the loss of their livelihood. The fifth reason is that you are keeping the local bodies completely away from the decision making process. The sixth reason is that if the land is not utilised for the intended purpose of acquisition, the Clause with regard to returning the land to its real owners is vague and uncertain. The seventh reason is that this Bill is not for meeting the real needs of the nation but for meeting the greed of land grabbers from the poor peasants.

With these pertinent reasons, I oppose this Bill. Thank you.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI KAUSHALENDRA KUMAR (NALANDA):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Bill, 2015.

Sir, first of all, under the Land Acquisition Act brought by the UPA Government in 2013, a provision was made that if five years had elapsed since the acquisition was recorded on paper, but the Government had neither taken possession of the land nor paid compensation, the original owner could seek return of the land. However, the present Government has now added a provision stating that if the matter has gone to court, the period of litigation will not be counted within the five-year limit. The Government has also removed the condition that work must commence on the land within five years. Under the earlier law, it was mandatory for companies to start work on the acquired land within five years. This restriction has now been removed. Further, under the earlier Act, if work did not begin within five years, the landowner could stake a claim for the return of the land. As per the earlier law, even if the compensation had not been credited to the concerned person's account, but had been deposited in court or

in the Government treasury, it was still treated as payment of compensation.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, after the NDA Government came to power, it has disregarded the spirit of the law. Even the provision for prosecuting officials who violate the law has been diluted. According to the new changes in the Bill, prior permission of the concerned department will now be required to initiate any action against an official. This was not the case earlier. Moreover, one of the most important provisions of the 2013 Act was that of consent. Under that Act, in joint projects involving the Government and private companies, consent of 80 per cent of landowners was mandatory, and in purely Government projects, consent of 70 per cent of landowners was required. This crucial provision has now been done away with.

The manner in which the Union Government has promulgated the new Ordinance makes it abundantly clear that land acquisition will take place whether the landowner agrees or not. Even if a landowner refuses to accept compensation, the amount will be deposited in the Government treasury and the land will still be acquired. Bringing such an Ordinance, and that too not once but twice, as we are discussing today, clearly shows that farmers across the country are watching and realising that this is not in the national interest. Even several members

from the Treasury Benches have opposed it. In these circumstances, I would request the Hon. Minister to withdraw this Bill and to give due consideration to what Hon. Mulayam Singh Ji and Shri Rahul Gandhi Ji have said.

Today, there was a need to bring a Bill on how farmers would receive water for their fields. There was a need to bring a Bill on how permanent houses could be constructed for farmers and the poor. Bills should have been introduced on these issues. If villages do not survive, the country will not survive either. Most of us Members of Parliament, nearly 80 per cent, are children of farmers. If we do not work in the interest of farmers, the people will not repose their trust in us. The arrogance that the NDA Government had has been humbled on the soil of Bihar. Our leader, Shri Nitish Kumar Ji, observed a one-day fast while serving as Chief Minister, and Hon. Lalu Prasad Ji also observed a fast.

Therefore, we would humbly request the Hon. Minister to withdraw this Bill.

**SHRI RAJU SHETTY (HATKANANGLE):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Land Acquisition Bill that has been introduced in the House. I wish to protect farmers' land. When our Hon. Prime Minister travelled across the country during the Lok Sabha elections, he addressed farmers in rural areas and assured them that once his Government came to power, it would implement the Swaminathan Commission's recommendation by providing farmers a Minimum Support Price with a profit margin of 50 per cent over the cost of cultivation. That assurance has not been fulfilled to date, and the Government has even filed an affidavit before the Supreme Court stating that it is not possible to provide farmers with a 50 per cent profit margin.

I want to ask this House and the Government: farmers of this country voted for this Government with great expectations and sent it to power. If we cannot provide a 50 per cent profit over the cost of cultivation, that itself explains why farmers are committing suicide today. On top of that, there is now a conspiracy to snatch away their land. The image of the martyr Gajendra Singh, who lost his life at Jantar Mantar, is crying out that farmers should be allowed to work in their own fields. For generations, farmers have worked on their land and have fed the entire nation. They have not defaulted on loans, they

have not cheated anyone, and they have not betrayed anyone. Then why is there betrayal of farmers by attempting to take away their land? This is what farmers across villages are shouting aloud.

Farmers of this country have never said that they will not give land for development or for the national interest. I say with great pride in this House that on 18 April 1951, when Acharya Vinoba Bhave started the Bhoodan Movement, he went from farmer to farmer and appealed to them, saying that there were many farmers in the country who had no land, and requested them, as a brother, to give a portion of their land so that it could be distributed to poor farmers. As many as 37 lakh acres of land were donated free of cost by farmers to Vinoba Ji, and about eight lakh farmers were provided land through this movement. This clearly shows that farmers are not opposed to giving land for noble causes and for development. There have been many social reformers who, with land donated by farmers, have established large hospitals and schools. Farmers willingly gave land for such purposes. However, today, farmers are witnessing that their land is being taken away by the Government through various laws, compensation of one or two lakh rupees is paid, and the same land is then sold to industries and industrialists for crores of rupees. At that point, farmers feel that they have been cheated and that a grave

betrayal has been committed against them. or these reasons, farmers are opposing this Bill. If land is required, speak to the farmers, seek their views, and obtain their consent. If farmers feel that development work will take place on their land and that it will serve the welfare of the poor, they will willingly give their land. However, when they realise that their land is being taken for industrialists, that roads will be built under BOT arrangements and tolls will be collected, enriching everyone else while leaving the farmer impoverished, they oppose it. If land is needed for roads, then ensure that farmers have a share in the toll revenue. In this country's GDP, the share of industry is 21 per cent, while agriculture accounts for 13.5 per cent. Yet, agriculture provides employment to 50 per cent of the people, whereas industry provides employment to only 20 per cent. This means that farmers provide employment to the largest number of people. We provide work to the unemployed and feed the hungry. Why, then, is injustice being done to us? Why is there an attempt to snatch away our land? That is why I oppose this Bill. If a project is not implemented within five years, why should the land not revert to the farmers? Because this is a major conspiracy to take away farmers' land. I am opposing this here, and I also warn this House and everyone else that if this Bill is

passed by brute majority, we will take to the streets, there will be intense agitation, and we will protect farmers' land. Thank you.

*[English]*

**ADV. JOICE GEORGE (IDUKKI):** Thank you Deputy Chairman Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill. Sir, as far as farmer is concerned, the land is everything for him. The land is not the only tool for earning his livelihood. It is an asset for him. Not only for him, it is an asset for the generations to come. If we grab the land from him, he will be assetless and the generations to come will also be assetless. So, by this amendment, the Government has proposed to take away the provision for getting consent from the farmer before taking the land from him. The provision for social impact assessment is also going to be taken away from the Act.

Sir, by this provision, the right of the people is going to be taken away. I believe that we have been elected for protecting the rights of the people. But if this Amendment Bill is passed here, this will be a massacre; this will be a slaughter of the rights of the poor farmers and agrarian people. So, what is the purpose of this Amendment Bill? Going by Section 10A of the Amendment Bill, especially clauses (c) (d) and (e), we can have industrial corridors. For that we can grab the land of the poor farmers. For the infrastructure projects under private-public partnership also, we can grab the land of the poor farmers, that too, without their consent and without having any social impact

assessment study. If the land is grabbed from the poor farmers without any social impact assessment study, then people will be displaced from their habitats. They will be rootless. They will become refugees. So, as far as all these social impact assessment studies are concerned, there should be a proper rehabilitation programme for the farmers. Without that proper rehabilitation package for the farmers, their rights cannot be protected.

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Please conclude.

**ADV. JOICE GEORGE:** I am concluding.

We had passed this enactment in 2013 after having due deliberations on the floor of both the Houses. We had due deliberations in the Standing Committee and after that we had passed the Bill. Now, why is the Government in a hurry to push over all these amendments without due deliberations in the House and without due deliberations in the Standing Committee, bypassing the entire Parliamentary procedure? So, I urge upon the Government to send the Bill to the Parliamentary Standing Committee for detailed deliberations and then we can pass the Bill. Thank you, Sir.

[*Translation*]

**SHRI JYOTIRADITYA MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (GUNA):**

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, today I rise to oppose this Bill. This matter has been discussed earlier as well, and it is surprising that if the Hon. Prime Minister, who speaks to the nation through *Mann Ki Baat*, were also to listen to the voice and conscience of the Members of his own party, the opposition would become clearly evident. ... (*Interruptions*)

This opposition exists not only within the Bharatiya Janata Party, but also among its alliance partners. Today, Members of the Shiromani Akali Dal have spoken, Members of the Shiv Sena have spoken, and Members from several other parties have spoken. Even Shri Naresh Gujral of the Shiromani Akali Dal has stated publicly that the views of alliance partners are not being taken into account, and that no NDA meeting has been held for the last two months. Decision-making in this Government has become completely centralised in the hands of one individual. As far as land acquisition is concerned, we were given barely two hours to express our views before this Bill was introduced in the House. On the other hand, Shri Arun Shourie, a senior member of this very party, has stated that the BJP had supported the earlier Land Bill, and he has rightly observed, 'Ego cannot drive the success

for the Modi Government. Humility will get more Bills passed than machismo.’ We must, therefore, shed arrogance.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am truly astonished that this Government itself does not seem to repose confidence even in the Minister of the Rural Development Department, which is directly concerned with this Bill. In December 2014, when the Hon. President wished to seek clarifications on the first Ordinance, the Government was asked to send its Ministers. Shri Rajnath Singh Ji went, Shri Arun Jaitley Ji went, Shri Gowda Ji went, but the Minister of the concerned Department was not sent. When the Ordinance was promulgated for the second time and a defensive campaign was launched on television channels, once again the face of that campaign was not the concerned Minister, but Shri Rajnath Singh Ji and Shri Gadkari Ji were projected. Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, whatever we may say about this Government will still fall short. Today, the farmer feels completely abandoned. He is not getting the Minimum Support Price, the system of bonus has been discontinued, fertilisers are not available, but lathis are. Compensation is not being paid. ... (*Interruptions*) As my colleague Shri Dharmendra just said, not even a single State has received assistance. ... (*Interruptions*) Please listen, have the capacity to listen, brother. We listened for ten years as well. ... (*Interruptions*)

Do not get agitated. ... (*Interruptions*) Show some civility from your side. ... (*Interruptions*) Fertilisers were not provided, but lathis were. Compensation was not given. Now the farmer has only one thing left, his only possession. ... (*Interruptions*) Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I said it earlier and I repeat it, arrogance must be abandoned. In our country and in our culture, we are taught to listen to everyone with humility and dignity. ... (*Interruptions*) But the manner in which this is being demonstrated here, while speaking of Indian culture, it is the Members of the Bharatiya Janata Party who are themselves disregarding it. ... (*Interruptions*)

Shri Bidhuri Ji, however agitated you may be, you are welcome. ... (*Interruptions*) You are welcome. ... (*Interruptions*) The only asset that remained with the farmers was their land, and even that, not according to their will and without their consent, this Government now seeks to take away. Five thousand farmers have committed suicide, and what does the Agriculture Minister of Haryana, Shri O. P. Dhankar Ji, say? He says that farmers are cowards and that the Government will not stand with such cowards. ... (*Interruptions*) What does Shri Gadkari Ji say? He says that farmers should not place their trust in the Government or in God. Why do you wish to invite the curse of lakhs and crores of farmers? As Shri Rahul Gandhi Ji said

earlier, why are you striking an axe upon your own foot? Just now, Shri Bhuria Ji said that an axe is not struck on the foot. It is an old Hindi saying. I may be younger than you, but I can still convey something to you. Our Prime Minister, yours and ours alike, has seen Paris, Berlin, London and Japan. When will our Prime Minister see the farmers of this country?

Sir, it is beyond comprehension why this Government is displaying such undue haste and desperation to push this Bill through. Whose loans are to be repaid, and to which suit-booted industrialists? This question must be answered today. The constitutional processes of democracy have been completely violated. For the first time in the history of this country, during an ongoing Budget Session of Parliament, the Rajya Sabha was entirely prorogued solely to re-promulgate an Ordinance. ... (*Interruptions*) This has never happened before in the history of our country. The Congress Party, and the UPA Government, have indeed brought Ordinances in the past. Shri Naidu Ji has reminded us of this. But whenever we brought an Ordinance, we placed it before Parliament and, by securing the confidence of Parliament and the House, we had it enacted. We never needed to bring the same Ordinance again. ... (*Interruptions*) Please maintain restraint. ... (*Interruptions*) Shri Venkaiah Naidu Ji will respond, Shri

Birender Singh Ji will respond. Please maintain restraint. The Congress Party has never acted in a manner where, while sitting in the Opposition, it supported a Bill and, upon coming to power, removed its very soul, stripped it of its backbone and ribs, and consigned it to the dustbin. What you are presenting today stands as evidence of this Government's character and intent. As far as the so-called cosmetic amendments are concerned, the real dispute lies in Chapter III-A: social impact assessment, consent of farmers, and the non-acquisition of multi-crop land. If you truly wished to bring amendments in the interest of farmers, Chapter III-A should have been retained in its entirety. Only then would justice have been done to farmers. Justice cannot be achieved on the basis of these superficial amendments. What amendments have you actually made? Today, inside Parliament, we hear repeated talk of land, land, land. Shri Rahul Gandhi Ji has just pointed out that of the land allotted to SEZs, only 40 per cent has been utilised. ... *(Interruptions)* Of all the stalled projects in the country, only 8 per cent are stalled due to land-related issues. ... *(Interruptions)* Recently, a newspaper article reported that five States today are holding nearly 90,000 hectares of land with their Industrial Development Corporations. Then what is the pressing need for fresh land acquisition? ... *(Interruptions)* As my brother Shri Jai Prakash

Narayan Yadav Ji and Shri Tariq Anwar Ji have rightly said, there is abundant ravine and wasteland in our country. In my own region, in the Chambal valley, there is extensive ravine land. Railway tracks and highways already pass through such land. Acquire that land and set up industries there. What right do you have to acquire farmers' land, especially multi-crop land? Today, the farmers of this country are demanding an answer from you.

So far as the so-called amendments are concerned, the Government now proposes to acquire land up to one kilometre on either side of an industrial corridor. This means that the very principle of minimum land acquisition, which we had incorporated through the provision of Social Impact Assessment, has been torn up and thrown into the waste-paper basket. With regard to Section 31, where it is claimed that employment will be provided to agricultural labourers, this is misleading and cosmetic. Under the 2013 Act, we had clearly provided that justice must be extended not only to labourers but also to landless persons. This has always been the policy and approach of the Congress Party and the UPA Government.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, in every country of the world, the voice of the Prime Minister represents the foundation and credibility of the Government. We are taught that one must speak the truth and nothing

but the truth. Yet today, it is deeply surprising that the Hon. Prime Minister has spoken a half-truth on his radio programme. What kind of ‘Mann Ki Baat’ is this, when the farmer’s pocket is ...\*?

Sir, the situation today is this. What did the Hon. Prime Minister say? He stated that the 2013 legislation was passed in haste and therefore contained flaws which his Government is now correcting. Let the facts be placed on record. That law took two full years to finalise. We held consultations with fourteen political parties. We consulted leaders from your side as well. The Standing Committee was chaired by our present Hon. Speaker, Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan Ji. We incorporated the recommendations of that Committee. We accepted twelve suggestions given by Sushma Swaraj Ji. At that time, Shri Rajnath Singh Ji, Shri Hukmdev Narayan Yadav Ji and Shri Vinay Katiyar Ji had clearly stated that Social Impact Assessment was essential and that Environmental Impact Assessment must also be mandatory. Today, all of them have taken a complete U-turn. This is truly astonishing. If a law framed after two years of deliberation, wide consultation and strict adherence to parliamentary procedure is termed “haste”, then what do you call what is being done within four months today? Is this not daylight robbery of farmers? Is this not a black mark

---

\* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

on the functioning of Parliament? This is the question we are placing before you today. If you believed at that time that the law had shortcomings, why did you support its passage? As Shri Rahul Gandhi Ji has rightly asked, why did you thump the table then, and why did you praise our Ministers at that time? You must answer these questions to the farmers of this country.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I will explain why they acted in this manner. At that time, they needed the farmers' votes; now they wish to strike at the farmers themselves. This is the situation they have reduced themselves to today. They said that by setting up factories on farmers' land, they would provide employment to them. The land belongs to the farmers, yet you propose to take it without their consent and then present it on a platter as a gift to industrialists. On the radio programme Mann Ki Baat, you say that farmers' children will be given jobs in those factories. But a farmer is a person of self-respect. As Hon. Members from the Shiromani Akali Dal and other parties have rightly said, the farmer values his dignity. Do you wish to turn his children into mere servants in this country? There can be no greater tragedy than this....(*Interruptions*) I would like to make one more point. On this issue, you raised the slogan, "*We have come to give, not to take.*" This slogan may sound appropriate, but it is not meant

for farmers. It is meant for industrialists: we have come to give to them, not to take from them.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, in certain cases the Hon. Prime Minister has stated that the SIA must be removed, otherwise development would be stalled. A time limit of six months was prescribed. You speak of maximum governance and minimum government, yet you are unable to adhere even to that six-month timeframe. When the World Bank tells you that it will provide ten thousand crore rupees for the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana, on the condition that SIA and EIA are retained, you readily accept their terms. But when Members of Parliament from fifteen political parties appeal to you, urging that this is an anti-farmer Bill and that SIA and EIA must be retained, you refuse to listen. You accept the dictates of foreign financial institutions, but you reject the collective voice of this country's elected representatives.

I wish to conclude by saying this: the farmer is our credibility, our annadata. Protecting his interests is not merely our responsibility; it is the very duty and dharma of the Congress Party. From Parliament to the streets, and from the streets back to Parliament, we will continue to fight for this cause. Today, the question before you is simple: do you wish to stand with the voice of the nation, or do you wish to stand

firm on obstinacy alone? Will the stubbornness of one individual prevail, or will the truth of 65 crore farmers prevail? The choice is yours.

**SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI (HYDERABAD):** Sir, our party, along with several other parties, is opposed to this law. However, it is rather strange that even the Swadeshi Jagran Manch has raised its voice against this law. ...*(Interruptions)*.

... *(Interruptions)* Alright, is that organisation also with you now?...  
*(Interruptions)* We were not aware that they too had now joined hands with the Swadeshi Jagran Manch.

**SHRI JYOTIRADITYA MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (GUNA):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, remarks are being made against Members of Parliament... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI:** *Sir*, I can take them on...  
*(Interruptions)* I will take on their seniors as well. *(Interruptions)*  
Their mindset is such that...\* is their way of thinking, all right.  
*(Interruptions)*

**SHRI JYOTIRADITYA MADHAVRAO SCINDIA:** This is not appropriate. ... *(Interruptions)*

---

\* Not recorded.

*[English]*

**SHRI K.C. VENUGOPAL (ALAPPUZHA):** Sir, this should be expunged. ... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is not recorded.

... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI JYOTIRADITYA M. SCINDIA:** Sir, this should be expunged. ... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI E.T. MOHAMMAD BASHEER (PONNANI):** Sir, this is not proper, and this should be expunged. ... *(Interruptions)*.

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is not recorded.

... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI GAURAV GOGOI (KALIABOR):** It shows his attitude. ... *(Interruptions)* Shame on him. ... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Please let him be allowed to speak.

... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am there to control them.

... *(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

**SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI:** that remark reminds me of a couplet:

“Sitamgar tujhse ummidein wafa honggi, jinhein honggi  
Humein to dekhna yeh hai ki tu zaalim kahan tak hai.”

(“O tormentor, those who harbour hopes of loyalty from you  
may do so;  
we only wish to see how far your cruelty will go.”)

This is your mindset. Secondly, if you are unable to control the Swadeshi Jagran Manch, how will you control us? It is opposing you openly. Why is this Government afraid of Social Impact Assessment? What exactly is the fear? Our history bears testimony that whenever land has been acquired, it has largely been for the benefit of capitalists. Had land been used for the welfare of the poor and in their interest, there would have been no need for this law at all. The reality is that this law is being brought only to further strengthen capitalists and to swell their coffers. ...(*Interruptions*)

Thirdly, why does this law not even mention building schools and hospitals? If you are talking about rural infrastructure, then build schools and hospitals. Who is stopping you from doing so?

Fourthly, where is the land bank? Why do you not create a land bank? My observation is that whatever land has been allotted has gone only to big capitalists. Thousands of acres have been given in the name of airports, yet the land lies vacant. Earlier today, Hon. Member spoke about an Adivasi taluka. Is it not a fact that this very Government, the Modi Government, diluted the requirement of obtaining prior permission from the Gram Sabha for acquiring Adivasi land? You are acquiring Adivasi land and then standing here to speak about Adivasis. ...*(Interruptions)* You even wrote a letter to the World Bank. ...*(Interruptions)*

**SHRI RAMESH BIDHURI (SOUTH DELHI):** Where has tribal land been taken? ...*(Interruptions)*

**SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI:** Sir, please ask him to take his seat.

...\*

Sir, I urge the Government to give due consideration to these matters, to create a land bank, and to explain why it seeks to alter the law enacted in 2013 by the UPA, which was upheld by the Supreme Court.

---

\* Not recorded as ordered by the Chair.

Yesterday, a statement by the Prime Minister made it abundantly clear that the BJP now believes it was wrong to support the UPA Government's law in the past. This indicates inconsistency, contradiction, and division within the BJP itself.

**THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT, MINISTER OF HOUSING AND URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU):**

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, those who wished to hurl abuses have done so to their heart's content. They have abused Shri Modi, the BJP and the Sangh Parivar, as well as those who support this Bill. Some people may have derived pleasure from this; I extend my good wishes to them. Ultimately, the people will decide.

Why was this Bill brought in the form of an Ordinance? As the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, it is my responsibility to explain this. Article 123 of the Constitution contains the relevant provision. There is no dispute that the law enacted by the previous Government in 2013 was framed after discussion. It was brought before the elections, with the belief that it would yield electoral benefit. However, that benefit did not materialise. If it were a popular and positive law for farmers, they would have been influenced by it. Why, then, did those who took this initiative not receive support from the farmers? This merits reflection. Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I submit that [*English*] there were representations from different people; there were representations from the states; there were representations from the chief Ministers; there were representations from the Ministers of

the then Union Government saying that the present act, in its present form, will not. ... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Please do not disturb him. Till now, all of you Members have participated and spoke whatever you wanted to speak.

[*Translation*]

**SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU:** Please maintain a little patience; exercise restraint. What is the problem? Adequate opportunity has been given to everyone to speak. Even those who have little knowledge about land have spoken at length on the subject. We too should be given some opportunity to speak. In a democracy, [*English*] it is not ‘numbers’ alone; it is also about ‘Members’. The majority of Members, as per my knowledge, is 272 ‘plus’, and not ‘minus’.

“The Bill in its present shape will have adverse, long-term implications for manufacturing, industrialisation and urbanisation in India. The instance of consent of 80 percent of the affected families will seriously delay acquisition and, in many cases, halt essential infrastructure projects.” This was the letter written by the then Commerce Minister to the then Hon. Prime Minister Sir. That is one issue. ... (*Interruptions*)

The second point is that the Chief Minister of Maharashtra ...  
(*Interruptions*) Please have the courage to listen for a moment.

The then Chief Minister of Maharashtra had written a letter to the then Rural Development Minister saying that changes were required. Then, at a meeting called on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2014 by the Union Government, presided over by the then Rural Development Minister, Shri Nitin Gadkari ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI K.C. VENUGOPAL:** He is again repeating the same old things. ... (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU:** They are the same old things, which you have also repeated like a gramophone record. It happens in a gramophone record. [*Translation*] That is what happens with a gramophone record. I had explained this earlier. At that time, you were not present in the House; you had stepped outside. When a gramophone record gets stuck, it keeps repeating the same line again and again. Many of you have spoken against this law and have merely repeated the same old record. Nothing new has been said. Recalling history, and learning from history and from experience, is always extremely important.

[*English*]

Sir, at a meeting called on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2014 by the Union Government, 32 States and Union Territories made extensive deliberations, and representations were received from many of the State Governments saying that in the present law, that is, the then law of 2013, there were practical problems, as far as the growth and development of the country is concerned and, therefore, they need to be addressed. That was the suggestion given by the majority of States, which were present in that meeting.

As I told you, the first one is the then Commerce Minister writing a letter; the second one is the Chief Ministers writing letters; and the third one is the Union Rural Development Minister at that time calling a meeting wherein the majority of States voiced concerns about its effect on the progress of the country and requesting for changes. The fourth one is about the speed. I must say that speed, scale, and skill is the *mantra* of our Government and that of our leader, Shri Narendra Modi. That is why the speed is required.

Should the Government take seriously the concerns expressed by other people or not? We thought, in our collective wisdom, that if there are some lacunae or some shortcomings, they need to be addressed. That was the decision taken by the Government. That is why this Government passed an Ordinance with an official mandate

to meet the twin objectives of farmers' welfare along with expeditiously meeting the strategic and developmental needs of the country.

Should the farmers be allowed to remain as they are? Should they not be allowed to become partners in the development? Should their children not get an opportunity to get employment, education, healthcare and other things? They need the support of the Government. From 1894 to 2013, how many lakhs of acres have been acquired, by whom, and has it be done with the consent of the farmers? Lakhs of acres of land in the country have been acquired from 1894 to 2013. Has it be done with the consent of the farmers? Have they been given justice? Who looted them? I was surprised that my young friend used the word 'looting'. *[Translation]* Where has the allegation of looting come from, who looted, and who cheated, is known to the people of the country. The people have already given the mandate they wished to give. Therefore, kindly do not go into that. I said this morning that we are prepared to discuss this matter in detail. ... *(Interruptions)* *[English]* The farmers should be made partners in development. One thing is very clear. I can assure the House on behalf of the Government. *[Translation]* I assure the House that what happened earlier in certain States, where lakhs of acres of land were

given to private parties, will not happen now. The manner in which land acquisition was carried out over the last ten years in Haryana, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, and Maharashtra for SEZs and private industries will not be repeated by us. It is certain that this Government will not acquire land for any private purpose or for any private company. Villages require ponds for agriculture. *[English]* You need a tank, you need an irrigation project for the development of the agricultural land. ... *(Interruptions)* If you do not have patience, you do not want to hear, I leave it to your collective wisdom. We heard most of your speeches. You made your own points. You please try to understand this. Bear with the Government which is having an overwhelming majority and respect the democracy also.

My point is, if you need an irrigation project, you need land acquisition; if you need electrification, you need land acquisition; if you need a railway line, you need land acquisition; if you need a national highway, you need land acquisition; and if you need to have rural road, you need to have land acquisition. Without that, how can that be possible? How is it possible? I am not able to understand. ...*(Interruptions)* *[Translation]* For the welfare of the people and to take the country forward, this Government will take whatever steps are necessary with courage. You may be assured of that. *[English]* We

will not do anything which will hurt the interest of the farming community. We want to uplift the farming community. We want to provide them employment. What you have done in fifty years, we are not going to do it. Be assured on that and there is no question of acquiring the land for private people. It has now become fashionable to say that this Government belongs to industrialists, capitalists and corporate interests, they have encouraged those people for fifty years. All these '*Udyogpatis*', all these '*Crorepatis*', all these Corporates, they were all born, they were all grown, they were all developed and they were glorified during the regime of the other side and not by our Government. Our Government is for the people. We feel that industry also is required. If some people do not want industry, if their policy is against industry, it is their choice. There is no problem at all. But our policy is not against industry. We want agriculture to prosper. We want that industrialization to take place. We want the children of farmers to get employment also. That is the purpose of this Bill. *[Translation]* The provision for guaranteed employment is also being mocked. There is a provision to provide employment even to those who do not own land, and some people are criticising that as well. There is also a provision that those who do not receive employment will be paid compensation for a period of twenty years. When I speak

about these provisions, I do not understand why some Members become so apprehensive. *[English]* There is a subsistence grant of Rs.3,000 per month. If the house is lost, there is a provision of new house. *[Translation]* If a house is demolished, a new house will be constructed. Subsistence allowance will be provided, and Rs. 25,000 will be given for the construction of a cattle shed. No land will be acquired for private commercial purposes, and no land will be acquired for industrialists. We will not do what you did earlier; we have learnt from experience. *[English]* I am speaking from the heart. The farming community needs a big boost. They need support; they need encouragement. Their children are to be given employment. We have to construct the houses for all by 2022. Houses cannot be constructed in the air. They have to be constructed somewhere, not in the air. if you want any of these facilities, they need to be constructed on land only. Even airports have to be constructed on land only, not in the air. That has to be understood by one and all.

Coming to these 13 Acts, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, if the ordinance is not proceeded on the most frequently used 13 Central Acts under which acquisitions are made, farmers will not get the needed compensation, they will not get the assured employment provided under the Act. The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and

Remains Act 1958, Atomic Energy Act 1962, Damodar Valley Corporation Act 1948, Indian Tramways Act 1886, Land Acquisition (Mines) Act 1885, Metro Railways (Construction of Works) Act 1978, National Highways Act 1956, Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User Land) Act 1962, Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1952, Resettlement of Displaced Persons (Land Acquisition) Act 1948, Coal Bearing Areas Acquisition and Development Act 1957, Electricity Act 2003, and Railways Act 1989 - these were all exempted from the earlier Bill. The farmers will not get justice. We want to give justice, that is why we brought this as part of the Ordinance, and we brought amendments also in Parliament.

Try to understand, Lakh of acres of land had been acquired earlier. Some friends are saying that half of that land is lying vacant. Let there be an agreement. If whatever land is given to you earlier is lying vacant, let it be taken back. Let that suggestion come in the Joint Committee. The purpose of referring this to Joint Committee is because the 1894 Act was called as a fraud on the people by the highest court of the land. And who implemented that? Now when you make changes, you need to make better changes. You need to apply your mind, you need to take the States into confidence, you need to

take the various viewpoints, and you also need to understand the aspiration of the farmers.

Whatever you may say, whatever curses you may give, nothing is going to happen because people of the country have utmost confidence and respect for our leader Shri Narendra Modi. He is the most popular Prime Minister Sir of the country today, tomorrow and day after also. You go through any survey. The survey that has come yesterday also expressed confidence that 82 percent of the people are saying that he is the best Prime Minister Sir. Today *Time* magazine has front-paged him even in America. He is popular outside and within the country.

Try to understand. Some parties criticising here and there are saying there is all-round opposition. If there is all-round opposition, do you think that we are innocent people? We are also keeping in touch with people. Most of our Hon. Members of Parliament are from the rural areas. They are also from agricultural families. The Hon. Member who initiated the debate from my party, Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria, comes from an *adivasi* area. He is a known leader who is fighting for the rights of the *adivasi* people. And then it is being misrepresented as if *adivasis'* rights are going to be taken away.

By false propaganda, by negative propaganda, by disinformation campaigns, you are not going to achieve anything. If you really want to serve the farmers, please use all your understanding and knowledge. Let us all sit together in that Joint Committee, put our brains together, make good recommendations so that the Parliament can take a collective view and then move forward.

As far as democracy is concerned, our Government is the most democratic Government. We have the patience to hear others also. We heard, in spite of all your accusations. The reason is, we want to respect the Opposition. Though the Opposition is small numbers-wise, we are not looking at it that way. We want the Opposition to have a say; but at the end of the day the Government must have its way. That is the meaning of democracy.

Sir, 452 ordinances were promulgated earlier. Forgetting that, our friends are giving *pravachan* to us. The same ordinance was issued four times. Do you want me to go into those details? And then you have seen also ordinances were issued for what purposes. You have seen also how fundamental rights of the people were taken away for the sake of individuals. If you want to discuss it, let us discuss it. I totally agree. When the Bill comes back, we can have a thorough discussion, a meaningful discussion. That is the purpose I said that in

the morning. When Khargeji wanted to say something, I said in the morning itself that the Government was willing to refer this to a Joint Committee of Parliament. That being the case, you should not have taken this much pain except that you wanted to tar the image of our government.

### **18.00 hrs**

My Government is fool-proof, it is not going to be tarred. Do not worry on that. You will be disappointed at the end of the day. I appeal to all parties in the House to work in that Joint Committee and make collective recommendation so that we can improve the lot of the farming community who have been suffering for years together, cheated for years together, looted for years together and taken for a ride years together. Let us make a good legislation, a meaningful legislation, a constructive legislation, that is my suggestion. As Parliamentary Affairs Minister, I feel that referring this Bill to Joint Committee is the best option available so that we can have collective wisdom of both the House. That will be useful to us.

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Now it is six o' clock. If the House agrees, we can extend the House till the time the Minister finishes his reply.

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS:** Yes, Sir.

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** So, the time of the House is extended till the time the Minister finishes his reply.

*[Translation]*

**THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT, MINISTER OF PANCHAYATI RAJ AND MINISTER OF DRINKING WATER AND SANITATION (SHRI CHAUDHARY BIRENDER SINGH):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we have brought a Bill to replace the Ordinance. Several Hon. Members have said that this was not appropriate. The Hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has referred to thirteen Bills and thirteen Acts that were outside the scope of the 2013 Act. Our primary objective was to include these so that farmers whose land has been acquired under the Railways Act, the Roads Act, or other Central Acts also receive the same compensation that ought to have been available under the 2013 Act. That is why this step was taken again, to ensure continuity. If continuity were not maintained, those who were entitled to compensation under the 2013 Act could have faced difficulties. This was the principal reason.

I am pleased today that all Hon. Members of the House, especially leaders of all parties, have acknowledged that if anyone has suggestions, whether from any forum, farmers' organisations, workers' organisations, or any political party, and if there are suggestions in the interest of farmers, we are prepared to accept them.

We have no objection to this, and if amendments are required, we shall make them. Today, an atmosphere has been created in the House for referring the matter to a Joint Committee, and this also points in that direction. There may be several other aspects which, when Members become part of the Committee and participate in discussions, can be incorporated into this Act. This is what we had stated earlier as well. Unfortunately, the party that had the Bill passed during the UPA Government took the view that the 2013 Act was final and that nothing could be changed before or after it.

Sir, I wish to submit that when the Constitution of India was framed, Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar was the Chairman of the Drafting Committee. Eminent national leaders contributed a wide range of suggestions, resulting in a Constitution that inspired faith among the people of India. Even so, 65–66 years have now elapsed, and more than one hundred amendments have been carried out. This is a matter of time and changing circumstances. Some Hon. Members have said that this law was enacted only recently and have questioned what developments necessitated its amendment. Certain aspects have been mentioned by the Hon. Shri Venkaiah Ji. Along with those, one must also consider why this situation has arisen. I have figures to show that from 1 January 2014 to 12 May 2015, across the country, under this

Act, which some claim should not be altered at all, land acquisition has been minimal: in Punjab, one hundred acres; in Odisha, less than one hundred acres; and in another State, only thirty-six acres... *(Interruptions)* Shri Mulayam Singh Ji, please allow me to complete my submission... *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI MULAYAM SINGH YADAV (AZAMGARH):** Nothing has been given to Uttar Pradesh. Cheques were bouncing. ...*(Interruptions)*

**SHRI DHARMENDRA YADAV (BADAYUN):** You are not even taking the name of Uttar Pradesh. Not a single rupee of compensation has been paid. ...*(Interruptions)* Cheques were bouncing. ...*(Interruptions)*

**SHRI CHAUDHARY BIRENDER SINGH:** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Shri Mulayam Singh Ji, please listen to me first. ...*(Interruptions)* Please allow me to complete my statement; then the position will become clear. In Andhra Pradesh, since 2013, the figures are as follows: Assam – nil; Goa – nil; Manipur – nil; Meghalaya – nil; Mizoram – nil; Punjab – 26 acres; Sikkim – nil; Tamil Nadu – nil; Tripura – nil; West Bengal – nil; Chandigarh – nil; Lakshadweep – nil; Delhi – nil; Puducherry – nil; Daman and Diu – nil. In addition,

in Odisha, 303 acres of land have been acquired. As regards the point raised by Shri Mulayam Singh Ji, the land acquisitions referred to were carried out under the provisions that existed prior to the 2013 Act. ...*(Interruptions)* After the passage of the 2013 Act, no land has been acquired in Uttar Pradesh either. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

**SHRI SUDIP BANDYOPADHYAY (KOLKATA UTTAR):** It is a baseless report, Sir. The West Bengal Government has acquired more than one thousand acres of land. ... *(Interruptions)*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Members, please sit down.

... *(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

**SHRI CHAUDHARY BIRENDER SINGH:** Sir, these figures have not been prepared casually while sitting at home. We have obtained them from every State, and they have categorically stated that, till date, no land has been acquired under the 2013 Act. I would ask this House to consider: are all 29 States truly not acquiring any land for the past one and a half years? Either there is some deficiency in the Act, or there is no requirement at all. It cannot be the case that no State requires land for any purpose whatsoever. This was the principal

reason for which we have brought these amendments.  
...(Interruptions)

Rahul Ji has made certain points. Let me also say that it was not my intention today to speak with a large amount of prepared material. His own speech has provided me with sufficient material.  
...(Interruptions) First, he stated that 40 per cent of SEZ land has not been utilised. This is correct, and we accept this point. However, the question arises: why were SEZs created in the first place, and in what proportion was land allotted to them? Even at the time when SEZ land was allotted in the manner it was, concerns were raised that if such allotments continued, nothing productive would come of them. In many cases, the intention behind SEZs was to acquire land near Delhi and, after ten or twelve years, claim that the SEZ had not taken off and then convert that land into commercial and residential use, thereby making profits running into thousands of crores of rupees.

I would like to make a second point. Rahul Ji stated that three blows of the axe were struck and that the blow was aimed at the neck. Rahul Ji, you would be aware of the difference between an axe and a *gandasa* or *farsa*. We have seen that when a farmer strikes the head, he uses an axe, but when he strikes the neck, he uses a *gandasa* or a *farsa*. Please understand this distinction. You said that we have

removed the five-year provision. The only change made is this: if any project, whose stipulated duration is five years, does not commence within those five years, the land will revert to the farmer. You would also appreciate that many projects cannot be completed within five years. Some projects have a completion timeline of eight, nine or even twelve years. How, then, can it be assumed that they must be completed within five years? ... (*Interruptions*) Even today, I recall the occasion when Shrimati Sonia Gandhi convened a conclave in Nainital, attended by Chief Ministers of Congress-ruled States. In very clear terms, she stated that under no circumstances should multi-crop land be acquired from farmers. Unfortunately, at the very time she was delivering that speech, multi-crop land was being acquired in Haryana.... (*Interruptions*) I will prove this with records.... (*Interruptions*) I have records to show that in Haryana, notices under Sections 4 and 6 were issued for 20,000 acres of land. This is a matter that must be heard and understood. Notices under Sections 4 and 6 were issued for 20,000 acres, and builders and developers were then told to purchase the land directly from farmers. ... (*Interruptions*) Of this, 4,000 acres were in Sonipat, 4,500 acres in Gurgaon, and 3,500 acres in Faridabad. ... (*Interruptions*) Please listen. ... (*Interruptions*) Developers were told to acquire the land, and

they went to farmers and said: your land will be acquired, you will receive five to seven lakh rupees, whereas we are offering you twelve lakh rupees. Thus, the developers purchased the land, and subsequently CLUs were granted to them to build residential colonies. ... (*Interruptions*) This is the biggest scam. ... (*Interruptions*) I have records with me. The manner in which the then Chief Minister of Haryana misled the Congress Party cannot be matched by anyone else. You have looted land. ... (*Interruptions*) Rahul Ji, I would like to say one thing to you. You travel across India and you have said that I wear a suit worth ten lakh rupees. ... (*Interruptions*) Please listen to me for a minute. ... (*Interruptions*) If the son of a farmer or the son of a poor person wears a suit worth one lakh rupees, what problem does that cause you? How much do the people sitting next to you spend on their suits? Ask them ...\* ... (*Interruptions*)

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have just returned from Jaipur, where we had representatives from seven States present. ... (*Interruptions*) Please understand this clearly: if you choose to make political statements, you will receive political replies. ... (*Interruptions*) It cannot be otherwise. ... (*Interruptions*) If you wish to speak

---

\* Expunged as ordered by the Chair

politically, then political answers will certainly be given. ...  
(*Interruptions*)

**18.18 hrs**

*At this stage, Shri Jyotiraditya M. Scindia and some other Hon. Members came and stood on the floor near the Table.*

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, apart from this, several Hon. Members have also spoken on the matter. ... (*Interruptions*) I am sorry. I intended to mention the name of Shri Jyotiraditya Scindia, but by mistake I mentioned the name of Madhavrao Scindia. I apologise for this. I am sorry. ...(*Interruptions*) That is what I have said. ... (*Interruptions*) It happened inadvertently. ... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, many of my colleagues have spoken about the industrial corridor. ... *(Interruptions)* I have already apologised; what more do you want? ... *(Interruptions)* That was a slip of the tongue. ... *(Interruptions)* That is what I have said. That was a slip of the tongue. I have stated that I mentioned the name by mistake. ... *(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The House stands adjourned to meet at 6.30 p.m.

**18.19 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Thirty Minutes  
past Six of the Clock.*

---

**18.30 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past*

*Eighteen of the Clock.*

*(Hon. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)*

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF  
RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND  
RESETTLEMENT (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 2015**

**AND**

**RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY  
IN LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND  
RESETTLEMENT (AMENDMENT) SECOND BILL, 2015 –**

**Contd.**

**HON. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Now, we take up item Nos.8 and 9.

Hon. Members, please take your seats.

*[Translation]*

**THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT, MINISTER OF PANCHAYATI RAJ AND MINISTER OF DRINKING WATER AND SANITATION (SHRI CHAUDHARY BIRENDER SINGH):** Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the truth is that there was no such intention in my mind, and I myself could not understand how that name came to my mind. I wished to refer to him, but by mistake I mentioned another name, and for that I had already apologised to him; even now, I apologise again and say that I should not have said so.

Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Mulayam Singh ji has made a suggestion, and I would like to speak on it for two minutes. Hidden within his suggestion is the very point that I made at the outset, that even now, if any political party or any other organisation puts forward any constructive suggestion in this Bill in the interest of farmers, we have no objection to accepting it. I believe that all these matters will be discussed in the Joint Parliamentary Committee and that positive outcomes will emerge. We wish to make it clear that if any provision of this Bill causes harm to farmers in any manner whatsoever, we will never pursue such a provision. This Bill is in the interest of farmers and has been brought for farmers.

Secondly, I would also like to say that this is essential for the development of the country. One Hon. Member observed that today 20 to 30 crore people living in villages are dependent on agriculture and that there is a need to provide them with alternative avenues of employment. This will be possible only when we are able to accelerate both wheels of development simultaneously and ensure complete justice to farmers.

At the same time, I would like to submit that there is broad agreement on the proposal to refer this Bill to a Joint Parliamentary Committee. With the consent of all concerned, I shall now read out the names of the Members of this House who will be part of that Committee.

*[English]*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Members, just a minute. I will give the ruling afterwards.

... (*Interruptions*)

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hon. Members, Shri Venkaiah Naidu, Hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* letter dated 12<sup>th</sup> May, 2015 addressed to Hon. Speaker has informed that the Government wants to refer the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in

Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Second Bill, 2015 to a Joint Committee of both the Houses. A notice of a motion for reference of the Bill to the Joint Committee has also been received. Copies of notice have just been circulated to the Hon. Members.

In view of the request of the Minister, after disposal of the Statutory Resolution, I shall call Shri Chaudhary Birender Singh, the Minister-in-charge of the Bill to move the motion for reference of the Bill to the Joint Committee.

**SHRI C.N. JAYADEVAN (THRISSUR):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when I moved the Statutory Resolution and participated in the discussion, the thoughts and feelings that I expressed were about the farmers and the poor people of India. But I did not get a proper reply from the Government.

Sir, I was hearing the entire discussion in the House except for a brief period when I went for taking a cup of tea. All the Hon. Members who were speaking from the Ruling Party, including Shri Venkaiah Naidu and the Hon. Minister of Rural Development were repeatedly saying that this Bill is in the interest of the poor. I would like to ask this question to the Government. What is the interest of the Government to bring such a Bill in the Lok Sabha? For whom are they bringing this Bill? Is it for the farmers and the poor people of India or is it for the big bourgeois of India? I accuse the Government that they have brought this Bill for the big bourgeois of India and for the protection of the big bourgeois of India. Therefore, I urge upon this House to pass this Statutory Resolution.

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Hon. Minister has already informed the House that the Government is ready to constitute a Joint Committee for detailed examination of this Bill. So, the Bill will be

discussed in the Committee and afterwards, we will discuss it again in the House.

I shall now put the Statutory Resolution moved by Shri C.N. Jeyadevan to the vote of the House.

The question is:

“That this House disapproves of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Ordinance, 2015 (No. 4 of 2015) promulgated by the President on 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2015”.

*The motion was adopted.*

---

**18.36 hrs**

**MOTION RE: REFERENCE OF RIGHT TO FAIR  
COMPENSATION AND TRANSPARENCY IN LAND  
ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND RESETTLEMENT  
(AMENDMENT) SECOND BILL, 2015 TO JOINT  
COMMITTEE**

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Now the Hon. Minister may move the motion for reference of the Bill to the Joint Committee.

**THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT, MINISTER OF PANCHAYATI RAJ AND MINISTER OF DRINKING WATER AND SANITATION (SHRI CHAUDHARY BIRENDER SINGH):** Sir, I beg to move:

“That the Bill further to amend the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement) Act, 2013 be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 30 Members, 20 from this House, namely:-

1. Shri Anandrao Adsul
2. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
3. Shri Kalyan Banerjee
4. Shri R.K. Bharathi Mohan
5. Shri P.P. Chaudhary
6. Kumari Shobha Karandlaje
7. Shri B. Vinod Kumar
8. Shri Murli Mohan Maganti
9. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
10. Shri Chirag Paswan
11. Shri Nityanand Rai
12. Shri Ravindra Rai
13. Shrimati Krishna Raj
14. Shri Udit Raj
15. Shri Mohammad Salim
16. Shri Rajiv Shankarrao Satav
17. Shri Ganesh Singh
18. Shri Anurag Thakur

19. Prof. K.V. Thomas
20. Dr. V.P. Velagapalli

and 10 Members from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of Members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a Report to this House by the first day of the first week of the next Session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the

name of 10 Members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee.”

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The question is:

“That the Bill further to amend the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement) Act, 2013 be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 30 Members, 20 from this House, namely:-

1. Shri Anandrao Adsul
2. Shri S.S. Ahluwalia
3. Shri Kalyan Banerjee
4. Shri R.K. Bharathi Mohan
5. Shri P.P. Chaudhary
6. Kumari Shobha Karandlaje
7. Shri B. Vinod Kumar
8. Shri Murli Mohan Maganti
9. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab

10. Shri Chirag Paswan
11. Shri Nityanand Rai
12. Shri Ravindra Rai
13. Shrimati Krishna Raj
14. Shri Udit Raj
15. Shri Mohammad Salim
16. Shri RaJiv Shankarrao Satav
17. Shri Ganesh Singh
18. Shri Anurag Thakur
19. Prof. K.V. Thomas
20. Dr. V.P. Velagapalli

and 10 Members from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of Members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a Report to this House by the first day of the first week of the next Session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the name of 10 Members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee.”

*The motion was adopted.*

**HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow, the 13<sup>th</sup> May, 2015 at 11.00 a.m.

**18.38 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on  
Wednesday, May 13, 2015/Vaisakha 23, 1937 (Saka).*

---

**INTERNET**

The Original version of Lok Sabha proceedings is available on Parliament of India Website at the following address:

<https://sansad.in/ls>

**LIVE TELECAST OF PROCEEDINGS OF LOK SABHA**

Lok Sabha proceedings are being telecast live on Lok Sabha T.V. Channel. Live telecast begins at 11 A.M. every day the Lok Sabha sits, till the adjournment of the House.

---

**©2015 By Lok Sabha Secretariat**

Published under Rules 379 and 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business  
in Lok Sabha (Sixteenth Edition)

---