

infructuous proposals, (ii) Indian partner not being interested in implementing the proposal for 39.8 per cent (iii) non-approval by the Government and failure of the foreign collaborator to fulfil commitments for 11.2 per cent and 4.4 per cent of the total infructuous proposals, respectively.

#### Sale of Shoes by Bata

3919. SHRI SURESH KURUP : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state :

(a) whether it has come to the notice of the Government that Bata India Ltd., Calcutta purchases shoes and chappals from the open market and after stamping them with Bata trade mark, markets them locally and abroad ; and

(b) if so, the action Government propose to take in this regard ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM) : (a) M/s. Bata India Ltd. is a private sector firm about whose day to day commercial activities the Government is not expected to possess information. However, the Company is known to have a partner-in-progress scheme under which it provides some small scale units with technical support and assists them in the manufacture and marketing of their products.

(b) No action on the part of the Government appears to be called for in this regard.

#### Representation from Colliery Mazdoor Sabha of India

3920. DR. SUDHIR ROY : Will the Minister of ENERGY be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government have received any representation dated 25th June, 1986 from Colliery Mazdoor Sabha of India (CITU) ;

(b) if so, the details thereof ; and

(c) the steps taken so far by Government on the said representation ?

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY (SHRI VASANT SATHE) : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Colliery Mazdoor Sabha of India (CITU) made a representation to Director General of Mines Safety on 25.6.86 complaining about a subsidence alleged to have taken place at Damodar-pur Village adjacent to No. 1 Pit of Khas Kajora Colliery, endangering about 100 houses in the area.

(c) The matter of subsidence taking place around Pit Nos. 1 & 2 of Khas Kajora Colliery was inquired into by the officers of the Internal Safety Organisational of ECL and it was found that no subsidence had taken place as reported : instead a portion of the shaft walling of a closed and abandoned old Pit No. 1 had recently collapsed. It had in no way endangered any inhabitant.

---

#### STATEMENT CORRECTING REPLY TO UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 647 DATED 22-7-86 RE : SETTING UP OF MOBILE COURTS

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H.R. BHARDWAJ) : In Para-1 of the reply to part (a) of the Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 647 for the 22nd July 1986 by Shri Banwari Lal Purohit and Smt. N.P. Jansi Lakshmi, it was stated "There is no such proposal under consideration of the Government." Likewise in reply to Parts (b) and (c) of the said question it was stated "Does not arise."

2. An error has crept in due to an oversight. The correct position in regard to the aforesaid question, however, is as follows :—

(a) A Resolution suggesting a scheme for setting up Mobile Courts as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism was

adopted in the Joint Conference of Chief Justices, Chief Ministers and Law Ministers of States held on 31st August—1st September 1985 and forwarded to the State Governments for their views and comments.

(b) and (c). It is not possible at this stage to indicate the time by which these Courts would be set up by the State Governments or to quantify the relief on the lower courts.

3. Therefore, for the reply given to the Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 647 answered on 22nd July 1986, the following may be substituted :

(a) A resolution suggesting a scheme for setting up mobile courts as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism was adopted in the Joint Conference of Chief Justices, Chief Ministers and Law Ministers of States held on 31st August—1st September 1985 and forwarded to the State Governments for their view and comments.

(b) and (c). It is not possible at this stage to indicate the time by which these courts would be set up by the State Governments or to quantify the relief on the lower Courts.

12.00 hrs.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : What is your point of order ?

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri) : There has been a constitutional deadlock in the State of Assam.

MR. SPEAKER : For what ?

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY : There has been constitutional crisis in the State of Assam. The Central Ministers visiting Assam are not allowed to meet officials.

MR. SPEAKER : There is no question of point of order. Over ruled. Not allowed.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDY (Adilabad) : I have given notice against Mr. S. Jaipal Reddy, who is a member of this House for breach of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER : I have seen it. I have rejected it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDY : If hon. members are making accusation against each other, how can the House..... (Interruptions)..... It concerns a breach of privilege.

(Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI (Howrah) : It is a constitutional issue. It is a violation of the Constitution. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : They can take it up.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed.

(Interruptions)\*\*

MR. SPEAKER : There are proper methods. There cannot be a question like this here. There are proper channels to do that. If it is a constitutional point of view, you can do it properly, not like this.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : That you can write. I have told you that if there are proper channels, I can consider it, not like this.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I do not care who the Minister is. I only care for my rules.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Das Munsi, I am only caring for my rules, and if it is according to the rules, I will consider that, not like this, not at all ; nothing goes on record.