

of a separate Council for veterinary research, there is no research work going on in this field. Research work is going on.

SHRI B.P. APTE: Sir, the Government had appointed a Task Force to look into the question of cow protection. The Task Force has submitted its voluminous Report, which contains recommendations on banning cow slaughter, and, I understand, on establishing a Council for veterinary research. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government has considered those recommendations. If 'so', what has the Government has done in this regard?

SHRI AJIT SINGH: Sir, the Report is being considered by the Ministry.

### **Conversion of forest land**

\*348. SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN:†  
SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY:

Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that proposals from various States have been received by Government, seeking environmental clearance for conversion of certain forest lands, for purposes other than forestry;

(b) if so, the details and the status of such proposals, State-wise;

(c) whether the Kamataka Government has sought approval for release of forest land for rehabilitation of tribal families, displaced on account of Bandipur National Park and construction of Kanini Reservoir; and

(d) if so, the reaction of the Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI T.R. BAALU): (a) to (d) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

### **Statement**

(a) and (b) For diversion of forest land for non-forestry uses, forestry clearance is granted under the provisions of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.

---

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri K. Rahman Khan.

More than 4900 proposals have been submitted by various State Governments during the last five years i.e. from 1998 to 31.10.2002 under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 for forestry clearance. A brief abstract of this information indicating their present status, State-wise is annexed as Statement-I (see below)

(c) and (d) The Central Government received a proposal from Government of Karnataka for diversion of 188.40 ha. forest land for rehabilitation of 154 tribal families displaced by formation of Bandipur National Park and construction of Kabini reservoir in District Mysore, Karnataka on 14.7.2000 under the provisions of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980. The proposal was rejected on 21.3.2001 as the land formed part of the Bandipur National Park. As per the directions of the National Human Rights Commission, the representatives of the Central Government and the State Government have identified an alternative area of 188 ha. forest land in "Kotwal Extension Forest". As such, the State Government has been requested by the Central Government on 6.11.2002 to submit a fresh proposal for rehabilitation in "Kotwal Extension Forest" under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.

### **Statement-I**

#### *Status of proposals submitted by State Governments for forestry clearance*

Sl. No.	State	No. of proposals received	Approved	Rejected	Rejected for want of information	Returned/ withdrawn by the State Govt.	Under process by Minister	Additional information awaited from the States
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Assam	90	63	14	0	10	0	3
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	69	47	1	0	0	10	11
3.	Andhra Pradesh	128	79	25	4	7	4	9
4.	Andaman and Nicobar Island	27	18	5	0	1	0	3

RAJYA SABHA

[13 December, 2002]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5.	Bihar	18	11	1	2	3	1	0
6.	Chandigarh	18	14	0	0	0	0	4
7.	Chhattisgarh	83	42	3	1	4	19	14
8.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	140	86	9	3	12	12	18
9.	Daman and Diu	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
10.	Delhi	6	3	2	0	1	0	0
11.	Goa	30	10	2	0	0	2	16
12.	Gujarat	416	316	30	15	25	6	24
13.	Haryana	235	184	19	0	0	2	30
14.	Himachal Pradesh	307	170	57	1	12	8	59
15.	Jharkhand	85	46	2	27	1	3	6
16.	Karnataka	166	91	22	12	7	12	22
17.	Kerala	43	30	2	2	2	3	4
18.	Manipur	5	4	0	0	1	0	0
19.	Meghalaya	49	44	2	0	1	2	0
20.	Madhya Pradesh	201	100	52	6	10	12	21
21.	Mizoram	15	13	0	0	0	0	2
22.	Maharashtra	474	296	65	10	16	45	42
23.	Punjab	540	371	47	1	6	7	108
24.	Orissa	141	87	6	12	12	12	12
25.	Sikkim	45	43	0	0	0	0	2
26.	Rajasthan	168	102	15	20	12	5	14
27.	Tamil Nadu	81	66	4	2	0	4	5
28.	Tripura	120	113	2	2	1	1	1
29.	West Bengal	14	7	3	0	2	0	2
30.	Uttar Pradesh	145	111	7	14	8	3	2
31.	Uttaranchal	1064	887	51	12	49	8	57
TOTAL:		4924	3454	448	146	203	181	492

[13 December, 2002]

RAJYA SABHA

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: Sir, the Government of India had acquired about 20,000 acres of land for the Bandipur National Park and the Kabini Reservoir, as early as 1973. About 20 villages were affected, and hundreds of tribals were displaced. Now, 154 tribal families are still to be rehabilitated. I would like to know from the hon. Minister why the Government is taking such a long time to provide alternative land, despite the Government of Karnataka requesting the Ministry of Environment and Forests for release of certain portion of the land for rehabilitating the tribals.

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is the sad plight of adivasis. They are the poorest of the poor of this country; they have been languishing for more than three decades. The Government of Karnataka wanted to construct the Kabini Dam on the river Kabini, which is a tributary of the Cauvery, which, once again, is an inter-State river. Sir, those 154 tribal families have been languishing for the last thirty years. What was the reason? The Government of Karnataka had declared Bandipur as a National Park.

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: You have declared it as a National Park...(Interruptions)...

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Unless a State comes forward to declare a particular area as a National Park, the Government of India cannot do anything. So, the land, the property and other things are part and parcel of the State of Karnataka. The Government of Karnataka, knowing fully well the rules and regulations of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980, and of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, declared Bandipur as a National Park and then sent a proposal on 14th July, 2000, requesting the Central Government to allocate about 180 hectares of land for the rehabilitation of the displaced tribals. As per the existing rules, it cannot be considered for the time being. That is all I can submit.

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: Sir, my second supplementary is this. Sir, since it is a National Park, permission from the Ministry of Environment and Forests is required. The Government of Karnataka has continuously been requesting the Government of India for release of land. The proposal of 2000, to which the hon. Minister has referred to, is only a fresh proposal identifying the land. This has been rejected by the Central Government.

Now, the National Human Rights Commission has intervened. It has directed the Central Government to release the land. Despite this, the Government of India has not taken any decision so far.

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Sir, my friend is correct. On 14th July, 2000, the State of Karnataka sent a proposal, requesting the Central Government to part with some land for rehabilitating the tribal families who were displaced when Bandipur was set up as a National Park. On 22nd February, 2000, this proposal was discussed in the Forest Committee, at the Centre. The proposal was rejected on 21st March, 2001, for the obvious reason that the Forest (Conservation) Act, as well as the Wildlife (Protection) Act, and the rules thereunder does not permit it. Sir, the State Government had sent a proposal to the Central Government on 4.8.2001 to reconsider its decision. The State Government had advised that the proposal could be reconsidered by the Forest (Conservation) Committee, after seeking permission from the Standing Committee on Indian Board for Wildlife. They want to seek the permission of the IBW, because if the land belongs to the National Park or any Wildlife Sanctuary, then, they have to seek the permission of this Standing Committee, headed by the Prime Minister. Once the Committee gives its approval for release of the forest land for rehabilitation of the displaced tribal people, then, the court can concur. This is the only way in which they can get an approval to use the land for any specific purpose. But even the Standing Committee on Indian Board for Wildlife has rejected the proposal. In fact, some NGO activists and displaced persons went to the National Human Rights Commission. The National Human Rights Commission patiently heard the views of the representatives of the Central Government, and they have concurred and they have appreciated our views. Finally, they have advised the Central Government and the State Government to identify the area, which is around 188 hectares of forest land, for the rehabilitation of the displaced people. Now, the Environment and Forests Ministry has directed the Inspector General (Forests) and the officials of the State Government to do this. Now, they have to identify a proper place to locate the displaced people. The proposal has to come from the State Government of Karnataka ...*(Interruptions)* As soon as it comes, we will consider it.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Sir, you kindly refer to part (a) of the question; it refers to the entire country. Crores of people, mostly belonging to the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, and the people belonging to the most backward sections of the society, have been living in this forest land, and tilling their land for centuries. I am grateful to the hon. Minister of expressing his concern for the sufferings of these tribals. You may be aware of the latest Supreme Court order.

According to that Order, these people should evacuate the place, and it has given an impetus for the evacuation exercise. All these people have been eking out their livelihood for centuries, tilling their small lands. You must also be aware of the fact that they can't even afford to have one single meal a day. Under these circumstances, why cannot you bring forward an amendment to the Forest (Conservation) Act to protect their lives?

श्री सभापति: आप बैठिए, बैठिए।

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: After all ...(*Interruptions*)...It is your job. You have to protect them. ...(*Interruptions*)...You are aware of the suffering of these tribal people; poor people. ...(*Interruptions*)...So, why cannot you, after consulting the State Government, bring forward an amendment to the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980, and protect their rights, instead of waiting for the proposal.

SHRI T.R. BAALU: As far as the question of these 154 displaced families is concerned. I think, I have already answered it in reply to Mr. Rahman's question. As and when the State Government sends a proposal, we will see to it that it is extended to the displaced people. But, at the same time, my friend, Mr. Poojary, when you were on this side of this House ...(*Interruptions*)...The Congress Party had brought the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Don't bring in politics here. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, you just mention about your reaction to the proposal given by the State Government. This is what the hon. Member wanted to know. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Sir, this is what I want to mention, but they should not spring on me, before I express my opinion. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member just wants to know whether you will amend the Forest (Conservation) Act. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Whatever the opposition... ...(*Interruptions*)...My friend, I know everything pretty well. ...(*Interruptions*)...I was a Member of this House, even before you were here. ...(*Interruptions*)...I know the

procedure of this august House. ...*(Interruptions)*... During Question Hour, nobody would try to score political points. ...*(Interruptions)*... I know that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please address me. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.R. BAALU: But, let them keep quiet first...  
...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, please keep the House in order...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: When you yourself are creating problems, how can I keep the House in order? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Sir, if you want me to answer this question, please keep the House in order...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You all sit down...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Minister, I request you to reply only to the point that has been made by the hon. member. Can you, through an amendment, do what the hon. Member wants?...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Sir, let them keep quiet first, then, I will reply...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, please keep the House in order...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow you and other...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Sir, you cannot expect me to answer the question when the House is not in order...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please give the reply...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Sir, Mr. Poojary has put a very pertinent question, but, at the same time, I have got a letter...

श्री सभापति: देखिए, मैं लेटर नहीं चाहता हूँ, मैं चाहता हूँ कि अमेंडमेंट की मारफत संशोधन करवा सकते हैं या नहीं, यह बताएं।

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Sir, if you want me to answer, please allow me to explain something. It is relevant to the question that the hon. Member has put. I have got a letter wherein the Leader of the Opposition in Lok Sabha, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi, has advised the Chief Ministers belonging to the Congress Party not to dilute the Forest (Conservation) Act. If the Congress Party is ready to bring forward an amendment to dilute the Forest (Conservation) Act, we are also ready to examine.

[13 December, 2002]

RAJYA SABHA

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's all right.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Mr. Minister, you are not addressing the letter; you are addressing the issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Datta Meghe.

SHRI JIBON ROY: She might have written the letter, but we have not.

श्री दत्ता मेघे: सभापति महोदय मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि फारेस्ट कंजरवेशन एक्ट जो बना है - विदर्भ के चार-पांच जिलों के अंदर कोई जंगल नहीं है, झुड़पी जंगल करें ... (व्यवधान)

श्री सभापति: आप क्वेश्चन पूछ लें। अब जंगल नहीं है तो जंगल में कई बातें हो सकती हैं ... (व्यवधान)

श्री दत्ता मेघे: जहां नागपुर का हाई कोर्ट है वह भी झुड़पी जंगल में है। 5-6 जिलों के अंदर झुड़पी जंगल आदि कुछ भी नहीं है। वहां जो आदिवासी दलित लोग रहते हैं - वर्धा है, गडचिरोली है, चन्द्रपुर है - ये जो जिले हैं इनमें डेवलपमेंट के काम नहीं हो रहे हैं।

श्री सभापति: आपका क्वेश्चन क्या है ... (व्यवधान) आप मंत्री महोदय का मुकाबला मत करिए। Please put the question.

श्री दत्ता मेघे: महाराष्ट्र सरकार ने आपको झुड़पी जंगल के विदर्भ के जो प्रोजेक्ट भेजे हैं वे प्रोजेक्ट क्लियर करने में सरकार को क्या दिक्कत है?

श्री सभापति: बस ठीक है।

श्री दत्ता मेघे: आप वे क्लियर क्यों नहीं करते हैं? आप वे करें।

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Sir, more than 65,000 hectares of land pertaining to Madhya Pradesh has been cleared just 2-3 months back. The Chief Minister is very much in interaction with the Ministry. He often comes here. Certain things have been cleared.

SHRI DATTA MEGHE: What about Maharashtra?

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Even the Chief Minister of Maharashtra met me thrice on this issue. We are trying to sort out the matter. We will examine the case as and when it comes.



SHRIMATI S. G. INDIRA: As far as diversion of forest land for non-forestry use is concerned—as given in the statement—in respect of Tamil Nadu, 66 proposals were approved. Out of 66 approved proposals, 4 have been rejected. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, what are the reasons for rejecting the four proposals?

SHRI T.R. BAALU: Sir, since those proposals were not according to the Forest (Conservation) Act and also the Wildlife Act, that is why they have been rejected.

### **Indian students in foreign universities**

\*349. SHRI R. P. GOENKA: Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether any study has been conducted to analyse the problems increasingly faced by the larger number of Indian students enrolling themselves in foreign universities for higher education and specialised courses; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and the action taken/proposed to be taken to safeguard the interests of the student community, especially measures against bogus foreign universities?

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI): (a) and (b) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

### **Statement**

While no specific study on the problems of Indian students studying in foreign universities has been conducted by the Government according to the information compiled by the Association of Indian Universities on the basis of advertisements appearing in the Indian newspapers 144 foreign universities/colleges/institutions are offering various courses of study to the Indian students. With a view to safeguard the interests of the student community, the University Grants Commission has framed draft Regulations for regulating the entry into and operations of foreign universities/educational institutions in the country. Besides, the Government has constituted a Committee with the objective of regulating operations of foreign educational institutions in India. The Government