

2 of 1978) (Hindi and English versions) promulgated by the President on the 1st July, 1978, under article 123(2) (a) of the Constitution. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—2363/78]

ANNUAL REPORTS OF DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL FOR SUGAR INDUSTRIES FOR 1975-76 AND 1976-77 WITH STATEMENT FOR DELAY

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION (SHR BHANU PRATAP SINGH): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table:—

(1) A copy each of the following Reports (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (4) of section 7 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951:—

(i) Annual Report of the Development Council for Sugar Industry for the year 1975-76.

(ii) Annual Report of the Development Council for Sugar Industry for the year 1976-77.

(2) A statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the above Reports. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2364/78]

MR. SPEAKER: Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan, you wanted to speak on item No. 6.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): Mr. Speaker, with regard to this Ordinance, I want to oppose it. There seems to be rather unseemly haste with which this Ordinance is being brought for discussion. The prime mover of this Ordinance is no longer a Minister. It is like Hamlet without Prince of Denmark. When the whole question of the Statehood of Delhi is under discussion and we are informed that this is going to come up before Parliament very soon. I think we should have a discussion on this matter, and the Ordinance should be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Prof. Mavalankar wanted to speak on item No. 7.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is noticed on the very first day of the new Session that it has become a general practice of daily occurrence that papers and reports and documents which ought to come before the House as soon as possible are coming with considerable delay. In this particular item the Annual Reports of the Development Council for Sugar Industry for 1975-76 and 1976-77 are coming after three and two years, and these are obligations under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951. Sir, if a particular law passed by Parliament makes it obligatory for the Government to put certain papers and documents before the Parliament at the soonest possible moment all that happens is that they come out with a statement showing reasons for delay in laying the Reports, etc. I request you to go into this matter seriously. You kindly look into this matter from two aspects. First, would it not be possible for you through the Lok Sabha Secretariat to first ascertain from the Minister concerned and satisfy yourself that the delay is genuine? Only after that you permit the Papers to come before the House.

Secondly, Sir, you would have noticed that when we get up in the House and invite your attention and that of the House that the Ministers are late, the Ministers never care to give a reply. All that happens is that we get up and make our point and then you take up the next item. Therefore, Sir, I would like to submit that even after you have satisfied yourself about the delay if the Members feel that there is sufficient ground for objecting to the delay, you will direct the Minister concerned to explain to the House at that particular point of time as to why the delay has taken place.

MR. SPEAKER: I have repeatedly brought to the notice of the Ministers that the delay is most undesirable and there must be satisfactory explanation. If in spite of that delay is there all I can do is to refer the matter to

[Mr. Speaker]

the Committee on Papers laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, this morning over the issue of sugarcane Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh was doing tall talking. When I pointed out to him that they are playing into the hands of sugar magnates he said that that was wrong. Mr. Speaker, I request you to see how things are shielded. If you could spare some time during the inter-Session period and go through some of the reports as to how sugar rebates have been enjoyed by sugar mills which were not even functioning. You will find the reason for delaying these reports. It is not so simple as you see on paper. There is something much more. The erstwhile Government had been on the pay roll of the sugar lobby. Am I to understand that the present Government is also following the same path? If it is doing so, I would deprecate it. The whole House should deprecate it. The Minister has to explain to us the reasons for this unusual delay in these two cases and until that is done, we would not be satisfied.

SHRI BHANU PRATAP SINGH: I refute the allegations altogether. As far as the delay is concerned, I have already explained it in a Memorandum submitted to you. The Council did not meet till March 1978 and it was only after their approval that it could be laid on the Table.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why?

MR. SPEAKER: The Council should have met. This is a statutory obligation of yours.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am telling you, Sir, that they were paid for delaying the matter. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bosu, the Minister is there. When a statutory obligation is there at the earliest opportunity he has to do it. I am referring it to the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table for examination.

Item No. 8.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI

ZULFIQUARULLAH): I beg to lay on the Table.....

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): I am absolutely shocked to find that what is known as the notorious Bhoothalingam Report on Wages, Incomes and Prices is sought to be introduced in this House in a most surreptitious manner and I am also surprised over this because it is commonly understood as Boothalingam Report which is quietly written here as a Report of Study Group on Wages, Incomes and Prices. The entire working-class in the country is agitated over this issue. The entire public opinion in this country is agitated over this issue. We are demanding when you have a man like Mr. George Fernandes that it would be a lasting infamy that he is associated with a legislation of this kind which is totally anti working class and I demand that this should not be placed on the Table of the House. It should be withdrawn. We do not want the report to be placed on the Table. The Kerala Legislative Assembly has unanimously adopted a resolution on this report and before it is placed on the Table we want to have adequate opportunity to debate on this vital document, vital in the sense that if these are accepted by the anti-working class Government, it is going to damage the interests of the millions of workers in our country. So, I demand that it should be withdrawn and it should be postponed till we can discuss this on a substantive motion. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, am I to be last Member to speak on this?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bosu, I may tell you that Mr. Ravi has also signed the notice. You cannot always be the first Member.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I fully agree with the observations made by Mr. Unnikrishnan. Mr. George Fernandes has of course issued statements in support of this document.

He should have prevented the hon. Minister from its being presented to

this House because I have had the opportunity of going through this report and I find that it is entirely against the working class. It takes away the benefits enjoyed by them today and moreover there is no proposal to hold the price line. The working-class should be allowed to get atleast what they are getting today. This report is meant only to help the growth of the monopoly houses in the country and further exploitation of the poor people. They are speaking of uniform wages in the public sector. They are speaking of minimum wages. People are today getting more than that. I am not going into the merits of the case. Therefore, Sir, I appeal to the Government not to place it on the Table of the House. Before doing so, we must have some discussion on it.

It is clear that even after repeated appeals from Mr. George Fernandes the working class had totally rejected and they even wanted to resort to strike. They have now decided to withdraw the strike proposals on the solemn assurance of Shri Ravindra Verma that it will be first discussed and taken up only later. By placing it before the House, you are making it a sacramental document. I appeal to the hon. Minister; please do not place it before the House till Shri Ravindra Verma fulfils his promise and discusses it with Prof. Madhu Dandavate, Mr. Stephen and others; please withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu. You are raising an objection that you are called last.....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: There are two ways of functioning. If you get notices at the same time, they are to be balloted and priority should be ascertained.

MR. SPEAKER: You must have the virtue of hearing others also..... (Interruptions) Anyway you have objected to 8(3). They have objected to 8(2). I suppose in arithmetic 8(2) gets priority over 8(3).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The moment you say 8, I come into it. I sincerely hope that you have no dislike for the communists. That is all I have to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Nor for you..... (Interruptions). Under the rules when papers are laid on the Table of the House, it is open to them to say that they are not doing so. Otherwise, you have to move a resolution and discuss the matter.... (Interruptions). It is upto them..(Interruptions). He has not moved it.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA (Serampore): On this same issue the workers met and decided to go on strike...(Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bhattacharyya has not given any notice.—There is a method for doing this...(Interruptions) Don't record.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: I am not coming in the way. There is a time at which objection can be taken. He has not yet risen. Even before he rises, you get up and take objection. That is the right position. When his turn comes, it is upto him to say what he wants to say; he may say: I am withdrawing. It is open to him to say. But, on the other hand, if he says, "I am at it".... (Interruptions)

I have always been engrossed in looking at you. The question of looking at him comes when he tries to introduce it. He has not introduced it yet. Mr. Bosu, you wanted to object to item 8 (3) (v) and 8 (4).

15 hrs.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: On 8 (2) you called me. Bhoothalingam has a notorious past, he is known as an American lackey. Therefore, this report will be treated in the same manner. He is an enemy of the working class.

* * Not recorded.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: It should not be laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is why I am saying, it should not be laid on the Table of the House. That has already been said. What is Bhoothalingam's past? He has a notorious past for which he became a subject matter of discussion a decade ago and the Government could not find a better person. I do not know, Mr. Patel's old colleague....

MR. SPEAKER: Your objection was to items 8 (3) (v) and 8 (5).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I object to items 8 (3) (v), (vi), (vii), (viii), (ix), (x), (xi), (xii), (xiii), (xiv)..

MR. SPEAKER: You have objected to only 8 (3) (iv) and 8 (5).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I would like the hon. Minister to tell us and make sure in the future that when they publish this, they should give the matter the Gazette Notification covers. Otherwise, we cannot make head or tail out of this notification. What does it read? It reads: "G.S.R. 293 (E) published in the Gazette of India dated 16th May, 1978".

On what? Mr. Hegde's standing on his legs or Mr. Bosu being expelled from the House—What is the matter? The second one the something; the third one and the fourth also the same thing. This is all for taking the House for a ride and hoodwinking the House. The bureaucrats have got so much control over the Ministers. I know some of them, of what variety they are. The question is, it should be clearly notified. Why surrender to the bureaucrats? They are not admitting short notice questions. In the First Session, they admitted so many short notice questions. Now the bureaucrats are advising not to admit the short notice questions and they are not admitting. That is what is

the state of the poor fellows. I feel sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, before we come to item 8 (2)...

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: What happened to Bhoothalingam Committee Report?

MR. SPEAKER: I am coming to that.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: You must give your ruling.
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No written notice has been given. I am not allowing Mr. Minister.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: Let the Minister make a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, are you withdrawing,...

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: Otherwise, we will withdraw from the House. (Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: Do not record.
(Interruptions)**

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I am on a point of order. The position has got to be clarified. Here the Government is seeking to lay a paper on the Table of the House. I was looking through the rules. The Government cannot demand as a matter of right to lay the paper on the Table of the House. You find that there is objection from different quarters in the House for laying the paper on the Table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the rule on which you are relying?
(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Rules 368 and 369 and all that. There is no other rule. (Interruptions) What I am submitting is...

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: Let him say categorically. An assurance was given that they will not

**Not recorded.

[Shri Dinen Bhattacharya]

accept the Bhoothalingam Committee Report.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: The question is whether the Government can demand as a matter of right to lay the paper on the Table of the House in the teeth of opposition from the House. Large sections of the House are expressing their opposition to the laying of the paper on the Table of the House. How this matter has to be resolved is the question. You have got a right to decide whether it can be permitted to be placed on the Table of the House. The House can decide whether it must be permitted to be placed on the Table of the House. You find a particular situation in which a very substantial section, including I am sure a large number of members from the ruling benches also, are objecting to the Bhoothalingam Report and to the vitiation of the Table of the House by this nauseating document. As against this, the question I am raising is, whether you would over-rule all these objections and permit him to lay it on the Table of the House. We have got to devise another machinery. The machinery is the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table. The jurisdiction of this committee is not completely defined. Delays can be considered. Objections raised can be considered. In the light of the objections raised, under rule 368, 369 and so on, you have got the discretion unless the House demands it. That is what Kaul and Shakhder says, namely permission is not granted when the document is in the nature of a private correspondence or there is no demand from the House for the document to be placed on the Table or there is objection to its being placed. You can over-rule the objection, but kindly take note of the fact that there is substantial objection and the objection may not be over-ruled. If you feel that the minister must not be ruled out, the paper can be referred to the committee to consider. For

heaven's sake, do not allow this paper to be tabled.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: May I move a motion that the House withhold its consent to the laying of this document under reference on the Table of the House? I move the motion formally. Let it be put before the House.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Rule 368 says:

"If a minister quotes in the House a despatch or other State paper which has not been presented to the House, he shall lay the relevant paper on the Table"

That is not applicable.

"Provided that this rule shall not apply to any documents which are stated by the Minister to be of such a nature that their production would be inconsistent with public interest"

This also does not apply. Therefore, under what rule is he laying it?

MR. SPEAKER: Rule 369.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Rule 369 says:

"A paper or document to be laid on the Table shall be duly authenticated by the member presenting it."

This is only about the method.

"All papers and documents laid on the Table shall be considered public."

Therefore, there is no rule under which just by mentioning that he is laying it on the Table of the House, he gets a right to lay it on the Table of the House, unless there is a specific rule which enables him to do so. Unless it falls within rule 368 how can he insist on saying "I want to place this document on the Table of the House"? Otherwise, there has to be a demand from the House. There is no demand for this particular document. So, this discredited document, which is not even worth the paper on which it is typed or printed and which deserves to be thrown into the waste

[Shri Vasant Sathe]
paper basket, should not be placed on Table of the House in the teeth of opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Finance Minister.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have moved a motion.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: What about Mr. Bosu's motion?

MR. SPEAKER: First of all, I have to consider the limitations under which a paper is to be laid and the effect of the papers laid. Resolution will come in only if it is of a binding nature.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Motion, not resolution.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI H. M. PATEL): Sir, a little while earlier, the hon. Members and the Leader of the Opposition talked to us about democracy and freedom of discussion and freedom of speech. Here is a paper, a report prepared by a study group, which is placed on the Table of the House for discussion and this is a paper... (Interruptions). It may befit you to speak in these terms. You do not wish to discuss any idea freely and democratically. This is why you condemn a document before it is laid.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He did not obstruct you from speaking. Why don't you allow him to speak?

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Here is a Report which has not yet been considered by the Government.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Then why is it placed?

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Papers are laid on the Table of the House in order that Members of this House have an opportunity of studying them, looking at them and then discussing them. Whether you consider it worth the paper it is written on, that happens

to be your opinion, but in a democracy...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot really understand. You don't allow the other people to make a statement even? (Interruptions) Mr. Bhattacharya, he has as much right as you have got. You may be right or he may be right, I do not know.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: The Minister can make a statement, but not a misstatement.

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. M. PATEL: You may make any criticism about this Report you like. Whatever language you like to use about it, you can use. But when I point out to you that here is a document which any democratic form of Government... (Interruptions). There is nothing to prevent you from rejecting it. But it is interruptions). There is nothing to prevent you from rejecting it. But it is the convention of this House... (Interruptions). Indeed the House has always demanded that any Report shall be placed on the Table of the House. (Interruptions). But at least I had hoped that you would be sufficiently democratic, sufficiently desirous... (Interruptions). But democracy means the right to listen to any opinion, not only the one that you like. (Interruptions). How intolerant you are? You are not capable of discussing any idea.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, I have got a point of order. My point of order is, we never made any allegation against the Minister or the Government. We only criticised the Bhoothalingam Committee Report. But here the Minister makes an allegation against the Opposition. It is very very unfair and he should not make any such allegation against the Opposition.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Everybody should be given the opportunity of discussing. Let there be a proper, free and fair discussion, not in this

way saying: "You throw it into the waste paper basket."

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Before you give your final ruling, I am raising one more point of order. There are some conventions with respect to the laying of papers on the Table. Statutory rules and notifications must be laid. Certain things which are stipulated under the law, governing the country, must be placed. The report of a Committee appointed by this House, i.e., with which this House is connected, has got to be placed on the Table of the House. Not anything that the Government thinks. If you have got the rule, your Secretariat examines as to the statutory validity of the report, the statutory conformity of the reports. It is with them that we are concerned. This does not come under any of these things at all. This House is not connected with the Bhoothalingam Committee at all. Therefore, we are not interested in the report. It is a study group. This House is not concerned; and its report should not be placed on the Table of the House. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot accept an oral motion.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrackpore): This report has been made public even before the Minister has laid on the Table of the House. There has been a national debate on this; and the trade unions have rejected it. And the Janata trade unions... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Is it a point of order?

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Under rule 226, the Labour Minister had called a meeting of all the Central trade unions. There, the Government had given an assurance that before discussing it...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Saugata Roy, I have also got something to say.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Please listen to me for one minute, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Everybody has a right to say; and you should listen. Why are you taking the monopoly?

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: It is not a question like the Shah Commission's report, which was made public only on the day it was laid on the Table of the House. This is a report made by a committee which was appointed by an order of the Ministry of Finance, Bureau of Public Enterprises. There is nothing so very sacrosanct about the report, that it has to be laid on the Table of the House. On the other hand, you take into account the objections of large sections of the Members of this House and the working class of this country who have thoroughly rejected this report. Please don't force us into a situation where we have to throw this into a waste-paper basket before your own eyes. (Interruptions).

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry): After all, this august House is the highest forum reflecting the opinion of the people of this country. Many would like to know how many Members from the other side are for it. Suppose you allow this to be laid on the Table. (Interruptions). I think before this is laid on the Table... (Interruptions) you can take a decision now... I will not go into the procedure. I am also not raising a point of order. An Assembly in this country has passed a resolution rejecting it. Everywhere, all the trade unions have stated that it should not be accepted. It is now time for you to take a decision and ask the Minister at least to defer it. He can lay it afterwards; not to-day. Let him defer it.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): It was not started on any resolution of this House. They don't bring all those reports—i.e., of all those committees or study groups appointed by Government—before the Parliament. In view of the unan-

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

mous decision of the working class in this country to reject it, and of the solemn assurance given by the Government not to implement it—not even to look at it; forget about implementing it—why should Government utilize this House for the purpose of laying it on the Table of the House and making it public? If they want to make it available for public consumption and education, they can easily make it available to the public through Government agencies. Why this recourse to the House; why should the precincts of the House be used, to place this document which has been unaimously rejected by the country? We request the Government not to do it. Unnecessarily it will create a feeling in the country that the Government is out to implement it, before even discussing or having any negotiation on it. Therefore, in all fairness, this report should not be placed here; and there is no compulsion, either under any statute or any rules of this House, to place it on the Table of the House.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES): Sir, it is not for me to intervene in the discussion which is going on about the papers to be Laid on the Table. The Rules are there and you will take a decision on the basis of the Rules.

There is only one point that I would like to make. It has been repeatedly stated, from at least some sides of the Opposition, that the working class movement in this country has unanimously rejected this Report.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is correct.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This is disputed. I do not personally believe that the other side of the House... (Interruptions) Yes, it is disputed for the reason... (Interruptions) I am not yielding to anyone. It is disputed because there are trade union organisations in this country

which have written to the Government that they would like to discuss this Report. For anyone, therefore, to claim a monopoly of representing the working class is a position that is not acceptable to some of us... (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: Which are those organisations?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: At the appropriate time it will be mentioned. Some organisations have written to us... (Interruptions) I am disputing the view of the opposition that the working class has unanimously rejected this... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am asking both sides: are you adding dignity to the House? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I think we have had enough discussion. I have heard all of you.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: The merits have not been discussed.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: The reason is that statements have been made which cannot be allowed to go uncontroverted.

The other point, particularly by Shri Dinen Bhattacharya, was that when there were talks and settlement about the 26th June threatened strike, one of the issues which was discussed was the Boothalingam Study Group Report... (Interruptions) That was the charge made by Shri Dinen Bhattacharya.

SHRIMATI AHILYA P. RANGNEKAR (Bombay North-Central): No it was made clear by Mr. Ramamurthi.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You were so excited that you did not hear your own party comrade. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: How does it all arise?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Shri Dinen Bhattacharya said that this was

one of the issues discussed on the threatened 26th June strike. My submission is that it was stated emphatically by the trade unions that the 26th June strike had nothing to do with the Study Group's report. That was made very clear and it was said at that time on the side of the Government also...

MR. SPEAKER: How is that relevant?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: For the simple reason that a statement has been made and my name has been taken, and I cannot allow it to go uncontradicted.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: Mr. Speaker, I must appeal to you to ask the Minister not to mislead the House. What was the reason behind the strike?

MR. SPEAKER: Wholly irrelevant questions are being debated.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: I want to put the record straight. Firstly, I want to know whether the voice of the Minister or the voice of the Opposition was being applauded by members on the other side.

As far as the 26th June discussion goes, the point is that after the agreement of that date, certain agreements have been signed in his own Ministry, in the BHEL, which go beyond and ignoring the Boothalingam Committee Report, because at that time it was made clear by the trade unions...

MR. SPEAKER: Now is all this relevant?

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: Trade Unions made it clear that the Boothalingam Report did not meet with the demands of the workers. (Interruptions) We cannot allow this report to be placed on the Table of the House.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): On a point of order. The question before the House is whether a Minister can lay a report on

the Table of the House or not. That is the limited question. Whether that report is good or bad can be discussed when it comes before the House. Now, under the rules any document which the Government wants to lay on the Table of the House cannot be stopped by anybody.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: It can be stopped, we can vote it down.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I am quoting from Kaul and Shakdher, page 831:

"There is nothing in the Constitution or the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House, or in the Evidence Act which prohibits the Government from laying a paper or document on the Table including a plain written statement, affidavit, petition submitted before a court of law. However, if a Minister declines to lay it on the ground that its production would be inconsistent with public interest the Speaker cannot compel the Minister to lay it on the Table."

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: It is otherwise. If the Minister wants to lay a particular document on the Table of the House, there is no rule which prohibits him from laying it. My submission to you is that you ask the Minister to lay it on the Table of the House. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER: For every single point, there are at least 20 points of order. Everybody wants to speak.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Some of us have not read the report. We have read the press report. We have our own views. But judging from the discussion and the kind of opposition that is shown to the report, may I suggest that Government may defer this matter for a day or two so that they can have some time to think over it and come again with a view to having what the Finance Minister says "a democratic

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

discussion?" Why are they in a hurry? We are few on this side. But most of these few are unanimous on this. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to delay this matter for a day or two. Let them think over it and reject the report and then lay it before the House.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE):

Without creating any excitement I want to make a submission regarding laying of the paper on the Table of the House. As far as the Government's position is concerned, Government has made it categorically clear to the press that as far as the study report is concerned, we would like to contact and have discussion with various interests including the trade union organisations, the All-India trade union organisations, functional organisations, various organisations of the peasants, organisations of the landless, men of industry, economists with everyone discussion will take place. Government is also conscious of the fact that certain sections of the trade unions have also vigorously expressed their opposition. It is also a fact that in this very report, there are many aspects which are not acceptable to the trade unions. Take a concrete case of the Railways. In this Report, it has been mentioned that the workers should be put on par with the public sector.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: How can he go into the contents of the Report? We do not want to go into the contents.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You have put forward it slightly; therefore, I desire that the Government will take due cognisance of the sentiments of every section including the trade union sections and on the basis of that a final decision will be taken. Government has briefed the press and told categorically that this report has only been taken up by the Cabinet but various sections including the

trade unions are going to be consulted. It is only a technical laying of the report on the Table. Therefore, there should not be any controversy about it.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: We want to know whether they are going to lay it or not.

MR. SPEAKER: It is for me to decide. I heard each one of you patiently. Government wants to lay a copy of the Report of the Study Group on Wages, Incomes and Prices. This is objected to by several Members of the House on the ground that the Report is against the interests of the labour. Some Members of Parliament might have read the Report; others might not have read the Report. The contents of the Report are not under discussion at present. All that the Government seeks to do is to place the Report on the Table of the House so that at an appropriate stage, discussion might be there on the Report.

The laying of the Report on the Table of the House does not mean either the House has accepted the Report or even the Government has accepted the Report. The matter is only for consideration.

The question whether the Government has an absolute right of laying any paper on the Table of the House has been gone into by my predecessor on 5th May, 1968. Overruling the contention of Mr. Madhu Limaye, the Speaker ruled at that time that the Government have an unlimited right in the matter of laying document/paper on the Table of the House; they can do so of their own accord. It has been the usual practice in the parliament not to take objection to laying any paper on the Table of the House. About the merits of the document, it will be certainly considered at an appropriate stage. The Government has a right to lay it on the Table of the House.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): We have got an objection to this...

(Interruptions) I want to place on record two things. Firstly, we do not agree that they have got a right and, secondly, our objection is to the vitiation of the Table of the House by a report against which the working class people of this country have taken a unanimous objection. It is unfortunate that the objection raised by us has been overruled. We do not want to be a party to this wilful action of the Government in laying the Report on the Table of the House. In protest, the Opposition walks out of the House.

15.37 hrs.

Shri C. M. Stephen and some other Hon. Members then left the House

NOTIFICATION UNDER GENERAL INSURANCE BUSINESS (NATIONALISATION) ACT, 1972, REPORT OF STUDY GROUP ON WAGES, INCOMES AND PRICES, NOTIFICATIONS UNDER CUSTOMS ACT, 1962, ETC., ETC.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ZULFIQUARULLAH): I beg to lay on the Table:—

(1) A copy of Notification No. S.O. 1586 (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 3rd June, 1978 making certain amendments to Notification No. S.O. 771(E) dated the 29th December, 1972, under sub-section (3) of section 39 of the General Insurance Business (Nationalisation) Act, 1972. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2365/78]

(2) (i) A copy of the Report of the Study Group on Wages, incomes and Prices.

(ii) A statement (Hindi and English versions) explaining reasons for not laying simultaneously the Hindi versions of the Report. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2366/78].

(3) A copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and Eng-

lish versions) under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:—

(i) G.S.R. 275(E) to 281(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 12th May, 1978 together with an explanatory memorandum.

(ii) The Baggage Rules 1978, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 290(E) in Gazette of India dated the 16th May, 1976.

(iii) The Tourist Baggage Rules, 1978, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 291(E) in Gazette of India dated the 16th May, 1978.

(iv) The Transfer of Residence Rules, 1978, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 292(E) in Gazette of India dated the 16th May, 1978.

(v) G.S.R. 293(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 16th May, 1978.

(vi) G.S.R. 294(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 16th May, 1978.

(vii) G.S.R. 295(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 16th May, 1978.

(viii) G.S.R. 297(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 19th May, 1978, together with an explanatory memorandum.

(ix) G.S.R. 301(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 24th May, 1978 together with an explanatory memorandum.

(x) G.S.R. 302(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 25th May, 1978 together with an explanatory memorandum.

(xi) G.S.R. 764 and 765 published in Gazette of India dated the 17th June, 1978 together with an explanatory memorandum.

(xii) G.S.R. 330(E) and 331(E) published in Gazette of India dated the 21st June, 1978