

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: (Hoshangabad): Sir, on a point of clarification. I have been noting with some concern, that you dispose of this item in a jiffy. I think you should devote some more time to it. It is not just a routine innocuous thing, as it may appear to be and as you may imagine it to be.

Now, in item 4, under sub-item (1), only "A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi version)" has been laid. Please turn over to the next page and see the same item. Under sub-items (iv) (a) and (iv) (b) of sub-item (2), the papers are both in Hindi and English versions.

The House is aware and you are even more aware—that Hindi and English are both official languages of the Union Government. Now in every case where either the Hindi or the English version is not laid, there is always a footnote giving the reasons, or an explanatory note for not laying the Hindi or English version. In this case, there is no such note at all, as to why the English version has not been laid. I am a linguophile, and not a linguophobe or linguo-maniac. I love all languages. (*Interruptions*). The reasons for not laying the English version in this case should have been given in an explanatory note, as is usually done in such cases.

Secondly, I invite your attention to sub-item (2), sub-sub-items (v)(a) and (v)(b). They refer to the year 1970-71. I wonder how long the present government will continue to hold the babies, the ugly ducklings of the previous government. I do not know why they should go on wasting time on the 1970-71 reports.

It is rather strange. The item reads :

"Review by the Government on the working of the Orissa Agro-Industries Corporation Limited, Cuttack, for the year 1970-71."

The next related item is:

"Annual Report of the Orissa Agro-Industries Corporation Limited, Cuttack, for the year 1970-71, along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon."

I do not know why an old report of 1970-71 has fallen to this Government's lot to lay on the Table. What did the old Government do all these six years? Were they sleeping, somnolent or comatose? What were they doing? These things are happening, and it is being taken as if it is routine. No, Sir, it is not routine at all. Sir, your predecessors, Shri Mavalankar, and others, used to give 5 or 10 minutes for this item of laying papers on the Table.

would request you to give some time every day, if any member wants to make a plea or a submission. This question of the English version not being laid on the Table is rather important.

MR. SPEAKER : I have been noticing it for some time—only one version being placed on the Table. It is not something new today. I was under the impression that the other versions has been placed earlier. I do not know whether I am right or wrong, but that is how I understood it.

So far as item No. 1 is concerned, if the earlier Government has not placed it before the House, we cannot help it. They have to place it before the House, however late it may be.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: What about the English version?

MR. SPEAKER : If it has not been already laid on the Table, I shall see that it is laid on the Table.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon) : What about this delay?

MR. SPEAKER : They cannot answer for that. Somebody has not done it. They are now doing it.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: The subordinate Legislation Committees has brought it to the notice of the Speaker, and the Speaker has given a specific directive that it should not be delayed for more than six months.

PROF. P.G. MAVALANKAR : (Gandhinagar): There is a special Committee on this subject, as you know. I think this matter should be referred to that Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, it should be referred.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): There are five erstwhile Ministers sitting here.

MR. SPEAKER : No, I cannot ask them to answer it. I am sorry.

SHRI SURJIT SINGH BARNALA : The English version of the report has already been laid.

MR. SPEAKER : Office must mention it. It must be mentioned in a foot-note.