

[Secretary]

Provisions Bill, 1955, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 1st December, 1955."

WORKING JOURNALISTS (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS BILL

Secretary: Sir, I lay the Working Journalists (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Bill, 1955, as passed by Rajya Sabha, on the Table of the House.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE NOTIFICATIONS UNDER ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES ACT

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture containing certain Orders, under subsection (6) of Section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955:

- (1) Notification No. S.R.O. 2264, dated the 15th October, 1955.
- (2) Notification No. S.R.O. 2210, dated the 8th October, 1955.
- (3) Notification No. S.R.O. 2154, dated the 1st October, 1955.
- (4) Notification No. S.R.O. 1792, dated the 20th August, 1955.
- (5) Notification No. S.R.O. 1793, dated the 20th August, 1955.
- (6) Notification No. S.R.O. 1450, dated the 9th July, 1955.
- (7) Notification No. S.R.O. 1396, dated the 2nd July, 1955.
- (8) Notification No. S.R.O. 3405, dated the 5th November, 1955.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-434/55]

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THIRTIETH REPORT

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): I beg to present the Thirtieth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

TWENTY-NINTH REPORT

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-ninth Report of the Business Advisory Committee subject to the modification that 7 hours instead of 5 hours be allotted to the Insurance (Amendment) Bill as recommended by the Business Advisory Committee in their Thirtieth Report presented in the House today."

Mr. Speaker: Yesterday the Business Advisory Committee considered the question of the time to be allotted to the Bill that is at present under the discussion of the House, namely, the Bill to amend the Insurance Act, 1938. The consideration motion was being discussed and the Business Advisory Committee thought that there should be an amendment in its recommendation and that 2 hours more should be allotted for this discussion. The motion will, therefore, be slightly amended. I shall place it before the House.

Motion moved:

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-ninth Report of the Business Advisory Committee subject to the modification that 7 hours instead of 5 hours be allotted to the Insurance (Amendment) Bill as recommended by the Business Advisory Committee in their Thirtieth Report presented in the House to-day."

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): I would like to invite your attention to two matters arising out of this Report. I shall refer first to the fifth para. It is an of-told tale that there is shortage of time during a session. I remember before I returned to this Parliament to have read in the papers that you, in your wisdom, had decided that Parliament should sit at least for 7 months in the year to transact its business efficiently. So far as I can see, this year Parliament has met only for about 6 months. I think the Press reported your decision last year that Parliament should sit at least for 7

months. At present, business is brought on the agenda; then it is deleted, and fresh business is brought on the agenda. We do not know what will happen to that also. The Preventive Detention Act item has been on the agenda since the beginning of this session practically and now it is sought to be deleted. What is the reason? It is shortage of time. The last para opens with shortage of time. We are faced with so many shortages and the shortage of time is the biggest shortage. I would request you earnestly to give some consideration to this matter whether Parliament should sit for 6 months or 7 or longer to transact its business efficiently and well, and not postpone business every session due to shortage of time.

The second point is, before you vacate the Chair for the day, I might invite your attention to a Bill which stands on today's Order Paper, that is, Prevention of Disqualification amendment Bill. As regards that, I would like to request you kindly to see that this Bill is sought to be discussed in the House without a copy of the report of the Committee of Parliament. A Parliamentary Committee went in to the whole of this affair and has reported. That is what we are told. That report has not been made available in the Library even for reference. Without that report, this Bill has been forced upon us and is sought to be rushed. We do not know what the report is, the Parliamentary Committee has been appointed by you. Indirectly I suppose the rights and privileges of the House are affected. It is a Parliamentary Committee, but without its report being brought before us even for reference, this Bill has been brought on the agenda paper. I must very very strongly protest against this procedure being adopted, that this Committee's report is being withheld and yet the Bill is sought to be rushed. I would request you to consider this matter that I have raised and give such ruling as you think proper.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): May I make a submission? It has been

decided by the Business Advisory Committee to extend the period for the discussion of the Insurance Amendment Bill to 7 hours. Yesterday, one of the hon. Members took as much as about 110 minutes at the consideration stage and his speech has opened out avenues of discussion far beyond the scope of the Bill. At the same time, it is very essential that it should be discussed—I hold no brief for any capitalist or anything like that—because it becomes very necessary that protection must be granted that the affairs of people in their private life are not to be talked in this House and this House is not to be used for the purpose of raising a debate on that. My submission is that Members should be allowed to have full say over this affair and 7 hours will not be sufficient time, since these 7 hours include not only discussion of the consideration motion, but also discussion clause by clause. I therefore pray that this matter may be considered and time may be extended.

Mr. Speaker: I have not taken notes of the various points raised by the hon. Member Shri Kamath; but I shall try. I think he took three points.

Shri Kamath: Only 2.

Mr. Speaker: Only two; one less. At the outset, I must express and I hope the hon. Member Shri Kamath will not take it in a wrong light, that it is no use attributing motives and using strong language in respect of opinions expressed or decision come to.

Shri Kamath: About what?

Mr. Speaker: He will read what he said and he will find. Let us say absolutely in a moderate manner and place our view points.

Shri Kamath: I do not recollect.

Mr. Speaker: As regards his first point that I have ruled—that is what he said—that Parliament should sit for 7 months in a year.

Shri Kamath: That is my information.

Mr. Speaker: He may better hear rather than pass running comments or replies. The difficulty then is that he misses certain points in what I am saying.

Shri Kamath: You said that I imputed motives. I did not raise such a point at all. Perhaps, you have confused....

Mr. Speaker: He confuses because he goes on talking, because he does not hear. Let him hear.

Shri Kamath: All right; I will hear.

Mr. Speaker: Then, of course, we will see: not that I will give him a chance to speak again on this point.

I have never ruled anywhere in the House. In the course of discussions or even sometimes expressing in the House the desirability of sitting for longer hours or for restricting remarks only to the relevant points or important points, I might have said, and I think, I did say that to my mind looking to the business coming before the House and the rush of business,—from the point of view of individual Members this Bill is important or that Bill is important; the sum total is, everything is important—we cannot dispose of all important things at the same time and we must arrange priorities looking to the entire volume of business. The difficulty really is that while individual Members take an individual view of a measure, the Chair has to take an overall picture of the whole thing and adjust. I do feel even today that the House may have to sit longer. It may be 7 months, it may be 8 months. All along, one has to bear in mind that some time in the year has to be left for the purpose of giving the Members sufficient rest to recoup themselves from the exhausting work and come to the House again with a fresher mind. That is one thing. They must also have an opportunity of contacting their constituencies and going round. That means, you must have time between two sessions. I do not know when the Government are calling the next session. Looking to the recommendations made by the General Purposes Committee, they

had suggested that the first session should be the Budget session, lasting about 3 or 3½ months. Then, the next session may be for about 1½ or 2 months, some time in July or August and ending in September. The third session may be for about a month and a week, but must end with Christmas, so that a sufficient time of a month and a week or two is left to the Members to contact their constituencies, to recoup study and all that. That is why a division is made roughly speaking.

But, these dates cannot be fixed dates. They change from time to time. They change according to the Indian calendar that we follow. Deepavali does not come on a fixed date. Deepavali and Pooja holidays change from year to year according to the calendar. There are many other things which come in the way of sticking to an exact programme. This time it was decided that the 23rd of this month is the last date. Necessarily it follows that only such business as can be put through up to the 23rd has to be taken. That does not mean there are no other important measures. There is no desire to shunt anything. If it is possible by any miracle to put through all pending Bills within 1 hour, I am prepared. I am prepared even to accept one second for that: why even one hour? That cannot be done. Therefore, it necessarily follows that priorities have to be settled. Certain important things which must be put through according to the Government and according to the opinion of the Members have to be taken up first and others have to be shunted off. That is my reply to the first question. There is no sanctity in 7 months or 8 months or 6 months. Nothing of the kind. There is no decision of that type. Even what I express today is an expression of my opinion and not a ruling.

Now, I refer to the other point, that is....

Shri Kamath: Consideration of the Bill without even the report of the Parliamentary Committee being before the House.

Mr. Speaker: As regards that, perhaps the hon. Member was either present in the House and was not attending or was not present in the House when the time allotment was read in the House. When half an hour's time was given as the decision of the Business Advisory Committee, I stated to the House clearly that the present Bill is nothing more than a continuance Bill; a mere continuation of the law as it stands. On merits, the report has nothing at present to do with the Bill before the House. But, why is the law being continued? Then, I stated that the question was gone into by a Committee of this House. They have collected a lot of information and they have submitted a report and that too recently. That report has to be studied and considered and in the light of that report the Government will frame a new Bill which will be coming before the House in due course. The new Bill will take some time and therefore it has become necessary to extend the life of the present Act. That is the position. Now, the report may surely be made available at the time the new Bill comes,—I have no doubt on that point. It could have been better if the report could be supplied, but that is not possible, because it will require a number of arrangements for printing and all that kind of thing. Insistence on having the report today will only satisfy the Members about the decision of the Business Advisory Committee as to how far it was justified in allowing continuance of the present Bill, but that is a matter not for the Business Advisory Committee but for the Government, and Government has to be given time to consider the report. I think the report was presented only last month.

Shri Kamath: By your leave I want to know why they want to continue it for two years. That is the point.

Mr. Speaker: Let us take it that the material collected is vast. If he has grievance on the point of two years' extension, he may raise it when the Bill comes for consideration. This is

not the stage for raising that point of objection when the Report of the Business Advisory Committee is considered. I am happy that he has no quarrel with half an hour allotment and he is prepared to put through the Bill in that time. His quarrel is over something different, but that point may be taken up when the Bill comes up. It has no relevancy just now.

These are the two points. I think there is no third point left now.

Shri Kamath: If you will kindly permit me....

Mr. Speaker: Is there any point now?

Shri Kamath: For my own enlightenment, would you kindly let me see you later on?

Mr. Speaker: He can see me. He is welcome to see me at any time convenient to him and me, both.

Shri Kamath: Of course convenient to you.

Mr. Speaker: And not only he, but every Member of this House.

As regards the third point that was raised by Shri Trivedi, he is, I think, on his own statement, if I may use the expression, out of court. His pleading has been: "a lot of things beyond the scope of the Bill was spoken and therefore as they were allowed, I must allow a lot of other things beyond the scope of the Bill. Assuming a mistake was committed, the mistake should be repeated even today at the cost of Parliamentary time—that is the substance of, not what he said, but what it comes to. If, *ex hypothesi* a lot of things beyond the scope of the Bill was spoken, I should firmly say that they should not be allowed to be spoken today, so that the mistake of yesterday need not be repeated today, if at all there was a mistake.

Therefore, in view of the pressure of time the Business Advisory Committee thought it proper to allot two hours more, not with a view to give scope to all sorts of arguments beyond the scope of the Bill, but to

[Mr. Speaker]

make up for the time taken by one hon. Member in his speech, so that others may have an opportunity of speaking, and I trust they will be quite within the scope of the Bill and relevant.

I may make here one position clear. I have not yet read the speech of the hon. Member who is alleged to have made such a long speech, but it has appeared to me from what I heard that a number of things were brought in in discussing the whole business affair of one individual. To my mind the House is sitting for the purposes of deciding as to how far Government should be vested with certain powers. Some things could be referred to by way of illustration, but this is not an inquisition into the affairs or the business matters of one individual concerned, and I do not think Members are right in taking more time for again going into the issues and side issues of that question. Let me apply our mind only to the Bill, the provisions of the Bill, and I think in that light the Business Advisory Committee thought that the time of extension that they are allowing, or rather proposing would be sufficient. That is what I have to say with reference to the objection of Shri Trivedi.

Now, I was just putting the motion....

Shri Kamath: When shall we have from the Minister the order of priorities for the items that are included in the report?

Mr. Speaker: That he will get. He is now at least in possession of what will be taken up in the session. The actual priority will depend upon the time available from day to day. It may be that there may be a change, but I think we shall be able to give a list of priorities at least 24 hours before. I have said yesterday also, and I will repeat that, in case there is any un-

due want of proper notice, I shall consider the question of allowing amendments, by waiving notices in respect of those amendments.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): May I submit that just for the convenience of smaller parties it would be better, now that we know exactly the Bills that will come up before the House, if we could have the priorities so that it would save time and we know automatically when the next Bill comes.

Mr. Speaker: That at any rate cannot be done until tomorrow.

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-ninth Report of the Business Advisory Committee subject to the modification that 7 hours instead of 5 hours be allotted to the Insurance (Amendment) Bill as recommended by the Business Advisory Committee in their Thirtieth Report presented in the House to-day."

The motion was adopted.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri C. E. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): Two days ago I gave notice of a motion calling the attention of the Home Minister under rule 216, to the ravage and disaster caused by the cyclone in Madras. May I know when the subject will be taken up.

Mr. Speaker: I may assure the hon. Member that as soon as he gave the notice, it has been forwarded to the hon. Home Minister, and he will, I am sure, in a short time, make a statement. He may perhaps take more time for having complete information and the hon. Member will get more detailed information than what the hon. Minister has been able to give in the other House.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satyanarayan Sinha): by tomorrow, I think.