

16.47 hrs.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

[English]

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Hon. Members would recall that this morning a demand was made in the House for having a discussion on the atrocities on Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the Speaker had observed that he would fix a date and time for discussion in consultation with Leaders of Parties and Groups. Accordingly, the Speaker had a meeting with the Leaders of Parties and Groups and it has been agreed that a motion under Rule 184 might be taken up for discussion in the House on Tuesday, the 13th August, 1991 after Question Hour and the election of the Deputy Speaker.

The following motion which has already been admitted for discussion in the names of Sarvashri Ram Vilas Paswan and Ramashray Prasad Singh would be put down in the List of Business for tomorrow, the 13th August, 1991:-

"That this House do express its concern over the atrocities being committed on the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and other weaker sections of the society in the country and urge upon the Government to take early necessary steps to prevent their recurrence."

16.49 hrs.

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE. DISAPPROVAL OF CONSUMER PROTECTION (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL**

**As Passed by Rajya Sabha**

[English]

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Now we shall take up

items No. 8 and 9 together Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava.

[Translation]

**SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA:** (Jaipur): I beg to move:

That this House disapproves of the Consumer Protection (Amendment) Ordinance, 1991 (Ordinance No. 6 of 1991) promulgated by the President on the 15th June, 1991".

Madam, I have moved a Resolution seeking disapproval of Consumer Protection (Amendment) Bill which has been introduced to replace the ordinance promulgated by the President. I have to say that even though Consumer Protection Act was enacted after four years, but it has not made any mark in the field of consumer protection. The expectations of the Government from this piece of legislation have not been fulfilled. I would like to submit that under this Act about 755 consumer courts were to be set up, but these could be set up at 40 places only during the last two years.

Madam Chairman, the matter was referred to the Supreme Court which passed an order that Consumer Courts should be set up everywhere within six weeks, but in spite of Supreme Courts' Order, Consumer Courts have been set up only in half of the total districts. The Government had asked for a report from the State Governments and Justice EB Eradi was to submit the report about it. But the State Governments instead of considering it their responsibility handed over the work to district judges. The judges were already under heavy pressure of work and therefore, they could not do much in this direction. As a result, these provisions under the Consumer Bill remained merely a formality. The State Governments set up a consumer court at the Divisional Commissioner's level and they catered to the needs of 5 to 6 districts. The civil judges and the District judges were already overburdened with work and they were handed over additional work for 5 or 6 districts. Consequently,