

planning. The tax-payer is paying Rs. 80 crores every year through the nose. We want to know what is going to be done to improve this state of affairs.

SHRI P. RAMACHANDRAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have already explained that we are looking into the price structure. The new committee has made certain recommendations and the same are being examined and as soon as a decision is taken, I will come before the House.

Sir, I want to make one point clear with regard to the quality of coal. Most of the complaints about quality of coal are from brick kiln owners, foundries and domestic users. What happens is in respect of the coal used by these lower priority sectors the middleman buys the coal at the statutory price from the pit-head. Unless the State Government stipulates certain conditions there is no restriction on the price of coal in the State. Here what happens is some quality coal is purchased by the middleman and also some slack coal or middlings which are of low quality are bought simultaneously from washeries. At the consumer end they are selling to the foundries and brick-kilns a mixture of these two. At the pitheads quality is regulated and anybody can go and buy a particular quality of coal. So, there is no question of poor quality of coal being available. As regards the other problems, I have already explained that all steps are being taken to meet the demand in the country.

16.24 hrs.

RESIGNATION BY MEMBERS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that on 29 June, 1978 the Speaker received a letter from Shri D. B. Chandra Gowda, an elected Member from Chikmagalur constituency of Karnataka, resigning his seat in Lok Sabha. The Speaker

has accepted his resignation with effect from 29 June, 1978.

I have also to inform the House that on 10 July, 1978 the Lok Sabha Secretariat received letters from Shri M. M. Hashim and Shri G. Venkateswamy, elected Members from Secunderabad and Iddipet constituencies respectively of Andhra Pradesh, resigning their seats in Lok Sabha. The Speaker has accepted their resignations with effect from 13 July, 1978.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Sir, under direction. . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It has not been accepted. Please allow Dr. Nayar to move a motion regarding Report of Joint Committee—Extension of Time.

MENTAL HEALTH BILL

Extension of time for presentation of Report of Joint Committee

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR (Jhansi): I beg to move:

“That this House do extend upto the last day of the first week of the next Session, the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the treatment and care of mentally ill persons, to make better provision with respect to their property and affairs and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto”.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

“That this House do extend upto the last day of the first week of the next Session, the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the treatment and care of mentally ill persons, to make better provision with respect to their property and affairs and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto”.

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, under rule 377—Mr. Ram Sewak Hazari.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, I have a point of order. Kindly see the Direction No. 2.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is the point?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The point is after Calling Attention, the priority is given to move a motion for adjournment of the business of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That has not been accepted.

16.27 hrs.

RE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): I had given an adjournment motion notice and the Speaker in the morning had conveyed to me that I should give him the newspaper cutting in which the specific allegation or charge by the ex-Home Minister was made, which I have given to him. I have got a copy of it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: After having seen it, the Speaker has decided that it is not admissible.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, you know the rules. You must explain it to me. This is a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has not accepted it.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: This is irregular. Either you say that the Speaker.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have no jurisdiction in allowing or disallowing it. He has disallowed it and that is the end of the matter.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It cannot be the end of the matter.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Speaker has not given his consent. (Interruptions)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: But the rules also provide.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please take your seat now. I have already told you the position with regard to the adjournment motion and that is the end of the matter.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I have a point of order. Please listen to my point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have listened to your point of order.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: As long as I have a point of order, you have to listen to it. Kindly see the proviso to rule No. 60.

“Provided that where the Speaker has refused his consent under rule 56 or is of opinion that the matter proposed to be discussed is not in order, he may, if he thinks it necessary, read the notice of motion and state the reasons for refusing consent or holding the motion as being not in order”.

Having said that he must say..... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has not thought it necessary. Mr. Sathe please take your seat now. I have already told you that the Speaker has gone through your motion and also seen the newspaper cutting that you have given and he has come to the conclusion that it is inadmissible and he does not think it necessary to read it out. I am not going to give you all the relevant discussions inside the Chamber for your benefit. But it has been decided that it need not be mentioned.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: This is arbitrary. (Interruptions)