

[Shri A. C. George]

that has to be taken up is this. The resignation of Mr. Charan Singh is not in the ordinary course of events. This is not a voluntary resignation.

MR. SPEAKER: Which is the rule that is breached? Please tell me.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: Rule 199.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing any further discussion. How many times am I to hear you? Mr. Stephen has raised the question that the word 'may' in 199 must be read as 'shall'. Under certain circumstances, the word 'may' may have to be read as 'shall'. But, so far as the rule is concerned, it has already been interpreted by the previous Speaker, the word 'may' shall not be read as 'shall'. Therefore, I cannot permit any debate on this matter; nor am I compelling the Ministers to make a statement. It is open to the Ministers either to make a statement or not to make a statement.

Now, papers to be laid on the Table.
Shri Sikandar Bakht.

14.45 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

URBAN LAND (CEILING AND REGULATION) 5TH AUDIT RULES, 1978 AND NOTIFICATION UNDER URBAN LAND (CEILING AND REGULATION) ACT

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table:—

(1) A copy of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Fifth Amendment Rules, 1978 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 840 in Gazette of India dated the 24 June, 1978, under sub-section (3) of section 46 of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976, together with an explanatory memorandum. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2359/78]

(2) A copy of Notification No. S.O. 1808 (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 24th June, 1978, issued under section 2 of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976 together with an explanatory memorandum. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2360/78].

AUDIT REPORT ON ACCOUNTS OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING, NEW DELHI FOR 1976-77

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Audit Report (Hindi@ version) on the accounts of the National Council of Educational Research and Training New Delhi, for the year 1976-77. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2361.]

CORRECTION OF INFORMATION GIVEN ON 8-5-78 RE. PURCHASE OF SHARES BY LIC.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI H. M. PATEL): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table: a statement (Hindi and English versions) correcting certain information regarding purchase of shares by Life Insurance Corporation which was given by him on the 8th May, 1978 in response to Calling Attention regarding large-scale purchases of shares of some leading business houses, including the Birlas, by the Life Insurance Corporation, General Insurance Corporation and Unit Trust of India. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2362/78]

DELHI POLICE ORDINANCE, 1978

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Delhi Police Ordinance, 1978 (No.

@English version of the Audit Report was laid on the Table on the 8th May, 1978.

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