

12.34 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): Sir, I move the following:—

"That this House do agree with the Thirty-third Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 25th April, 1979."

MR. SPEAKER: A number of Members have expressed their desire for suggestions. I shall call one by one. Prof. Mavalankar.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the notice of the hon. House certain aspects of the matter arising out of this Report of the Business Advisory Committee. Sir, the House knows that we have now got only three weeks left, barring the current week, for the discussion of several important legislative matters and several major discussions about which my hon. friend, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has very graciously again and again given us an assurance that time will be found for these.

Now, my difficulty is that apart from this I consider the provision of three hours for the consideration of the amendment of the Rajya Sabha on special courts Bill inadequate and providing only four hours for the Constitution (Forty-ninth Amendment) Bill is also inadequate. Apart from that, my difficulty is that the reports about which we have been concerned, rather the discussion on the reports of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, for a number

of years, have not been discussed in this House at all.

They must be discussed annually. Otherwise, what is the point in having the annual reports? Similarly, I have, in my hands, a copy of the report of the University Grants Commission, for the year 1977-78. You know that the Ministry of Education's Grants this year were guillotined. Therefore, the Ministry of Education could not be discussed at all. There is now no other way in which the Ministry of Education can be discussed. If we cannot discuss the annual reports of the U.G.C.; if we cannot discuss the educational policy and affairs in this country, particularly, the state of affairs in higher education. What are we to do? Now, I would like the House to discuss in detail the affairs of the Jawaharlal Nehru University and many other universities. Therefore, my point is that the Minister should have found time—the Business Advisory Committee should have found time—for some of the important discussions at the earliest, since only three weeks are left as otherwise later on, you will say that there is no time. So, how long we will go on like this? It should be done on a priority basis. Therefore, next week he must come here for the proper time-table of discussion of these matters. Otherwise it would be difficult for us to pass this kind of report in this House.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली संघ) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो मंत्री महोदय ने बिजनेस ऐडवाइसरी कमेटी की रिक्वेस्टेशनस पेश की हैं, उसके अतिरिक्त दो, तीन बातें मैं कहना चाहता हूँ जो बहुत आवश्यक हैं। और मेरे ख्याल से सबसे आवश्यक और सबसे पहली चीज इनको करना चाहिये की वह स्पेशल कोर्ट्स बिल है जिसको इस सदन ने पास किया और राज्य सभा ने उसको नोट किया है कुछ संशोधनों के साथ। वह बहुत अर्जेंट है और उसके लिये भी कोई समय नहीं रहा है। इसको दिले करने से कोई क्रायदा नहीं होगा।

बुरी बात यह है कि जहाँ तक बरतें और हाउसिंग विविट्टी की गारंटी का सवाल है वह गिलीटिन हो गई है। और पिछले सेशन में भी आपने वायदा किया था कि दिल्ली की हाउसिंग प्रोब्लम पर शीट डिस्कस होना। लेकिन अभी तक उसके बारे में और दिल्ली की लाईव और प्रोब्लम के बारे में कोई डिस्कशन हुआ है।

It is the most acute problem in Delhi. If it is not solved, I am afraid, it will take a serious turn. May I request that the Minister must find out time for it particularly when there was a promise made to this effect in the last session.

Lastly, you must admit some sort of a discussion about the recent attack by the police in Southall on Asians and particularly on Indians. This is a very important matter and amounts to an insult to the whole Indian nation.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrack-pore): Sir, there are several things which are left out in the Thirty-third Report of the Business Advisory Committee. For the last two weeks we have been seeing in the newspapers the announcement by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting that the Bill to ensure autonomy to Akashvani and Doordarshan to make it Prasar Bharati will be brought into Parliament. Sir, we have serious misgivings about the working of All India Radio and Doordarshan. It is being made a tool of RSS propaganda. (Interruptions) Sir, I want this Prasar Bharati bill to give autonomy to AIR and Doordarshan be brought so as to stop immediately the RSS infiltration.

Secondly, Sir, there has been lot of discussion in this House and in the country over the foreign collaboration policy of the Janata government. In fact, the BHEL-Siemens deal has raised many an eye-brows. Number of MPs have submitted a memorandum to you asking for a discussion on the policy of foreign collaboration of this government. This BHEL-Siemens deal is a shoddy deal. We want the matter to be thrashed out in the

House, and, as such, there should be some scope of discussion for this BHEL-Siemens deal.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Then, Sir, we want a discussion regarding Science and Technology in this House. There is a complaint from all the scientists that science and technology is getting lower priority. Mr. Chavan has also written to you in this connection but you are not allowing any discussion on this important matter of self-reliance in science and technology.

Lastly, Sir, I want to point out how Janata Government is going back on its promise. When the Anti-Defection Bill was introduced it faced with tremendous opposition and Government withdrew it by saying that they will bring in a fresh legislation keeping in view the opinion of all the parties. But, so far the Anti-Defection Bill has not been brought in and this is a matter affecting the political health of the nation. So, I have drawn your attention to these matters of vital national importance including the Southall incident. These are being bypassed in the House and only routine government business is taking all the time of the House.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to emphasise upon the imperative need for priority to take up the Constitution Forty-Sixth Amendment Bill. The Bill seeks to give statutory and constitutional recognition the Minorities Commission and the Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. All the minorities, with one voice, are demanding that such a status should be given to them as early as possible.

The Minorities Commission has also expressed the desire that it should be given an autonomous, constitutional and statutory recognition at the earliest opportunity.

[Shri G. M. Banatwalla]

One ex-Chairman of the Commission has resigned on the issue that the Government was proceeding at a snail's pace in the matter.

The Bill was introduced on the 3rd August, 1978. My humble submission to the Government is that this Bill should be taken up at the earliest opportunity for discussion so that any apprehensions in people's minds of pressurising or interference in the working of the Minorities' Commission are avoided. They must get the necessary constitutional and statutory recognition. This is my first point.

My second point is this. The Minorities Commission has since long submitted its report on the Aligarh Communal Riots. We do not know the contents of that report. I submit that it should be placed on the Table of the House immediately especially in view of the situation prevailing in the country today, in order that we may apply our minds to the matter. Thank you.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay-North-East): Sir, regarding the BAC Report presented to the House, I have two points to make.

The first one is regarding discussion on item 11, regarding disclosures made in the book entitled 'A Dangerous Place' by Mr. Moynihan. The scope of the discussion is much too narrow. There is widespread apprehension in the whole country about the role of US money in Indian politics. Mr. Moynihan's book is only part and parcel of the whole discussion. Besides Mr. Moynihan's book, many other things have come out in the papers. For example, there is the latest disclosure made by Mr. R. K. Khadiolkar that he personally brought money for Mrs. Gandhi from the embassies on a number of times. Mr. R. K. Khadiolkar just before his

death said about this. All these points should form part of the discussion. The CBI report of 1967 should also be part of the discussion. If we have discussion on this narrow subject of Mr. Moynihan's book only, we may probably push up the sales of the book, but we will be none the wiser for it. So, we should have a fuller discussion on the subject. This is my first point.

My second point is this. Mr. Saugata Roy raised the question of BHEL-SIEMENS deal. I would like to point out that the Public Undertakings Committee has just completed its review of this agreement and the general working of the BHEL. That report is a matter of national concern because it represents the possibility of a take over of a public sector organisation by a multi-national company. I think this House should have a fuller discussion on BHEL-SIEMENS deal on the basis of the Report of the Public Undertakings Committee. Thank you.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to you for permitting me to raise a matter which is of the greatest concern to this House. In my view of the trends during the last many years—what I say is based on certain facts, figures and statistics and I hope that the House will bear with me for a few minutes,—

MR. SPEAKER: It should be connected with this item.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Since 1952, the position in respect of the duration of sessions of Lok Sabha in terms of hours has exhibited wide fluctuations at times, the implications of which cannot be ignored.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you reading out Rule 877 statement? I have disallowed it. Order please.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I have written to you...

MR. SPEAKER: It should be connected with the list of business for the next week. If you have any submission to make regarding the business of the next week, you may do so.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Kindly listen to me. In my letter I have said this. On 1-8-1972, I had been permitted to make a similar statement during the discussion on the report of Business Advisory Committee and you were kind enough to convey to me after your office had consulted the necessary documents and told you that such a statement had been allowed to be made that I should be brief. And, therefore, I am making this statement in a little briefer way. That is the story.

Since 1952 the position in respect of the duration of sessions of Lok Sabha in terms of hours has exhibited wide fluctuations at times, the implications of which cannot be ignored.

We began with 800 hours in 1952, went up to 1026 hours in 1956 and came down to 616.20 hours in 1971. We registered on an average, during 1952-56 846 hours per year; during 1957-61 741.24 hours per year; during 1962-66 762 hours per year, during 1967-70 757.15 hours per year and during 1971-76 678.12 hours per year. In 1975 the fall in the number of hours was rather steep as we had only 441.45 hours. This again went up to 645.04 hours in 1976 but came down again in 1977 to 568.10 hours. The average of 26 years was 754.26 hours.

I had drawn the attention of the House to this unfortunate trend on 1-8-1972. Apparently not much heed was paid to it. In the consequence, for three years in succession 1975, 1976 and 1977, the distressing decline in parliamentary hours has continued and the average per year, pathetically, has been only 551 hours.

As against this, the position in U.K. does not show such wide fluctuations, let alone any decline. The number of sittings in U.K. during the year is normally 160 and at the rate of eight and a half hour per sitting, the parliamentary time per year is 1360 hours, and mind it we have got only 551 hours. Thus, the parliamentary time available in U.K. is nearly two and a half times that in India.

If we consider the position particularly in regard to the time for discussion on Demands for Grants (General Budget), a sphere in which the accountability to Lok Sabha is both absolute and complete, we find that the current year would find us worse off than during the last four years. Whereas the time taken in 1976 was 113 hours 46 minutes, in 1977 it was 92 hours 20 minutes, in 1978 94 hours 36 minutes and in 1979 even the time allotted was only 87 hours. We have actually landed ourselves with only 68 hours. Correspondingly, the number of Members speaking on the Demands for Grants is only 235 as against the average of the last 6 years of 315 Members.

A similar adverse trend is noticeable in the matter of the guillotining of the Demands of Ministries. The number of Ministries whose Demands have been guillotined during the last three years is: In 1975 it was 15, in 1978 it was 13 and in the current year it is 19.

It would thus be seen that Lok Sabha's function to exercise scrutiny and control even in financial matters is steadily eroding.

The position in regard to making of laws in which Parliament's power and jurisdiction is considered 'transcendent and absolute' is even more distressing. The time taken by Lok Sabha on legislation as percentage of the total time has been steeply going down. During the first Lok Sabha it was 48.8 per cent; during the Second

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

Low Sabha, it came down by nearly 50 per cent and was only 25.3 per cent; during the Third Lok Sabha the trend further worsened and it was 19.3 per cent, during the Fourth Lok Sabha it dropped to the pitifully low figure of 18.8 per cent. However, there was an upward swing during the Fifth Lok Sabha when the figure went up to 30.7 per cent. But unfortunately, during the first two years of the Sixth Lok Sabha—1977 and 1978—the average plummeted again to 21.4 per cent. As against this, law making in U.K. claims 50 per cent of the Parliamentary time.

In other important fields like the international situation and planning, the existence of the House is hardly felt. The situation in this regard was much better a few years ago.

This state of affairs definitely be taken as dangers to our Parliamentary system. The participation of elected representatives in the national affairs committed to their care must not become perfunctory or nominal. If it has not become so already, it may be seen that we are, as these trends indicate, fairly on the way to it.

The situation becomes truly a great strain on the Members' conscience when they find themselves helplessly constrained by enervating limitation of time where their duties call for full expression of their views to express the will of the people. The occasions are not rare when they get only 5 minutes, or may be even less, on importance subjects with the inevitable result that the quality of the debate goes down and the Members experience a gnawing sense of futility, frustration and non-fulfilment.

Legislatures in other countries have, from time to time, appointed committees to rectify unfavourable trends and restore their health and vitality. In our case, it appears to have become even more compelling to take urgent steps not only to arrest

the slow and steady erosion in the authority, effectiveness and concern of Parliament, but also to introduce such reforms as would make our Parliamentary system truly vigorous and vibrant.

A Parliamentary Reforms Committee, preferably a Joint Committee of the two Houses may be a constituted which should study the recent innovations made in Parliamentary procedure by various countries, particularly U.K., so that the functioning of our Parliament can be brought more in tune with the needs of the present times. The Committee may, in particular, suggest ways and means by which (a) the Parliamentary time available in the House may be increased to enable Members to get more time to speak in the House and make substantial and meaningful contribution, and (b) the routine or technical work may be assigned to standing or select committees, so that the House may focus its attention on wide questions of policy, current problems and urgent and immediate legislation only.

As the matter I have raised is of highest importance to the House, the House would legitimately expect the Leader of the House to consider it and, in consultation with the hon'ble speaker, take appropriate steps at an early date. I think the House joins with me in making a request to the Leader of the House to give his views on this subject during the current session of Parliament itself.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Mr. Minister.
(Interruptions)

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: It is a matter of vital importance.

MR. SPEAKER: We cannot have a debate now. He has made a suggestion. A debate does not arise. Now Mr. Kamath.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): You could have informed me, Sir. I

have sent a note. (*Interruptions*) I wanted to make a submission in connection with this. (*Interruptions*) That is what I said in the note. It is not a debate. I am not going into a debate. It is exactly a Business Advisory Committee matter. The sum total of what has been submitted here is that many vitally important issues are not coming up before the House because of the paucity of time. It is in this context that the statement made by Mr. Mishra must be taken into account. This House must be beholden to him for having highlighted this matter. I am personally beholden to him because he has discharged a duty which I should have discharged, viz. of highlighting this matter. It is a very important matter.

I also make a submission here: the BAC must not be limited merely to examining as to what should come, and what should not come. BAC must be concerned about the totality of the time available to the Members, and about the totality of the effectiveness that takes place as a result of the debate, and the total range of national problems that will have to be taken into account. This is not being done. It has got to be done. On behalf of myself and my party and of the hon. Members, I very strongly support....

MR. SPEAKER: You are converting it into a congratulatory meeting. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN. Not a congratulatory meeting. I am suggesting that the matter of steady erosion of the debating time available, is a matter concerning the House. I am suggesting that time must be found to discuss this matter in the House, to find out a solution for that and, in the meantime, the Leader may....

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Kamath. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. GOPAL rose

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Gopal, don't develop this into a debate.

SHRI K. GOPAL: You should call all the leaders of parties and try to find a solution.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): Kindly allow me one minute.

MR. SPEAKER: You have not given any notice. Mr. Kamath.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I rise on a point of order. Allow me only one minute. You are wasting so much of time. Why not allow me?

MR. SPEAKER: Should you add to that?

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I want to say this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: You have not given notice. Don't record.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): All that has been so forcefully stated by my hon. friends and colleagues point to the inductable inexorable conclusion that the Lok Sabha which is the supreme forum of 600 million people of the largest democracy in the World will have to sit at least for seven months if not longer. Otherwise Lok Sabha will fail to exercise its constitutional obligation under article 113 and will be to that extent, guilty of dereliction of duty.

I want to move an amendment under Rule 290:

"That the House regrets the absence of any reference to the Lokpal Bill in the report and trusts that this does not imply its relegation to the next session."

I hope the Minister will assure the House that it is not being relegated to the next session because of constraints of time and would be taken up in this session.

MR. SPEAKER: You have stated your point.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It cannot be taken up next week. There are only two weeks left after that. That means that only in the penultimate week of this session it may be taken up. It will then go to the other place, the Rajya Sabha. Suppose they make amendments and it comes back, there may be need for a joint session. Will there be time for all that? I am sure my prophecy will come true again, and I am sorry to say it will not be passed in this session, God forbid.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): I must apologise for the mistake committed; he has given time for Special Courts Bill.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): Mr. Speaker, I can very well understand that hon. Members feel that the occasion when we discuss the report of the Business Advisory Committee should be utilised to raise matters which are uppermost in their minds and which they would like the House to discuss. As the House knows this report relates to the time allotted for certain items which have to be discussed in the House. My hon. friend Mr. Mavalankar pointed out that the time allotted for some of the items was inadequate. I entirely agree with him that there are various items which need considerable discussion. As the hon. Members know it is within the total time available to us that we have to apportion time to different items. The Business Advisory Committee which my hon. friend Mr. Lakkappa, it seems, does not like consists of representatives from all sections of the House . . . (Interruptions) The Members of the Business Advisory Committee are not hand-picked by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. The composition of the Committee is well-known: whose nominees sit in the Business Advisory Committee is well-known. Therefore I do not want to deal with this subject. The Business Advisory Com-

mittee, after taking into consideration the total time available to us and the relative importance of the different subjects, and its estimate of the time that would be necessary to discuss the subject at length, decided on a certain allotment of time, and I am moving that the report of the Business Advisory Committee should be accepted by the House.

He said that there was nothing in the report about the discussion on the report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Tribes. I would use this occasion to say once again that we would certainly find time to discuss this report during the current session. This was not a statement about business for the next week; therefore, obviously there was no reference to it. But the report will certainly be discussed by the House and we will find time for it. He referred to the fact that many Ministries were not discussed and were subjected to the guillotine. They were important subjects. For instance in the field of responsibility of the Education Ministry, he would like some subjects to be discussed on a priority basis. These matters will certainly be raised by me in the Business Advisory Committee and I shall attempt to find some means of discussing these important subjects. My hon. friend Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta raised a point; I know him very well, he is very progressive man . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: How is he progressive? Others are not progressive?

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Because he is different from you.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Is he the only progressive RSS Member? I really disapprove of this . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Lakkappa is more progressive.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: It was not necessary for my hon. friend Mr. Lakkappa to solicit compliments; I was going to pay him a compliment. However, I was referring to the argument of my hon. friend Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta. Though today is Thursday, perhaps he thought that it was Friday, and I was making the statement of government business for this next week. That is why he said that there was no mention of the Special Courts Bill. He himself subsequently realised that he had moved faster than the calendar and the sun, and therefore he corrected himself. Time will be found for the Special Courts Bill.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: You should appreciate his courage.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: He has the courage to sit behind you. He referred to the Works and Housing Ministry and the problem of housing in Delhi. I remember that this was a subject he raised even in the last session, and he is quite right when he says that some way must be found to have a short duration discussion on this subject. This again will be a matter which will have to put before the Business Advisory Committee. He and some other friends, including my good friend Mr. Saugata Roy referred to the recent incidents in South Hall which have caused considerable concern and dismay in this country, and said time must be found. You will recall that this matter was discussed yesterday, and it was decided that at the next meeting we would decide the form in which it should come up, and the time that should be allotted to it.

Mr. hon. friend Shri Saugata Roy referred to Door Darshan and A.I.R. A Bill in this regard will come before the House and there will be an opportunity to discuss it.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: In the present session?

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: It may very well be introduced; I think the intention is to introduce the Bill. He referred to a very important subject, foreign collaboration and thought that there should be some discussion on this; he referred to other subjects like science and technology and Anti Defection Bill.

13.00 hrs.

As far as the anti-defections Bill is concerned, my good friend, Prof. Mavalankar feels that this thunder has been stolen, or almost stolen by my friend, Shri Saugata Roy. I can say, the thunder is being shuttled back and forth between Shri Saugata Roy and Prof. Mavalankar. But it is the intention of the Government, as soon as consultations are completed, to introduce the Bill.

My hon. friend, Shri Banatwalla, referred to the 46th Constitutional Amendment. This again is an amendment which we hope to process during this session. In the schedule that the Government has drawn up, this Bill finds a place and it is our hope that with the cooperation of all sections of the House, it will be possible to see this Bill during this session.

Dr. Swamy referred to the discussion on Mr. Moynihan's book, and said that the caption that has been used for the subject is too narrow. In fact he said that the real subject is the role of foreign money. I thought, when there is a discussion on the subject, the crux of the matter would be referred to and it will be for different hon. members to deal with the subject in the way in which their wisdom wants them to deal with the caption does not become a total description of all the contents that would be there in the discussion.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: The motion should be appropriately worded.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: At the moment only the subject matter is indicated. At the moment, it is only a sign post, not a map or a blueprint.

My hon. friend, Shri Kamath, the member from Hoshangabad, was concerned about the Lok Pal Bill. He was keen that we should include it and discuss it.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It is already hanging fire. The Joint Comm ttee report has come.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: He was keen that we should discuss it and pass it so that it may be processed by both the Houses during this session. It will be our attempt to do so.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Did you say 'endeavour'? I could not hear it.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Shall I say that we will do so? Will it make any difference? My hon. friend is a scholar, and he understands the implications of words. When I say it will be our earnest effort, it means it will be our earnest effort. Whether the effort will succeed or not, philosophically it does not depend upon me. In this context, it depends upon the House, of which the hon. member is a very respected member.

My hon. friend, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, raised a very important subject. Of course, I can very well say that he has made a suggestion which the Leader of the House would consider, and stop there. But I do not want to do so. I will also join other hon. members, who said that he has done a distinct service in looking up the statistical details and, with his impeccable meticulousness presenting a certain aspect of our work which is of great importance to all the members of this House. The question he raised referred to the adequacy of

the time we get for legislative work, the time we get for discussion on matters of public interest and public importance, the time that is devoted for the financial business that the House has to transact, the time that is devoted for parliamentary scrutiny and control of the work of the Government etc. He thought that ways must be found to ensure a more effective utilisation of the time of the House and for adequate time for discharging the responsibilities that the constitution has vested in this House. He also raised the question of increasing participation by hon. members in the work of the House and improving the quality of the contribution of the hon. members. Therefore, it is not a matter between the Government and the rest of the House; it is something about which the whole House is concerned, and every member is concerned. Therefore, every member, every group and party and the Government, everyone has to think of how to make the House more effective. Sometimes it does happen that time is found, time is allotted, the schedule is accepted, but unforeseen events, and unforeseen considerations make their own inroads into the schedule that everybody has agreed upon, and matters which are scheduled for discussion sometimes get pushed off, as the hon. Member, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra referred to, and matters which are not scheduled and matters about which, Sir, you yourself are not aware, matters which are not in the Order Paper, sometimes succeed in pushing things more important. It is a matter for all of us to think how we can ensure effective utilisation of the time within an agreed procedure, to which the House is committed.

Then he referred to the role of committees. This, again, is a subject which has been brought up in this House more than once. He thought that there must be a study of the functions of the Committee.

the work that can be entrusted to the committee and the way in which the working of this House should be streamlined, and he made the suggestion that a Committee should be appointed, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition was gracious enough to pay a compliment to the hon. Member, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, and say that he was almost doing the work that the Leader of the Opposition should have done. For a moment, I wondered whether it was a compliment that was being paid, or it was a characterisation.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
I accept it as a compliment in the particular context.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: In any case, as my hon. friend said, this is a matter which the Leader of the House should consider. As my hon. friend, Shri Gopal and others have said, Sir, as the Speaker of the House, you have a very important role to play in this, and it may be possible for you and the Leader of the House to decide the best manner of considering the problem, whether you should call a meeting of the leaders of the opposition or get up a committee of all parties. This is a matter which you as well as the Leader of the House should consider.

श्री राज नारायण (राय बरेली) : श्रीमान्, हमारा सेशन यह है कि आप 1963 से 1968 की कार्यवाही देखें तो पावेंगे कि स्वर्णीय लोहिया ने बार बार कहा है जिस प्रकार हाउस आफ कामन्स चलता है उसी तरह यह सदन भी 10 महीने चले...

MR. SPEAKER: This is the way the time is lost. I am not allowing it.

श्री राज नारायण : आप नहीं सुनेंगे तो काम नहीं चलेगा। यही तो गड़बड़ी हो रही है। न माननीय एडिटर बर्ना सरत न राहें मोर न मार। ना 10 महीने सदन की बैठक हो। और इसकी चर्चा एक बार नहीं, अनेक बार हुई है।

13.08 hrs.

INTER-STATE MIGRANT WORKMEN (REGULATION OF EMPLOYMENT AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) BILL*

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to regulate the employment of inter-State migrant workman and to provide for their conditions of service and for matters connected therewith.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to regulate the employment of inter-State migrant workmen and to provide for their conditions of service and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: I introduce ** the Bill.

*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II Section II dated 26-4-1979.

**Introduced with the recommendation of the President.