

tion (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5582/66].

(2) Directors' Report of the Orissa Road Transport Company Limited, Berhampur, for the year 1963-64, along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

(3) Review by the Government on the working of the above Company. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5593/66].

12.03 hrs.

RE: ABSENCE OF MINISTERS

Mr. Speaker: Shri Guha—Shri J. R. Mehta—No one there to present the report of the Estimates Committee? (Interruption).

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What will happen to the report?

Shri Daji (Indore): Sir, may I point out that this is happening again and again? The Prime Minister is also here now. May I point out that this is happening again and again—that the Ministers are not ready with reply to questions, they are not ready with their papers to be laid on the Table, etc. May I point out that in the interest of a better order of business of the House, the dignity and decorum of the House should be maintained? (Interruption).

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): The Government are yet to find their feet.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I would certainly make a request to the Prime Minister that this should be looked into, and also to the Leader of the House that he should look into it: that the Ministers ought to be ready with their briefs here, or at least they must instruct or direct some of their colleagues that they should act on

their behalf and answer the points in time. Then, I did not find Shri Guha to present the report of the Estimates Committee. Also, no other Member was there to lay it.

Shri Hem Barua: What a shame!

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): What is Parliament coming to?

श्री हुकम चन्द कच्छवाप (बेवास): डांचा ही बिगड़ गया है।

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals (Shri Iqbal Singh): I am very sorry that I came late, but there were questions in the Rajya Sabha.

Mr. Speaker: That contingency can arise. But in case he arrives late, he should have asked some one else, some one of his colleagues, to do it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What will happen to the Report of the Estimates Committee?

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Sir, this is not the first thing of this sort. The other day we took very strong objection to the absence of any Cabinet Minister, when the Deputy Speaker was presiding. There are so many of them 15 of them—and even if the worst possible absenteeism is to be condoned, surely their complete absence cannot be condoned. When we raised the objection, the poor Deputy-Speaker was reduced to requesting the Deputy Chief Whip. He went round. The Chief Whip—I do not know what title they have given him—was also here and he was helpless. We came to know that some of them were asleep, from the gestures they were making to each other. We took objection and when we wanted to leave the House in protest, some of my friends were able to do that, but I was not able to do that because the Deputy-Speaker was not kind enough to extend the courtesy of allowing us to go out without our losing the

[Shri Ranga]

right of Mr. Narasimha Reddy continuing his speech. He was in the midst of his speech and so I was not able to go out. Otherwise, I should have been treated as having gone out. The whole of the opposition went out of the House in protest against this misbehaviour of on the part of the Cabinet.

Earlier also, I drew your attention, Sir, to the fact that we have been feeling that the Cabinet has been making an effort, calculated or in an unconscious manner, to denigrate this Parliament in order to show to the people that they do not care anything at all for this Parliament and Opposition in this House. In the other House also the same thing happened. There the Deputy Chairman was little more liberal to the opposition than the Deputy-Speaker here and there the opposition was able to go out in protest. Therefore, my hon. friend, who has been brought into this House by the Prime Minister as the Leader of the House—Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha—had to apologise to that House and give a promise. But he has not had the goodness to come here of his own accord and offer his apologies to you and to the House and give an assurance here that when the President's Address is being discussed or when any such important question is being discussed, the Cabinet would be kept in evidence here. The House would not be satisfied merely with Ministers of State or Deputy Ministers being present.

श्री हुकम जन्व कछवाय : मदरसा खोला जाए और वहां सब को पढ़ाया जाए ।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : असल में जिम्मेवारी का पता नहीं है कि किस की है, संसद के नेता की है या प्रधान मंत्री की है । दो काजियों में मुर्गा हराम होती है ।

The Leader of the House (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Sir, I am quite aware of the fact that Prof. Ranga wrote a

letter to you and you were good enough to send it on to me. I went to you and expressed my apologies. I was going to refer to that matter, but I was told that Mr. Ranga would raise it in the House. Otherwise, I would have expressed my unqualified apologies.

श्री हुकम जन्व कछवाय : अब माफी मांग लो ।

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: In the other House, the question was raised. We are very sorry. I really plead guilty. What else can I do? All I can say is, in future this thing will not happen once your ruling is there. The other day, I requested you that if you and the House agree that on the occasion of the discussion on the President's Address, if the Ministers of State . . .

Shri Ranga: No, no.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I have every right to make an appeal to you and to the House. It is the right of the House to reject it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It has been already rejected.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I am not allowed to complete my submission. If Ministers of State who are holding independent charge of their portfolio . . .

Shri Ranga: No, no; a Cabinet minister should be present.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the House just had a talk with me. He wanted that if a Minister of State who was in independent charge of a department was present in the House, the House might just feel satisfied with that.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have considered it. If there would be any

such difficulty, of course, the House would tolerate even that. But is it too much to expect that out of 15 ministers . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: 16 now.

Mr. Speaker: Is it too much to expect that out of 15 ministers one might be here at the time of the discussion of the President's Address. This is a very important discussion. When the President had addressed both the Houses of Parliament it is not too much to expect that one Minister at least should be here.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Sir, may I say . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us hear the Leader of the House.

Some hon. Members: Let us hear Shri Hanumanthaiya.

Mr. Speaker: All, right.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Sir, you have been reminding us—and we are grateful to you for that—that Parliament should command dignity and respect from the public and from everybody concerned. I have been here for some time. As you have been rightly remarking, any detraction or deviation from the dignity of the House, detracts the worth of the work we are doing here. Similarly, the neglect that is being continually shown by the ministers to this House equally detracts from the dignity of the House. I am not saying this by way of criticism on anybody in particular. Many a time we are thinking of amending the Constitution in order to guarantee a quorum in the House. As a parliamentarian of some experience I would like to tell you, many of us do not feel like speaking when a Minister of State who cannot give an effective answer is there to reply to the suggestions we make. Unless we feel that here is a minister who will be able to take the suggestions we make, we will not be serious enough to make any suggestions or even speeches. One of the main reasons why we do not have

quorum in the House is that the ministers do not take this House seriously and, therefore, we do not take this House seriously. This is the real position. You will see, when Cabinet Ministers take the suggestion we make seriously the House will be full and with interest. Then members will attend the House and the House will be full. For various reasons, the ministers think that we members here are not worth taking notice of and our suggestions are not being listened to by them. It is primarily the duty of the Government to realise that it is their show that is being enacted on the floor of the House. It is their responsibility to see that there is quorum by their presence primarily and, secondly, from the other side by the members who will have to be responsible to the various measures and policies adumbrated by Government. This is the crux of the problem. This point is not being touched by anyone of us either in this side of the House or on the other. Specially when the President's Address is being debated or the budget is being debated, if the Minister in charge of Planning, the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister are not present no self-respecting member will take the proceedings of the House seriously. Therefore, I merely reinforce the weight of your suggestion that this House should be treated by the Government more respectfully and with greater sense of responsibility.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Sir, I beg to submit that apart from the Question Hour, we sit for 5 hours every day. The House sits for five days a week and therefore at the rate of five hours a day we sit for 25 hours a week apart from the Question Hour. There are 15 members of the Cabinet. If they can sit only for two hours per day each by turn I think there will be no trouble and the dignity and decorum of the House will be maintained. If they cannot sit for two hours a day each, then the Leader of the House, who is fast becoming a "Minister of apology" should be made to sit here at least when no Minister is available.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

I think it is upto the Government to do it. It is up to us also that we should see to it that the Members of the Cabinet sit here and listen to whatever is said by the Members of the Opposition or other Members of Parliament. If they do not sit here, to whom are we speaking?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I would like just to add that more than once before the Chair definitely indicated its desire, and the desire of the House also that at least some members of the Cabinet should be present here during these discussions. We have seen earlier how Jawaharlal Nehru used to attend this House much more frequently than his successors. Everybody, of course, cannot be expected to do that. But, at the same time, in the first Parliament we used to notice the Finance Minister almost regularly attending every meeting of this House during the discussion of the budget and all that. It has been given the go by the successors of the first Finance Minister, Dr. Deshmukh.

In this discussion on the President's Address questions like DIR, the emergency and that kind of thing has come up over and over again and I should think that members on this side of the House have a right to see that the Home Minister, Shri Nanda, is present when that discussion is going on. Regarding the Prime Minister—I do not know, she may have preoccupations of a particularly extraordinary sort; she does have some foreign visitors from time to time, but even so I do not understand why she does not happen to be in the House as much as she ought to be. The Home Minister is not here. The Food Minister, who is in the pillory as the Minister of Food Imports and Begging, he is seen here from time to time making statements but as soon as the statement is over he is no longer seen anywhere. The Ministers do not seem to try to come here and listen to the debate.

We are almost at the end of the discussion. I do not know how many hours are left. Today we have Private Members business and we stop at 2.30 or so. Who are all going to speak, we have no idea. We heard the highfalutin speech, which meant hardly anything, by the Minister of Planning. I do not know whether the Home Minister is going to intervene in the debate. I do not know if the Food Minister is going to intervene in the debate. I do not know who from the Treasury Benches are going to take part in the discussion and that sort of thing. The Ministers are not here to listen to the proceedings, to find out whether there are points which require their replies and then participate in the debate. They treat us with the kind of contempt to which we are getting accustomed. We are getting accustomed to the idea that the parliamentary system is somewhat inadequate. In all parts of the country this impression is being produced. Even in Delhi when we try to the best of our capacity to help to remove this impression we find this kind of thing is going on and the Ministers are behaving in this fashion.

Yesterday during the Question Hour a Minister's conduct was in jeopardy. You were persuaded to hold up the proceedings for more than half an hour in order that particular question can be asked and answered. But the Ministers did not turn up. All over the country the Ministers seem to be in the dock, as far as peoples' accusations are concerned, but the Ministers do not even come before Parliament, let alone before the public outside in the country. This is a serious state of affairs which should not be tolerated in the interest of parliamentary decorum and parliamentary propriety.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): In debates such as this, the President's Address the motion of thanks is moved by the Government side. So, some representative of Government must be present

here to hear what is being said on that motion. If it is not done it is an aspersion on the House and on the Chair also.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर): इस सदन की प्रतिष्ठा और सरकार की प्रतिष्ठा को इस लिए धक्का लग रहा है क्योंकि इस मंत्रीमंडल के बहुत ज्यादा सदस्य राज्य-सभा से हैं प्रधान मंत्री तक. तो एक बात मैं आपसे माफ़त उनसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी जल्द राज्य सभा की सहस्यता छोड़कर इस सदन में भायें। वह सदन की नेता बनती हैं या नहीं उससे मुझे मतलब नहीं। स्वयं नारायण जी सदन के नेता रह सकते हैं लेकिन अधिक से अधिक और महत्वपूर्ण मंत्री इस सदन के सदस्य हो जायेंगे तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जब महत्वपूर्ण विषयों पर बहस होती है तो केवल किसी एक मंत्री का सदन में उपस्थित रहना काफी नहीं है। मैं चाहूँगा कि या तो प्रधान मंत्री या सदन के नेता हर महत्वपूर्ण बहस में सदन में उपस्थित रहें, किसी एक मंत्री के उपस्थित रहने से काम नहीं होगा।

और तीसरी बात यह है जैसे कि कल प्रश्नोत्तर के घंटे के समय ठूपा, घाघे घंटे तक हूज्जत होती रही. अगर सदन के नेता या प्रधान मंत्री या गृह मंत्री और वित्त मंत्री जो कि सदन में मौजूद थे, अगर वह एक पूरा विवेकन उसके बारे में करते तो शायद इतनी झंझट नहीं होती और काफी बातें हुई हैं, जिनको लेकर हमको बार-बार इन सवालों को उठाना पड़ेगा। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि हर महत्वपूर्ण बहस में और प्रश्नोत्तर के समय सदन के नेता और प्रधान मंत्री सदन में उपस्थित रह्य करें।

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandaur): I would like to make only one submission in this respect. Although

many of these ministers and we have been known to each other for a number of years, some of them have developed the habit that even when an accusation is being levelled and their whole conduct is a matter of discussion before this House, they go on hobnobbing with each other and do not pay any attention to what is being talked on this side. This is a very bad thing. At least when a direct accusation in their faces is being made, they must not go on merely talking about how to consolidate their positions to which they have reached but they must also look to this side and listen to what is being said about them and against them so that they may be able to give a proper reply. It is one thing that they are absent when the President's Address is being discussed, it is another thing that Shri Muthyal Rao runs about to call for them and they are found sleeping in their houses, it is quite another thing that when they are quite awake they do not listen to what is being talked about them. It is too much.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mr. Speaker, we cannot but view with grave concern the prevailing state of affairs at the very beginning of a long Budget session. I do not know what the future holds in store in the 10 to 12 weeks more to go. At this rate I do not know what will happen in the coming weeks. I have no hesitation in saying that the apathy, the callousness of the Treasury Benches is apt to eat into the very vitals of parliamentary institutions in our country. I for one would appeal to the Treasury Benches and to the embattled cohorts behind them to realise their responsibility towards democracy, and ensure that respect for parliamentary institutions is maintained and promoted in our country. I do not wish to lay the blame at the door of the Prime Minister for this particular matter. I do hope that she gets the co-operation from her colleagues to which she is entitled. The blame, if at all, should be laid at the

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

door of the Member number two—that is the culprit—on the Treasury Benches . . . (Interruption). He is the Leader of the House. For the first time in his lifetime he has taken upon himself, upon his fairly broad shoulders the leadership of the House.

Shri Ranga: It is the Prime Minister who has given to him such a responsibility.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Unfortunately, she is not a Member of the House and she cannot be the Leader here; that is why I said the other day that she should fight a by-election and come as a Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Members should be brief. All that has been said.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I will be very brief. I am sorry to say that since he has taken over the leadership of the House, from the very first day, this has been happening. Yesterday I made an appeal to you that during the debate on this important matter, during the discussion on the President's Address, if you adopt the drastic remedy which I suggested for the desperate disease—desperate diseases need drastic remedies—if you warn them that the time when there is not a single Cabinet Minister on the Treasury Benches, whether it is half an hour, 15 minutes, 20 minutes, or one hour, will be and shall be debited to the Congress Party account, they will learn.

One more point I would like to make. We have observed during the last three or four years that when the reply comes from the Treasury Benches, issues or matters that we have raised are rarely replied to. I have been watching here for the last two or three days that one or two ministers sit here; sometimes they sit and mope; sometimes they are drowsy. I do not blame them; they work hard, spend sleepless nights and sleepy days. I do not know why they do not take any notes. They should take notes and answer the points that are raised here. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Sreekantan Nair.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda): After the apology given by the Leader, it should not be a controversial matter. I have been rising time and again to give an entirely different view of the whole picture, but I have not been given any chance.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Sreekantan Nair.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): I do not want to cast any aspersions on Ministers of the State nor do I want to find fault with the hon. Prime Minister who has got to receive foreign dignitaries like Nkrumah and others. But it is indeed the right of the House to expect that at least the Home Minister or the new Finance Minister who is an unknown 'quantity' for us or the ever present and ever available Leader of the House—any one of the three—must be in the House.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Mr. Sinha has already apologized and he has said that he will try to see that this does not happen again. But I do resent some of the insinuations which have been made and for which there is no justification or ground for coming to such conclusions. I am glad that some of the hon. members have at least conceded that a Minister does have some little work to do besides sitting here. We have full respect for Parliament; nobody is trying to reduce the stature of Parliament or the dignity of Parliament or democracy. We have got the greatest respect for you, Sir, and for what you say to us and for the opinions of the hon. members of the Opposition. Detailed notes are kept and I see them every day to know what every hon. member has said. We are keeping in full touch with what has been said on both sides of the House and we shall try our best to answer all the questions. But groundless charges and the atmosphere sometimes created does not improve the dignity of democracy or of the House. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. **Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha.**

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I would not like to add to what the Prime Minister has said, but because my friends . . .

Mr. Speaker: I have called him to announce the business for the next week.

श्री मधु सिन्हाये : अगर यह सरकारी कार्य के बारे में निवेदन है तो मेरा भावोप है। व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आपको सुना होगा।

प्रत्यक्ष प्रहोश्य : मैं सुन लूंगा। लेकिन यह कोई ऐटोयुड नहीं है कि आपको सुना होगा। मैं सुन लूंगा जब वक्त आयेगा लेकिन यह क्या बात है ?

12.28 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business in this House for the week commencing 28th February, 1966 will consist of:—

- (1) Further discussions on the President's Address.
- (2) Consideration and passing of: The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill, 1966. The Delhi Land Reforms (Amendment) Bill, 1966. The Imports and Exports (Control) Amendment Bill, 1966. The Armed Forces (Special Powers) Amendment Bill, 1966.
- (3) General Discussion on the Railway Budget for 1966-67 from 1st March onwards.

(4) Discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants (Railways) for 1966-67.

As members are already aware, the General Budget for 1966-67 will be presented on Monday, the 28th February, 1966, at 5 P.M.

श्री मधु सिन्हाये (मुनेर) : यह व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। उस को पूर्व सूचना देना जरूरी नहीं था। . . . (व्यवधान) . . . प्राय को नियम संख्या चाहिए ? 376। प्रौर चाहिए तो 377 भी लीजिए। तो इम को पूर्वसूचना देना कोई जरूरी नहीं था। लेकिन मैं ने समझा कि चूंकि इस में नियम प्रौर संविधान के बड़े सवाल आते हैं इसलिए मैं ने इन का जिक्र करते हुए आप को पत्र लिखा था लेकिन आप ने मुझे लिख कर भेजा कि इस में व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं उठता अब मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि व्यवस्था का प्रश्न कैसे उठता है प्रौर वह क्या है। प्राय इस पर निर्णय करे।

जो कार्य-सूची, प्रांडर पेपर प्रचारित किया गया है उस में कहा गया है कि सदन के नेता द्वारा वक्तव्य। श्री मधु नागायण सिंह 29 फरवरी, 1966 को प्रारम्भ होने वाले सप्ताह के सरकारी कार्य के बारे में एक वक्तव्य देंगे। पिछले गुरुवार को भी यह सवाल उठा था प्रौर उस की कार्यवाही मेरे पास है। उस में यह कहा गया था : वी। मिनिस्टर प्रोफ पालियामेंटरी प्रफेसर्स। पिछली बार जो उन्होंने ने वक्तव्य दिया यह विवाद में दर्ज है कि वह संसदीय मंत्रों के नाते दिया था। अब की बार की कार्य-सूची में पता चलता है कि वह सदन के नेता की हैसियत में दे रहे हैं। उस के बारे में आप ने भी अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रश्न उठाया, मैं उस को दोहराना चाहता हूं प्रौर संविधान की प्राय को भी आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूं। उन्होंने ने प्रायद हवाला दिया "मेज पालियामेंटरी प्रैक्टिस" का। उन्होंने जो कहा वह उद्धरण मेरे पास मौजूद है। वह सत्रहवें संस्करण में 299 पेज पर है, मेज पालियामेंटरी प्रैक्टिस में।