

that in view of his ill-health he is unable to attend the House from 27th May to 12th June, 1998. He has, therefore, requested for grant of leave of absence.

Does he have the permission of the House to remain absent from 27th May, to 12th June, 1998?

*(No hon. Member dissented)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

### **SPECIAL MENTIONS**

#### **Shortening of the period of Parliament sessions**

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I respectfully thank you for allowing me to raise this important issue regarding shortening the period of Sessions of Parliament. Sir, may I submit most respectfully that under the glare of thermonuclear tests that have taken place in Pokhran, the din and

noise of great political controversy subsequently that is sweeping across the country, what is most unfortunate is that we are losing sight of a very important feature connected with the functioning of the Parliamentary system? Sir, there is a steady and uninterrupted attempt to curb the Parliamentary system over decades, to make it ineffective in the discharge of its responsibilities by systematically curtailing the duration of sessions over the years. Sir, in my opinion, this constitutes a grave interference of the executive in the fruitful functioning of the Parliament. In my opinion, Sir, this is being done because effective Parliamentary system is found to be inconvenient to people at high places. If you allow me, can I give you some examples? Explosion in Pokhran took place on 11th May, but the Parliament had an opportunity to discuss this issue of national and international significance only on and from 27th May, that is, 18 days after the occurrence.

Sir, may I draw your attention to the fact that the Budget for the current year was presented in the House 73 days after

the new Finance Minister took over! All this is due to an inordinate delay in convening the present Session of Parliament. Sir, many developments have taken place inside the country. Many unwarranted statements have been made. The House is unable to discuss many of these because of time constraint.

There is a time constraint because the present Session of Parliament is too short to enable the Members to have a discussion on all these issues. Sir, the present Budget Session is scheduled for 31 days and my thanks to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs because the time schedule has been so meticulously drawn that out of 31 days of this Session, seven days are meant for the Private Members' Bills and discussion on them. It means effectively this Session is only for 24 days. Sir, if I look into the records available with our Secretariat, I find that when the Committee system was introduced in 1993, we had a Budget Session of 39 days. Last year we had a Budget Session of 36 days. This year we have a Budget Session of 31 days nominally and effectively of 24 days. Sir, a Budget Session has never been so short, may be, any time before. It has been shortened at least by one week. Moreover, it is due to this belated Session which we call the Budget Session, that the Parliament is unable to hold its Monsoon Session. But, unfortunately, the Government has not disclosed its intention so far. Sir, at the dawn of India's freedom, the Parliament used to meet for not less than 100 days in a year. That was actually the intention of the Constitution-makers in order to make the Parliament more effective and to have enough time for fruitful discussions and allow the parliamentary system to become a forum for building national consensus. When the Government is speaking of national consensus and when the Parliament is the only forum to build up national consensus, this parliamentary system is being tinkered with and the Sessions are sought to be shortened. Sir, for this I do not blame the present Government only. There has been a persistent trend in that direction over the

decades. Sir, I would like to submit that only a few days back, as Members of the Ethics Committee, which you had kindly set up, we visited a number of western democracies. We met the parliamentarians of the House of Commons, we met the Members of the House of Lords, we had the opportunity of meeting the Speakers of a number of National Assemblies, we met the representatives of the French National Assembly, the Italian Parliament and the Finnish Parliament. Everywhere we put this question—it was put not only by me but my friends, my colleagues also—as to how long their Parliaments were in Session in a year. Their answer was, "Sir, please ask us how long our Parliaments are in recess!" After looking into the records of those Parliaments, we find that Parliaments in those countries are meeting for not less than 120 days, minimum in a year and 160 days, maximum, in a year. Sir, I would like to inform you that in all these parliaments there is effective functioning of the Committee system. The argument that is put forward is that since the Committee system has been introduced, there is no need for elaborate general Session of the Parliament. When the Committee system was introduced we were given to understand that the open debate in the Parliament will not be interfered with. It is an indoor discussion in a Committee where allocations for various 'Heads' would be scrupulously scrutinised and, therefore, indoor Committee meetings cannot be held contradictory to or they will not be allowed to cut across open parliamentary debate. Sir, before the Budget Session began, as far back as the 9th of the last month, I had the privilege of writing a letter to our hon. Prime Minister wherein I sought clarification from him whether the Monsoon Session would be held. I had suggested that since there would be little time to hold the Monsoon Session, the duration of the Budget Session should be a little more and we can prolong this Session so that we can have some more days for it. Sir, the point that I raised has not been replied to by the hon. Prime

Minister. My letter has only been acknowledged. Sir, is this the way that the Members of Parliament are treated by the hon. Prime Minister of the country?

That is for you to decide and that is for the House to take note of. But, may I suggest that convening of the Parliament should not be left to the sweet will and mercy of the Government. In our country, Parliament Session is convened by Rashtrapatiiji on the advice of the hon. Prime Minister and the Cabinet. Why should it be so? Therefore, if the Government does not want the Parliament Session to take place, it can postpone. It is only obligatory for the Government to hold a Parliament Session to get its Budget passed. Otherwise, it can be dispensed with. The Session can be shortened. Why should the Session of the Parliament be dependent on the decision and whim of the Government in power for whom the Parliament is found to be inconvenient? Therefore, may I suggest, it is for you to kindly consider this. Sir, it is you who had been fighting for the rights of the Parliament in this House when the emergency was clamped. Again, you are here as the Chairman of this House, as the custodian of the rights and privileges of the Members. It is for you to take the initiative whether there can be a statutory provision for the minimum duration of a Parliament Session in a year so that people can talk inside the Parliament. Let us not talk outside. We have a number of talkative Ministers who speak more outside than inside the Parliament. If we do not get a chance to talk about the national issues, to talk about the problems, to talk about the economic situation, to talk about the steady decline of the external value of money and if we are not able to discuss the national problems, how is the national consensus going to be built up and how and in what way can the parliament be proved to be effective to function as a Constitutional watch-dog? Sir, with humility, may I say in many ways the Parliament had not been able to discharge its responsibility. It is because of that we find judicial activism. Even an

hon. Member of this House had gone to the Supreme Court to seek remedy on an issue which this House could have discussed. On the question of allegation of bribery—bribe, being offered to a Member of Parliament—there was no parliamentary investigation. Parliament could not take up the responsibility. That is why a remedy had to be found in a court of law and the case is pending. Sir, the Parliament is not able to discharge its responsibility because its duration is getting limited. The reason is, the Executive does not like the Parliament to be fruitful and effective.

Therefore, while thanking you profusely for allowing me to raise this issue, may I implore upon all my colleagues to look at this problem from a national angle? If the parliament is sidelined, if the Parliament is ineffective, if the duration of its Session is shortened, if you are not allowed to discuss the national issues, what is going to happen to our own democracy, to our own Parliamentary System, to our ethos, to our moral values and what is going to happen to this country? Therefore, Sir, let all of us rise above party considerations and take up the question of making the Parliamentary Session more effective and making it more fruitful for the interest of the people and for the interest of democracy. Thank you.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: (West Bengal) Sir, I fully endorse the points and arguments which have been advanced by my colleague, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta. I do not really understand what the Government has in mind. I have noticed that there would be no Monsoon Session. This is the Monsoon Session. In fact, it has been merged with the Budget Session and effectively from the end of June/July there will be no Session until November. Why this big gap? On the one hand, the Government is worried that there are a large number of Bills pending. I understand there are more than 100 Bills pending. At the same time, hon. Members are also willing to attend the Parliament. There is no problem with the number of

Bills. There is enough to work for Parliament to do. The problem is not that hon. Members are not wanting to have a Parliament Session. But, somehow the executives does not want a Parliament Session to be held. We have been seeing repeatedly that when some important Bills come, the Minister concerned comes to us with folded hands and requests us to get it passed without discussion. Why should that be the case? We are going to discuss in this Session a large number of very important Bills—the Lok Pal Bill, the Prasar Bharati Bill, the Bill on Women, the Bill on Agricultural Workers, may be, and the Bill on Electoral Reforms. Each of these Bills and Constitutional Amendments requires a large amount of discussion, going into the details and nuances. But, somehow the Government is not prepared to give us sufficient time for discussion. At the last moment the Minister comes and asks us to get it passed without discussion, by just voting on it. It has been happening for a long time. This is very wrong. This upsets the balance between the three organs of State—the Executive, the Legislature, and the Judiciary. As it has already been pointed out by Shri Gurudas Das Gupta, since the Parliament is not functioning properly, matters are taken to the judiciary. Many important issues are pre-empted by the executive in terms of Ordinances. Many major policy pronouncements had been made when the Parliament was not in session. There has been a major departure from the national consensus on foreign policy and defence issues. When a decision was taken on 11th May, the Parliament was not in session. They regard it as a nuisance; so, as far as possible it should be avoided by the executive, so that as soon as the Parliament is over there is sufficient time for the Government to do whatever it likes. I suggest that a decision should be taken to convene the Monsoon Session of the Parliament. It can be convened in mid-August or late August. There is nothing wrong in having the Monsoon Session from late August to late September, for one month. The

Parliamentary system should be allowed to function; otherwise, the balance between the executive, the judiciary and the legislature would be upset. It has to be restored. Thank you very much.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI (Karnataka): Sir, I completely endorse the views already expressed by my colleagues. The Parliament is supreme. It represents the sovereign will of the people. But, I am sorry to say that it has ceased to function effectively because of the executive. When the executive becomes inefficient, ineffective and avoids to face the Parliament, judicial activism comes in. Recently, we have seen judicial pronouncements regarding the functioning of the Parliament, regarding the functioning of the executive. I do not want to comment on the judicial pronouncements. But, ultimately the Parliament is supreme.

It should be allowed to function as a supreme body. The duration of the Parliament session should not be curtailed because of the Committee system. I had argued this when I was in the Government. It is not that I am arguing this point only today. When the Parliament meets, a number of issues concerning the nation, concerning the people are brought before it and debated. Thus, the Government is enlightened and it gets information and a consensus can be arrived at. I do not want to make a lengthy speech. Through you, Sir I appeal that we should find a way out to see that the Parliament/meets atleast for a minimum of 100 days in a year. I would like to mention here that we had visited the Ethics Committee of other countries. Shri Chavanji was the Chairman of our Committee. I remember that it used to meet every week. On Saturdays, Sundays and Mondays they did not meet. But, on one of the other four days they used to meet every week. It means that anything which happens in such meetings can be raised, discussed and debated in the Parliament and, thus, a decision can be taken by the Government. Therefore, to maintain the supremacy of the Parliament

and sovereignty of the people the duration should be kept up. I would like to know how it will be done. The Government should consult all leaders of the Opposition and see to it that the duration of the Parliament is not curtailed. And particularly, I have never heard of the monsoon session being postponed or cancelled. Parliament should meet at least for some days. We should not set a bad precedent.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I fully endorse the views expressed by my colleagues, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta, Dr. Biplab Dasgupta and Shri Bommai. Sir, we all know that Parliament is the highest forum in the country where we discuss different issues that arise in the country. Since the session was delayed we could not discuss the happenings of the nuclear explosion in time. We have been reading in the newspapers different Ministers expressing different views. We are rather upset about it. One day the Defence Minister of this country expressed his view declaring sprue nation as the enemy of the country". So, this was going on. Had a session been held at that time, we could have discussed all these matters. But somehow or other the session could not take place in time. We know that the 12th Lok Sabha was formed by the first week of March, then the new Government took over on the 19th of March. They took time to convene the Parliament. The Parliament was convened on the 27th of May. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta has already explained that we have only 24 working days and 7 Private Members' days. What does it show? It shows that gradually there is a concerted effort at degrading a public institution that is the Parliament, the highest authority in this country - which was created by the Constitution. Its powers, its privileges are being eroded gradually by various other organs of State. Biplabji has already mentioned this. The executive does not like to face the Parliament, specially the Question Hour because it is very uncomfortable.

The Ministers are only spokespersons. All the answers are prepared by the bureaucracy and the functioning of the various Departments of the Government come under fire. Sir, you have already been told that when the Members of the Ethics Committee travelled to various parts of the world, they saw how Parliaments in different democracies function. Parliament being the supreme body has a right to function properly. No Government has a right to erode the power of the Parliament. So, as a custodian of this House I implore upon you, Sir, to take into consideration that the Parliament should sit properly for not less than 150 days in a year. Why should the Monsoon Session be curtailed? The present Session is going to end virtually on the last day of July. Then we would meet again on 12th August. I suggest that when we meet again on 12th August, that Session could go on for another month and it could be called the Monsoon Session.

Sir, I request you to consider this issue and direct the Government to act accordingly.

Thank you, Sir. *jfto faiw epm mgm प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा* (दिल्ली) : सभापति महोदय, जो प्रश्न जहाँ उठाया गया है यह बहुत हि महत्व का है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस पर काफी गंभीरता से हम सबको विचार करना चाहिए। मैं इस बात से पूरी तरह सहमत हूँ कि इस सदन में बोलने का अधिक से अधिक समय मिलना चाहिए। सभापति महोदय, यह जो मॅबर्स बोलना चाहते हैं और उनको समय नहीं मिलता, मॅबर्स अपने क्लिपस को नाम देते हैं और उनको बोलने का टाइम नहीं मिल सकता, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह स्थिति अच्छी नहीं है। यह ठीक है कि सभी देशों में जितनी पार्लियामेंट्स को मैं जानता हूँ या मैंने देखा है वहाँ पर कोई समय की पावंदी नहीं है। जितना समय कोई बोलना चाहे उतना समय वह बोल सकता है और जितने विषयों पर बोलना चाहे उतने विषयों पर बोल सकता है। इसलिए सदन का समय इतना होना चाहिए कि वह इसके अंदर अधिक से अधिक, हर मॅबर एक विषय पर नहीं, दो पर नहीं, तीन पर नहीं, बल्कि सभी विषयों पर भी बोलना चाहे, तो वह बोल सके और उसको टाइम मिले। यह उसकी स्थिति

होनी चाहिए। यहाँ तो बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है खासकर जो हमारी बड़ी पोलिटिकल पार्टीज़ हैं उनके मॅबर्स अगर बोलना चाहें तो किसी एक विषय पर बोलें तो दूसरे पर बोलना का समय देना मुश्किल होता है। परन्तु मैं कुछ चीज़ें आपके सामने यह भी रखना चाहता हूँ, अभी गुरुदास जी ने बताया कि सभी पार्लियामेंट करीबन 9 महीने मिलती है और सप्ताह में चार दिन मिलती है तथा 120 से 150 दिन मिलती है यह बिल्कुल ठीक बात है। परन्तु कुछ बातें मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर पार्लियामेंट का समय क्या है दो बजे से रात 11.00 बजे तक वह बैठती है और कभी-कभी सुबह एक या दो बजे तक भी बैठती है वहाँ पर 9-10 घंटे रोज पार्लियामेंट मिलती है और वहाँ पर कोई कमेटी अलग नहीं मिलती है। कमेटीज सुबह मिलती है। 11.00 बजे से एक बजे तक कमेटीज की मीटिंग होती है तथा उसके बाद दो बजे से रात 11.00 बजे तक पार्लियामेंट होती है। यह सब जगह पर है। अगर ऐसा हो और इतना समय होगा जो फिर ज्यादा से ज्यादा मॅबर्स को समय मिलेगा। वहाँ पर उन्होंने इस बात का भी ध्यान रखा है कि पार्लियामेंट और कांस्टीट्यूंसी, दोनों को कैसे एक आदमी नर्स कर सकता है, तो उन्होंने चार दिन पार्लियामेंट रखी है और चार दिन कांस्टीट्यूंसी रखी है। तीन दिन भी नहीं, शुक्रवार को जाते हैं, शुक्र, शनि, इतवार और सोम, चार दिन अपनी कांस्टीट्यूंसी में तथा मंगल, बुध, वीर और शुक्र, ये अपनी संसद में तो चार दिन वहाँ पर और चार दिन यहाँ पर। एक दिन मैंने दोनों के बराबर कर दिए कि शुक्रवार को सुबह सेशन करते हैं और 12.00 बजे खत्म कर दिया। उसके बाद कांस्टीट्यूंसी में चले गए। उनकी कांस्टीट्यूंसी कितनी है इस बात को भी देखना चाहिए। इंग्लैंड में 5 करोड़, साढ़े 5 करोड़ की आबादि है और 668 मॅबर्स हैं। एक कांस्टीट्यूंसी 80 हजार की पॉपुलेशन पर और 40-50 हजार वोट हैं। फिनलैंड में 50 लाख की आबादी पर 200 मॅबर्स की पार्लियामेंट है। 50 लाख यानी दिल्ली से आधी आबादी। इटली में, फ्रांस में वही 5 करोड़ की आबादी है। 500, 600 मॅबर्स हैं और एक आदमी 80 हजार की कांस्टीट्यूंसी नर्स कर सकता है और यहाँ 20 लाख वोटर हैं, 15 लाख वोटर है या 10 लाख वोटर हैं। उसको भी कांस्टीट्यूंसी को नर्स करना हो और आप कहें कि साल भर यहाँ मीट होती रहे। कोई कांस्टीट्यूंसी में जा ही न सके तो वह भी ठीक नहीं है। दूसरी बात यह है कि वहाँ पर तिन महीने जो छुट्टी होती है, दो महीने गर्मियों में और 15-15 दिन क्रिसमस और गुड ईयर में। इन तीन महीनों में कोई मीटिंग नहीं होती, न किसी कमेटी की और न किसी और चीज की। तीन

महीने पूरी छुट्टी होती है। फिर 9 महीने में रोज सुबह कमेटियां मीट करें और बाद में सेशन। यह जो इंग्रेशन दिया गुरुदास जी ने यह हमारी बहन ने कि यह बी.जे.पी. की नई गवर्नमेंट ने आ कर के करटेल कर दिया तो यह स्थिति नहीं है। सभापति महोदय, सभी स्टेट असेंबलीज में यही हो रहा है। मैं अगर चाहूँ तो वेस्ट बंगाल का भी उदाहरण दे सकता हूँ कि वहाँ की असेंबली कितने दिन मिल रही है और कितने दिन डिक्लाइन हो रहा है। सभी स्टेट असेंबलीज में यह स्थिति हो रही है। तीन दिन, मीट करो, 6 महीने के बाद सेशन करो और फिर उसके बाद खत्म कर दो।

सभापति जी, वहाँ एक व्यक्ति ने बहुत अच्छी बात कही थी कि इम्प्रेशन यह होता है कि Parliament controls the Government, and the Government controls the bureaucracy. फिर उन्होंने कहा कि अब हमारे देशों में भी उल्टा हो गया है : The bureaucracy controls the Government, and the Government controls Parliament. इसलिए ब्यूरोक्रसी या एक्जीक्यूटिव ही सुप्रीम हो रही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह स्थिति बहुत गलत है और इसे नहीं होना चाहिए। यहाँ भी पार्लियामेंट सुप्रीम हो और पार्लियामेंट गवर्नमेंट को कंट्रोल करे व गवर्नमेंट ब्यूरोक्रसी को कंट्रोल करे। इस तरह पार्लियामेंट के नीचे सब रहें। लेकिन सभापति जी यहाँ जब बजट आएगा तो आप देखेंगे कि मुश्किल से एक या दो मिनिस्ट्रीज डिस्कस होंगी और "गिलोटिन" आ जाएगा। दो मिनिस्ट्रीज हो गयी हैं, अब टाइम नहीं है इसलिए गिलोटिन आ जाएगा। फिर यह जो स्टैंडिंग कमेटीज का फंक्शनिंग है, वहाँ 120 से 150 बताई है, हमारे यहाँ 18 स्टैंडिंग कमेटीज हैं, 43 कंसल्टेटिव कमेटीज हैं, फायनेंस कमेटीज हैं और उसके बाद कंसल्टेटिव कमेटीज हैं। इस तरह से ये करीबन 75-80 हो जाती है। ये सारी कमेटीज मिलती है, देशभर में दौरे पर भी जाती है और उनके दिन भी शामिल होते हैं। इसलिए हमें बहुत गंभीरता से कमेटी सिस्टम, पार्लियामेंट की फंक्शनिंग और ओपन डिस्कसन के साथ इनको मिलना चाहिए। फिर मेरी राय है कि संसद का समय भी बढ़ाना चाहिए और इसके मिलने का टाइम भी बढ़ाना चाहिए। सभापति जी, जब सालभर मिलेंगी तो फुल टाइम हो गए। अब इन्होंने यह नहीं बताया, यह हमेशा अपोज करते हैं, वहाँ उनको रिन्यूमरेशन क्या मिलता है, और सेक्रेटोरिएट सर्विस के लिए क्या मिलता है ? वहाँ कोई पार्लियामेंट का मेंबर नहीं है जिसे 6 लाख रुपए महीने से कम मिलता हो। जहाँ-जहाँ हम गए, उन चारों-पाँचों पार्लियामेंट्स में यह स्थिति है। आप कहें कि चौबिसों घंटे मिले, कोई और

काम न करें, अपनी कांस्टीट्यूंसी को नर्स करें और दूसरे काम करें फिर न उसके पास अपना डिपार्टमेंट, न पी0ए0 और न कोई और फेसिलिटीज हो। वहाँ 6 लाख रुपए देते हैं और कोई दूसरा काम वे नहीं करते। यह स्थिति वहाँ पर है।

सभापति जी, हमें इन सब चीजों पर विचार करना है कि एक मॅबर ऑफ पार्लियामेंट किस तरीके से पूरा काम कर सकता है और पार्लियामेंट की सुप्रिमेसी रखने के लिए मैं चाहूँगा कि आप स्पीकर के साथ भी बात करें। आप भी बैठे, और लीडर्स भी बैठकर विचार करें कि कमेटी सिस्टम को कैसे चेंज करना है ? शाम को पार्लियामेंट मिले, सुबह कमेटियां कैसे मिलें। वे 11 बजे मिलें, एक बजे लंच कर दें और 5 बजे छुट्टी कर दें। इस तरह वे 3-4 घंटे मिलें।

सभापति जी, आज उसमें भी बहुत ज्यादा समय ऐसी बातों पर बरबाद हो जाता है जो शायद न हो तो अच्छा है। बहुत समय ऐसे निकल जाता है और कोई काम नहीं होता। कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिना बहस के पास कर दो, फ़लां बिल आधे घंटे में पास कर दो, जो बिल करोड़ों लोगों की जिंदगी से ताल्लुक रखता है, वह एक घंटे में पास कर दो क्योंकि हम चर्चा के लिए ज्यादा समय देने को तैयार नहीं हैं। इस के लिए जरूरी है कि मॅबर्स को ज्यादा-से-ज्यादा बोलने का समय मिले। मॅबर्स को कोई रिस्ट्रिक्शन नहीं हो, जिस विषय पर वह बोलना चाहें, बोल सके। इन सारी बातों पर आप चेयरमैन साहब, स्पीकर, गवर्नमेन्ट और अपोजीशन-सब बैठकर विचार करें। पार्लियामेंट की सुप्रिमेसी तभी स्थापित हो सकती है।

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN (Maharashtra):  
Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am in agreement with what hon. Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta has said. It is a fact that there has been a conscious effort I am sorry for using this word—to curtail the period of the Session of the Parliament. I do not think that it will be a correct proposition to curtail the period of the Session of the Parliament. We should try to give it as much time as it is possible so that hon. Members are in a position to express their views on different issues.

I don't agree with Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta that it should be taken away from the Government. Ultimately the session is called for transacting the business of the Government. So, we cannot possibly

appropriate to ourselves the authority which normally the Government has to enjoy. But, at the same time, this cannot be a reason for curtailing the time of Parliament. You have to have enough time. We have to take a conscious decision on the number of days Parliament has to meet in a year.

My serious objection is to issuing of ordinances thereafter. This has become a normal practice now. It normally used to be an exceptional thing. Once or twice you consider a very urgent thing. You cannot possibly postpone it. But nowadays, during the session itself a decision is taken that there is no time and that we can issue an ordinance. The way in which ordinances are being issued is a serious misuse of power given under the Constitution. I can tell you a number of instances where ordinances have been re-issued three times or four times. When I was in the Home Ministry, I had to write to some of the State Governments saying that re-issue of an Ordinance three to four times is a total misuse of the power. You cannot do this. And once you give this authority, they misuse it like this. I think, that is the end of the democratic system. That is why I am totally opposed to the issue of an Ordinance unless it relates to a very urgent matter which cannot possibly wait. My request to you will be to try to see that Members get full opportunity to express their views and, as far as possible, the Government also should take a decision that it cannot make any policy decision outside the Parliament. Of course, in exceptional circumstances, I can understand it, but normally any policy decision has to be on the floor of the House so that Members get full opportunity to express their views. My only request will be not to make this a kind of a routine thing.

Now, I come to the point about Standing Committees that we have created. Standing Committees have been created with a definite purpose. The tendency of the officers seems to be that they do not like these Standing

Committees going into the details and the officers having to provide ready made material to all Members of Parliament. The point is if you do not have the time, you have at least the material in your hand and you can have enlightened discussion on the floor of the House. So, the Standing Committee's time should not be curtailed. The time of Parliament should also not be curtailed. If it is absolutely necessary, there is no harm in sitting late hours, but we should see to it that Parliament meets regularly. Curtailment of the time should not be there. On the other hand, the time should be extended to see that all issues are discussed on the floor of the House.

**सैयद सिब्ते रजी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** सर, एक बहुत ही संजीदा और गंभीर इश्यू पर हम यहां बात कर रहे हैं। विधान सभाओं में यह प्रक्रिया शुरू हुई है कि कहीं कहीं ऐसा देखा गया है कि बजट पास न करना हो तो शायद विधानसभा मिले ही नहीं। नतीजा, साल में दो बार एक, दो, तीन दिन के लिए बहुत सी विधान सभाएं मिलने लगीं और इसलिए मैं यहां यह कह रहा हूं कि आज उसका असर हमारी संसद पर भी पड़ रहा है। हमें इस विषय पर बहुत गंभीरता से सोचना चाहिए और निर्णायक तरीके से फैसला करना चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय, हमारे अधिकारों का हनन हुआ है, ईरोजन हुआ है, बहुत अपरेशन्स आए हैं, जैसी कि स्टैंडिंग कमेटीज के बारे में बात आई, मैं आपको बताना चाहूंगा कि जब स्टैंडिंग कमेटी बन रही थी तो उस समय यह शंका हम लोगों ने रखी थी कि बजट सेशन में जितनी स्टैंडिंग कमेटी मिलेंगी यह मानकर चलते हैं कि सेशन चल रहा है, लेकिन हम संसद और चैंबर में कोई बात नहीं करते हैं। यह 15 — 20 दिन का जो समय होता है, इसमें मुख्य रूप से जो क्वेश्चन आवर का सवाल होता है क्योंकि क्वेश्चन आवर हम लोगों का एक ऐसा अधिकार है, जिससे हम जनता के जलते हुए प्रश्न जो हैं उनको करते हैं और सरकार उन पर अपना जवाब देती है, बहुत से दूसरे सवालात आते हैं, जो हम कॉल-अटेन्शन के जरिए लाते हैं, हाफ एन आवर डिस्कशन के जरिए लाते हैं, शार्ट डियूरेशन डिस्कशन के जरिए लाते हैं, लेजिस्लेटीव बिजनेस को छोड़कर, यह हमारे एक साधारण मੈम्बर कि हैसियत से जो अधिकार हैं, उन तमाम अधिकारों पर अतिक्रमण होता है। मैं चाहता हूं कि एक तो सेशन के दिनों में कमी नहीं होनी चाहिए। मानसून सेशन जरूर बुलाया जाना चाहिए। इसी

کے ساتھ-ساتھ ہمیں اس پر بھی خیال کرنا چاہیے کہ جب اسٹینڈنگ کمیٹی بٹ رہی ہو تو ہاؤس آف دے جو ہے وہ اسٹینڈنگ کمیٹی کے لیے ہونا چاہیے اور ہاؤس آف دے پارلیامینٹ سیشن کے لیے رکھا جانا چاہیے، تبھی میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہم جنیتا کی جو آکاؤاؤں ہیں انکو پورا کر سکتے ہیں۔

سباپتی مہودے، بہت سے سواالاٹ یھاں اٹااے گاے ہیں، میں انکو رپاٹ نہیں کرنا چاھتا، لکین میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ سانسد سارے اءش کے لوگوں کے اءکھاراں کو پروٹکٹ کرنے کی گارنٹی اءتی ہے اور اگر ہمانے اسکے سیشن کے اءنوں کو اءیرے اءیرے کم کرنا شرو کر اءیا تو مؤاے اءر لگتا ہے کہ کھیں ہم بھی ویاان سبااؤں کے راستے پر ن چل پڑیں۔

انھیں شاءوں کے ساتھ گروااس ااسگؤٹ جی نے جو اءشؤ یھاں رکھا ہے، اسسے میں اپنے کو سبءء کرتا ہوں۔ شؤکریا۔

†سید سبط رضی "اٹر پردیش": سر۔ ایک

بہت ہی سنجیاء اور گمبھیر ایشو پر ہم یہاں باٹ کر رہے ہیں۔ وءھان سبھاؤں میں یہ پریکریہ شروع ہوئی ہے۔ کہ کہیں کہیں ایسا اءکھا گیا ہے کہ بچٹ پاس نہ کرنا ہو تو شاید وءھان سبھا ملے ہی نہیں۔ نتیجہ، سال میں اءو بار ایک، اءوٹین اءن کے لئے بہت سی وءھان سبھاایں ملنے لگیں اور اسی لئے میں یہاں کہہ رہا ہوں کہ آج اسکا اءثر ہمارى سانسد پر بھی پڑ رہا ہے۔ ہمیں اس و شے پر بہت سہی گمبھیرتا سے سوچنا چاہئے۔ اور نرنایک طریقہ سے فیصلہ کرنا چاہئے۔ سبھاپتی مہودے۔ ہمارے اءھیکاروں کا ہنن ہوا ہے۔ ابروزن ہوا ہے۔ بہت

اپریشنس آئے ہیں۔ جیسا کہ "اسٹینڈنگ کمیٹی" کے بارے میں باٹ آئی۔ میں آپکو باٹانا چاہوںگا کہ جب اسٹینڈنگ کمیٹی بن رہی تھی تو اس سمے یہ شنکا ہم لوگوں نے رکھی تھی کہ بچٹ سیشن میں جتنی بھی اسٹینڈنگ کمیٹی ملینگی یہ مان کر چلتے ہیں کہ سیشن چل رہا ہے۔ لیکن ہم سانسد اور چیمبر میں کوئی باٹ نہیں کرتے ہیں۔ یہ ۱۵-۲۰ اءن کا جو سمے ہوتا ہے اسمیں خاص طور پر جو "کوئشنز اور" کا سوال ہوتا ہے کیونکہ "کوئشنز اور" ہم لوگوں کا ایک ایسا اءھیکار ہے جس سے ہم جنٹا کے جلتے ہوئے پرسن جو ہیں انکو کرتے ہیں اور سرکار ان پر اپنا جواب اءیتی ہے۔ بہت سے اءوسرے سواالاٹ آتے ہیں جو ہم "کال اٹینشن" کے اءریعہ لاتے ہیں "ہاف این اور اءسکشن" کے اءریعہ لاتے ہیں "شارٹ اءیورشن اءسکشن" کے اءریعہ لاتے ہیں۔ پلسلیٹیو بزنس کو چھوڑ کر یہ ہمارے ایک سااھارن ممبر کی حیثیت سے جو اءھیکار ہیں ان تمام اءھیکاروں پر اءیکرمن ہوتا ہے۔ میں چاہتا ہوں کہ ایک تو سیشن کے اءنوں میں کبھی نہیں ہونا چاہئے۔ مانسون سیشن ضرور بلایا جانا چاہئے۔

†[ ]Transliteration in Arabic Script



اسی کے ساتھ ساتھ ہمیں اس پر بھی وچار کرنا چاہئے کہ جب اسٹینڈنگ کمیٹی بیٹھ رہی ہو تو "ہاف آف دہ ڈے" جو ہے وہ اسٹینڈنگ کمیٹی کیلئے ہونا چاہئے "ہاف آف دہ ڈے" وہ پارلیمنٹ سیشن کیلئے رکھا جانا چاہئے۔ تبھی میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ جنتا کی جو آکانشائیں ہیں انکو پورا کر سکتے ہیں۔

سبھا پتی مہودے۔ بہت سے سوالات یہاں اٹھائے گئے ہیں میں انکو ریپٹ نہیں کرنا چاہتا۔ لیکن میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ سنسد سارے دیش کے لوگوں کے ادھیکاروں کو پروٹیکٹ کرنے کی گارنٹی دیتی ہے اور اگر ہم نے اس کے سیشن کے دنوں کو دھیرے دھیرے کم کرنا شروع کر دیا تو مجھے ڈر لگتا ہے کہ کہیں ہم بھی ودھان سبھاؤں کے راستے پر نہ چل پڑیں۔ انہیں شبدوں کے ساتھ گرو داس داس گپتا جی نے جو ایشو یہاں رکھا ہے اس سے میں اپنے کو سمبڈھ کرتا ہوں۔ شکریہ۔ "ختم شد"

PROF. RAM KAPSE (Maharashtra): Mr. Chairman, Sir, when the Parliamentary Standing Committees were formed this issue was raised as to what should be done about the Question Hour. A suggestion was made by Mr. Madhu Limaye that the Question Hour should continue and the Standing Committee should meet after the Question Hour.

The problem was of accommodation. On the same day all the Committees could not meet and work. Ultimately, it was decided that we should discuss the Budget in the Standing Committees without the Question Hour. It was the same thing.

Regarding the issue of the number of sittings of the Parliament, it was discussed many times. We have discussed what the position was in 1950 and what the position was in 1970. Every year the number of sittings of Parliament has been reduced. This has happened. There was a clear-cut suggestion made by the Parliamentary Committee that the Parliament should meet for a specific number of days. But gradually the erosion has been there. I have a feeling that all the issues raised There—the number of sittings of Parliament, the issuing of Ordinances, how the Standing Committees should work and whether there should be—Question Hour on the days of the Standing Committee: meetings—should be discussed by Committee again in the light of the situation today. Thank you very much.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the matter raised by the hon. Member, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta deserves very serious consideration. The tendency to abridge the Parliament session is a denial of the very basic prerogative of the Parliament. Adequate and free debate in the Parliament on the issues of national importance brought by the Government or by the members is a prerogative of the Parliament. In fact, such a prerogative is the very heart, is the very essence of any liberal democracy. Increasingly, abridgement of the Parliament session is eroding our right. There is a growing apprehension in the minds of the people that the Government of the day wants a greater regimentation of the society and that is why they do not want to face the Parliament. It is a very unfortunate phenomenon. But it is there in reality. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that

we do not go on abridging the duration of the Parliament session. In India, it is not possible to follow the Western pattern of democracy. But certainly we have been having adequate debates, fairly long sessions. I have been in Parliament for the last 30 years and I have seen it. These days it is very difficult for Members to be able to have an opportunity to make their views known. That is "a" denial of our basic parliamentary right.

I also want to say a few words about issuing of Ordinances. The issuing of an Ordinance was contemplated to be an exception. Many rulings are there. The then Speaker, Lok Sabha, Mr. Mavlankar had said that Ordinances must come in the rarest of the rare cases. Now, that has become the rule of the day. It is very unfortunate. Therefore, the Government must be directed that Ordinances should not be issued except under compelling circumstances. Specially on policy matters, they should not take recourse to issuance of Ordinances. A law by an Ordinance is a denial of our parliamentary right. That is my respectful submission. Sir, something needs to be done and needs to be done urgently. Thank you very much.

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN (Uttar Pradesh) Mr. Chairman Sir, this is a very important issue and a very legitimate issue. I have been in this Parliament for the last 18 months. I feel that there is some sort of uncomfortableness on the part of those who are ruling the country and they do not want to face the Parliament properly. But the allegation against this particular Government that they do not want to face the parliament or the allegation against this particular Government that they desire to reduce the duration of the Parliament session, I think, is politically motivated. The erosion has been constant.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I never said that.

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN: You did not say that, but some aspersions

have been cast by my sister. So, these allegations are very unfortunate. We should discuss the issue that the duration of Parliament session should not be curtailed.

I am in full agreement with him on that issue. But the question is: How should it be done? We know that we are somehow having our own constraints. For example, sometimes the Members do not come to Parliament. How many Members are sitting here today? Very often there is a quorum bell and these issues cannot be merely brushed aside under the carpet. How much time do we waste in creating hoisy scenes and walk-outs? If we can save all this time, perhaps, we can utilise it more appropriately. I know that there is a basic right of a parliamentarian that he should be given adequate time to express his views on any subject of his choice. This basic right should not be denied. Mr. Chairman, Sir, through you, I would like to appeal to the Government that somehow this basic right should be restored in this country also. The Members of Parliament of this country feel seriously that they are not being given enough opportunity to express their views on many important subjects. Sir, through you, I would like to convey it to this House that an issue like defence has not been discussed in this Parliament for more than four years consecutively. The budget of the Defence Ministry has not been discussed in this Parliament. It has been just passed by a voice vote. It is happening not only in the case of the Defence Ministry, but many other important Ministries are not being discussed though it is said that the country is being ruled by Parliament. But the truth is that most of the Ministries are never being discussed in this Parliament. Even the recommendations of the Department-related Standing

Committees are not being discussed in Parliament. Why is it so? What is the situation? How can we rectify this malady? Sir, I would like to submit that the Parliament is not merely meant for the business of the Government, as has

been pointed out by my hon. colleague, Shri S.B. Chavan, though the business of the Government is of paramount importance. But the Parliament should also discuss the business of those Committees which have been constituted by the Parliament itself. There is a Business Advisory Committee; there are Calling Attention, there are Short Duration Discussions; there are many important matters which the Members want to raise, through you, before the House. They should also be allowed. If a Government has a right to push through their business, the Members must also be allowed to push through their business and the same should be discussed here. If they are denied their right, that would amount to curtailing the right of a Member of Parliament. Sir, through you, I would like to make an appeal to the Government that the Monsoon Session must be restored, and the erosion which has been set in by reducing the duration of Parliament, must be stopped. Thank you.

SHRIMATI JAYNATHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I would like to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta and I express my grave concern over the lessening of time for discussion in Parliament and the lessening of the number of sittings that Parliament had. Sir, actually, cutting across party lines, Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta and all of us have constantly raised this issue over the last three, four years, whichever Government has been in power. We have noticed a trend that the number of sittings have been lessened and we have always expressed our concern about the lessening of days of Parliament because it reduces the time by which the representatives of the people can put forward the problems of the people. It also prevents them from discussing very serious issues relating to governance, very serious issues of legislation and so on. Very often, the Finance Bill is passed by a voice vote when many of us have to say quite a great deal about it. Often, the Railway Budget where very important issues relating to different

States have to be raised, the same could not be raised' and we are unable to discuss the Railway Budget. Sir, just give me one minute more. I have to express my concern. I want to add a particular note of caution without any rancour and without politicising this issue that we are particularly concerned over the move made by this Government for two reasons. This is the first time in the history, I think,—and I stand corrected if I am wrong—that we are dispensing with one session altogether. Usually, there is a lessening of the number of days. Now, there is an attempt to dispense completely with the monsoon Session. This is really the Budget Session which will continue till July. This is not a good precedent for two or three reasons. The most important reason is—I would like to express this and I would request my friends to bear with me and to kindly discuss it amongst themselves also—that important issues have been raised by very senior members of the Government, the Home Minister and others, talking about a review of the Constitution, talking about a review of parliamentary democracy itself and talking about a Presidential form of Government. Sir, these are issues which have to be raised after a national debate. It seems to me that this Government, which is a coalition led by the BJP, is uncomfortable with the manifestation of parliamentary democracy, of dissent in Parliament.

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN: This is a wrong allegation, Sir. ... (*Interruptions*).. This is a wrong allegation, Sir. ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI BANGARU LAXMAN (Gujarat): You are trying to criticise. You are not on the issue. Please be on the issue.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: But these are my views. You are welcome to state your views. This is why you don't want Parliament. This is why you deserve ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI BANGARU LAXMAN: You are not on the issue again.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: You don't want to hear the other's views. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir I am sorry. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, you please complete it. ...*(Interruptions)*... You please- complete it. ...*(Interruptions)* ... Let her complete it.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I am completing. I am just saying, Sir, that on a very grave issue we feel—in a parliamentary democracy there are certain classes of people, the most disadvantaged class of people, who come to Parliament to raise their voices—that this Government is uncomfortable with this kind of a thing. That is why they want a fascist kind of authority ...*(Interruptions)*... I am not going into that. Sir, the last point I wish to raise is. ...*(Interruptions)*...

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : यह तो फासिस्ट जैसी बातें की जा रही है । यह क्या है . . .  
(व्यवधान)

What is this? What does it mean? This is too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with you, Mr. Malhotra. Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta has raised a general question, not concerning this Government alone. For decades, we have been saying this. Please do take it more seriously and don't make it cantankerous so that we can't take a serious view of the thing. Please complete it.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, with respect, I accept whatever you say. I am only saying that many times—we have also been on the other side—we have heard criticism. Sir, they can't be so intolerant of criticism. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN: What is this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please- complete it ...*(Interruptions)*... I say, complete it.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, the final issue I want to raise is about the Ordinance ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka) Sir, we also belong to a particular political party. We have patience to hear her. She has got every right to speak. My only submission is this. One senior Member has raised the issue, cutting across party-lines. Everybody is supporting him. But unfortunately, if she make such a sweeping allegation as 'fascist', who is more fascist than the people who had imposed emergency, who had put all of us in jails? We had been in jails for nearly 17½ months. Who is responsible? Her party, her leader ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please keep it to the point now.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I am only saying that when there is a review of the Government, people are asking for something like a review of the Constitution, like a Presidential form of Government as opposed to a Parliamentary form of Government, these are very dangerous trends seen along with the lessening of sittings of Parliament ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): This has been discussed all along. This is a debate which is going on in the country. This is a continuing debate ...*(Interruptions)*... The word that she used was 'regimentation'; that this Government wants regimentation. These are the allegations ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I am finishing, Sir. I don't want to accept that ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, please sit down ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: My last issue is this ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: You allow her to speak. What is this? She has a right to speak. You have to listen to her. Don't interrupt her.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I am on the last issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why did you unnecessarily raise it?

*(Interruptions)*

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Why are you interrupting her?

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: You used a strong language, and then you say that you are interrupting! ....*(Interruptions)*...There is a limit to our patience too.

*(interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Nothing more, nothing more, nothing more.

SHRIMATI JAYANATHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I am going to the last issue, about the Ordinance. I would like the time to be extended for Parliament to sit so that we can discuss very important issues, e.g. the Ordinance relating to power because the power Ordinance.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please don't bring in this. This is a general debate.

SHRIMATI JAYANATHI NATARAJAN: All right, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can raise that in the Business Advisory Committee also.

**संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री राम नाईक) :** सभापति महोदय, मैं माननीय सदस्य गुरुदास दाशगुप्त जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने एक महत्वपूर्ण विषय यहां उठाया है और अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने भी अपने-अपने विचार रखे हैं। सरकार को भी इस बात कि चिंता है कि संसद के काम करने के दिनों में कमी नहीं होनी चाहिए। यह चिंता हम भी जताना चाहते हैं लेकिन यह कहानी 50 वर्षों की है जो यहां पर बताई गई। अब नई सरकार आई है। देश के पहले प्रधान मंत्री पंडित नेहरू जी के जमाने से गुजराल जी के जमाने तक जो पार्लियामेंट के काम करने के दिन धीरे-धीरे कम होते आए हैं, हमारा यह प्रयास रहेगा कि इसमें हम परिवर्तन लाएं। इन परिवर्तन में हम सदन को विश्वास में लेंगे और सभापति जी, आपके साथ भी विचार-विमर्श करके जो उपयुक्त निर्णय होंगे, उनको लागू करने का हमारा प्रयास रहेगा लेकिन इस समय यह

बात ध्यान में रखनी चाहिए कि मार्च में चुनाव हुए और पहला अधिवेशन 19 मार्च को हुआ, बाद में बजट बनाना था और बजट बनाने के बाद सेशन शुरू हुआ है। अब वह बजट कमेटीयों के पास जाएगा और 3 जुलाई को जब सेशन शुरू होगा तो तांत्रिक दृष्टि से बारिश शुरू ही होती है जुलाई में। आपने उसको मानसून सेशन कहना है तो आप कह सकते हैं लेकिन बारिश तो शुरू ही हो रही है और फिर सदन चलने वाला ही है। इसलिए इसमें और कुछ परिवर्तन करना चाहिए यदि ऐसा लगता है तो वह करने के लिए हमारी ओर से कोई कठिनाई नहीं है, सबकी सहमति से चर्चा करने के लिए हम कभी डरते नहीं हैं, डरेंगे नहीं। हम चर्चा को उपयुक्त मानते हैं इसलिए इसके बारे में हमें कोई चिंता नहीं है।

जहां तक ऑर्डिनेन्स निकालने की बात की गई, यह बात जिन्होंने की है, उन्होंने सारी बातें बताई कि ऑर्डिनेन्स निकालने की आदत अच्छी नहीं है। हम भी यह मानते हैं और हम भी यही कहते आए हैं। इसलिए भविष्य में हमारा यह प्रयास रहेगा कि जब तक अति-आवश्यक न हो, ऑर्डिनेन्स निकालना आवश्यक नहीं है ऐसा हम मानते हैं और हम इस प्रकार का व्यवहार आगे करके दिखाएंगे। जो समितियां बनी हैं, इन समितियों के पास यह बजट जाएगा, बीच में छुट्टी है। तो करटेल करने का कोई सवाल नहीं है। सारा बजट अलग-अलग स्थायी समितियों के पास चर्चा के लिए जाएगा। जब रिपोर्ट आएंगी तो उनकी रिपोर्ट में तो समय लगने वाला है और 3 जुलाई के बाद उन पर बहस हो सकती है। इन सारी बातों को देखते हुए यह जो महत्वपूर्ण विषय उठाया गया है, उसके संबंध में हम यह राय व्यक्त करना चाहते हैं कि सदन के काम करने का समय आज तक जिस तरह से कम होता आया है, वैसा आगे कम नहीं होगा। इस दिशा में हम आगे बढ़ने कि कोशिश करेंगे और संसद की पहले जो प्रतिष्ठा थी काम करने की, उस प्रकार की प्रतिष्ठा हम फिर से स्थापित करने का प्रयास करेंगे।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि सारा सदन इसमें हम लोगों को सहयोग दे।

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, ....

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, please don't ask anything now.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Sir, I have a specific question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, please, Let us not discuss it any further. I know there is nothing specific now.

We are not discussing about an issue of the present session. We are discussing a general problem. I was also a Member of this House. The number of days have been reducing over the decades. So, we are taking a very serious note of it. The issue should not be taken as relating to this session of this Government. Let us realise it. The other thing is that we have discussed it. The issue we are discussing is not the shortening of this session. We have seen that in the last few decades the Houses have been meeting and adjourning daily. That is also shortening of the session, not making the Parliament efficient, not making the Houses work efficiently. We are asking for powers and privileges. We are giving up our Question Hour. We are giving up our powers and privileges. The issue is much bigger. So, don't take this session or that session. I would say that this is a very important issue raised by the hon. Members. There is a unanimity on this. We will consult the Lok Sabha and refer this issue to the General Purposes Committee of the Rajya Sabha so that we can thoroughly discuss it. What is happening is that for decades the number of days has been decreasing. We should also discuss how the Members are themselves responsible for boycotting the Houses for eight days, ten days, fifteen days and twenty days and the Houses are not meeting. Everything should be discussed so that we can make our parliamentary : /stem much more effective, much mo purposive, and this question will not a ise. It is a much broader question. Please take it that way, not relating it to this session alone. I think whatever we say, the Government, whichever Government it bp, will have to accept. I am referring this issue to the General Purposes Committee. We will form the Committee and start working on this.

1. P.M

#### **Atrocities on Dalits in Orissa**

SHRI SANATAN BISI (Orissa): Sir, I am raising a very serious matter regarding atrocities on Dalits in Orissa. On 20th May, landless Dalit families were attacked by the upper caste people of a nearby village, apprehending danger, the Dalit families have left the village Bhanpur, District Puri, Orissa. In this severe attack one was killed and several others were injured. Some of the injured have been admitted to a hospital in the Capital. Even women and children were not spared.

During 1995, the number of crimes committed against the Scheduled Tribes was 143 and against the Scheduled Castes was 329.

Sir, I demand a high level inquiry into the matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now it is one o'clock. I adjourn the House till two o'clock.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one minute past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at five minutes past two of the clock,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN, (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE) *in the Chair*.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): We would new take up the Zero Hour Submissions. DrJ. Mahesh Chandra Sahrma.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam, I have a point of order. There is no Cabinet Minister present in the House.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR (DR. SATAYANARAYAN JATIA): I am here.

SHRIMATI, JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I am so sorry.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): Government has not supplied a list of Ministers to us. That is why there is this confusion.