

RESIGNATION OF SHRI BANARSI DAS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have to inform Members that I have received a letter from Shri Banarsi Das, Member representing the State of Uttar Pradesh, resigning his seat in the Rajya Sabha. I accepted his resignation today, the 28th June, 1977.

RE. BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

नेता सदन (श्री लाल कृष्ण अडवाणी) : उप-सभापति जी, एक निवेदन है। आज के सप्ताह केपार में जो प्रम है उसमें श्रम मदन की अनुमति हो तो श्री राजनारायण जो जिस बिज को प्रस्तुत करने वाले हैं, उसको कहलें ले लिया जाये।

श्री प्रकाशचोर शास्त्री (उत्तर प्रदेश) : क्यों ?

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal) : Sir, I rise on a point of order because I have already submitted a petition to you. I do not know what is the attitude of the present Government to the Rajya Sabha. For the last two days the agenda paper contained the Additional Emoluments Bill which is agitating our minds and the working class as a whole. We came prepared and suddenly found that it was surreptitiously withdrawn. Is this the way that this House is going to be treated? Is this the way they are going to treat democratic norms and forms, parliamentary norms and forms? They may be a minority here. But the Congress Government was also a minority here for some time. At least on the agenda paper the Bill was there for two days. I had personally talked to the Secretary-General and he said that it would be discussed on Monday. From Monday it was postponed to Tuesday and now it has been withdrawn. It is such a vital Bill, such an important Bill affecting 20 million workers. It has been debated in the Lok Sabha and we were all prepared to debate it here and give an opinion the people expected us to give. The working class are waiting for it but it is surreptitiously withdrawn. What is the attitude? Are they going to take away our right to discuss such vital Bills here? I expect the Leader of the House to say something about it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, on this point...

SHRI NRIPATI RANJAN CHOUDHURY (Assam) : Sir, I have also written to you about it. The question is not only that of the attitude of the Government but also of propriety. This is not an ordinary Bill. This Bill seeks to replace an ordinance. Now, today we are dispersing; I think the House adjourns sine die today. Actually, we received this Bill from the Lok Sabha. It is the property of the House. It is not the business of the Government or only the sweet will of the Government to decide whether to press for the Bill or not. It is the property of the House and the House has to decide whether they are discussing it; and the House has to consider it and return it to the Lok Sabha. Sir, there is the Business Advisory Committee. Whereas it was discussed in the Business Advisory Committee and listed for today, we do not find it in the Revised List of Business for the day. My humble question is : whether the Business Advisory Committee was taken into confidence while doing so; if not why? The second point is that when this particular Bill seeks to replace an ordinance, I do not know what is the legal position about it, what about the ordinance? Can it stand after today? What is the Constitutional position of the ordinance? Can it stand after today? If not, why are they not revoking it? Let them revoke it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, on this point, the matter should be taken seriously. Now, we were all ready for taking up this Bill, but suddenly this morning I also came to know that this Bill was not going to come up before this House; this part of the session would not be utilised for considering it. Sir, the Government owes an explanation as to why this ordinance was issued. Under the Constitution, there are some provisions. Unless they are corresponding to a Bill, with changes or without changes, the ordinance lapses after a period of six weeks or so, I think. Now, this is the position. Do I understand that