

that it was only after the answer that I gave in the House on 7th August that the *Observer* published a letter of our Public Relations Officer on the 11th August for the first time after a very long time.

I hope this background will clear any misunderstanding I may have created in the minds of some Hon'ble Members for which I once again express regret.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): I had also written to you about this. This London *Observer* is consistently pursuing an anti-India posture. This paper has not excused India becoming free. In its article by Colin Legnum published on 11 August, It has called the problem of Naga hostiles as a 'problem of minority'. It is not a problem of minority. But unfortunately, our London High Commission was sleeping over this matter all through. It did not contradict the articles published in the *Observer* during June. Would you not direct the Minister to take action against the High Commissioner?

12.18 HRS.

PUNJAB STATE LEGISLATURE
(DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL*

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to confer on the President the power of the Legislature of the State of Punjab to make laws.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is: "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to confer on the President the power of the Legislature of the State of Punjab to make laws."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I introduce the Bill.

MOTION UNDER RULE 338 IN
RESPECT OF FOREIGN MARRIAGE BILL

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW (SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM): I beg to move: "That rule 338 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the motion for concurrence in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha for reference of the Foreign Marriage Bill, 1963, to a Joint Committee, adopted by Lok Sabha on the 13th August 1968, be suspended".

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Why? Without any explanation?

MR. SPEAKER: One Member is being substituted by another. The question is:

"That rule 338 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the motion for concurrence in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha for reference of the Foreign Marriage Bill, 1963, to a Joint Committee, adopted by Lok Sabha, on the 13th August 1968, be suspended.

The motion was adopted.

MOTIONS RE: JOINT COMMITTEE
ON FOREIGN MARRIAGE BILL

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW (SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM): I beg to move: That the decision taken by Lok Sabha on the 13th August, 1968, on the motion for concurrence in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha for reference of the Foreign Marriage Bill, 1963, to a Joint Committee, be rescinded".

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the decision taken by Lok Sabha on the 13th August, 1968, on the motion for concurrence in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha for reference of the Foreign

Marriage Bill, 1963, to a Joint Committee be rescinded”.

The motion was adopted.

SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM : I beg to move :

“(i) That in the motion for concurrence in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha for reference of the Foreign Marriage Bill, 1963, to a Joint Committee moved in Lok Sabha on the 13th August, 1968, the following amendments be made :

- (a) for ‘Shri C. M. Krishna’ substitute ‘Shri S. M. Krishna’;
 (b) for ‘Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor’ substitute ‘Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta’; and

(ii) that the said motion for concurrence in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha for reference of the Foreign Marriage Bill, 1963, to a Joint Committee, as amended be adopted.”

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

“(i) That in the motion for concurrence in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha for reference of the Foreign Marriage Bill, 1963, to a Joint Committee moved in Lok Sabha on the 13th August 1968, the following amendments be made :

- (a) for ‘Shri C. M. Krishna’ substitute ‘Shri S. M. Krishna’;
 (b) for ‘Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor’ substitute ‘Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta’; and

(ii) that the said motion for concurrence in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha for reference of the Foreign Marriage Bill, 1963, to a Joint Committee, as amended be adopted”.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : For Shri S. M. Krishna, they had put Shri C. M. Krishna and for Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor. Why ?

MR. SPEAKER : It was a printing error or some such mistake.

SHRI HEM BARUA : Were the names wrongly put deliberately or through mistake ?

MR. SPEAKER : Not deliberately I am sure.

SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM : I can assure him it was not deliberate.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : It is not deliberate, but it is an emblem of inefficiency.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR : (Gurgaon) : I beg to move :

That in part (a) of the motion,—
 for “Shri S. M. Krishna” substitute “Syed Badrudduja” (1)

That in part (a) of the motion,—
 for “Shri S. M. Krishna” substitute “Sirdarni Nirlep Kaur”(2)

That in part (b) of the motion,—
 for “Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta” substitute “Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait” (3)

That in part (b) of the motion,—
 for “Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta” substitute “Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani” (4)

स्पीकर साहब, मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह इस सेशन में चौथी बार है कि नामों में तब्दीली की गई। मैंने अर्ज किया था कि इस सरकार को इस ढंग से हाउस के सामने आना चाहिए कि यह किसी को पैट्रोनाइज करना चाहते हैं, वह करें, हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है क्योंकि इन की मेजारिटी है किसी को हटाएँ, किसी को रखें लेकिन अगर किसी को आप फायदा पहुंचाना चाहते हैं तो यह बार-बार जो हाउस के सामने आता है यह ठीक नहीं है क्योंकि सात आठ साल से मुझे कभी ऐसा तजर्बा नहीं हुआ कि ज्याइंट सेलेक्ट कमेटी के नाम ल आये और फिर उस को तब्दील करें। इसलिए मैं ने कहा कि बजाय इस के कि इन को रखें, निर्जैप कौर जी को रखें या मुचेता जी को रखें। मैं यह इसलिए अर्ज कर रहा हूँ कि इस तरीके को इन को छोड़ ही देना चाहिए। इस से इन का कोई फायदा नहीं है। शायद यह किसी को खुश करना चाहते

ہے۔ کچھ ممبروں کو اس لیے ایسا کرتے ہیں۔ اگرچہ تو میں ایسے ہی دُکھی ہوں کہ یہ جوائنٹ سلیکٹ کمیٹی جو بناتی ہے وہ کسی خاص موضوع میں بنے تو سمجھ میں آ سکتا ہے لیکن کچھ موضوعوں کو ایک ممبر بنانے کے لیے ہر ایک ممبر بن نہیں سکتا، 285 ہے، یہ 285 تو ممبر بنانے سے ہے۔ کچھ بننے کو چاہتے ہیں۔ اس لیے کہ اس کے ذریعے سے آپ کی درخواست کو اس کے لیے دیکھا جائے۔ اس کے لیے ان کا کوئی فائدہ نہیں ہے۔ شاید یہ کسی کو خواہش کرنا چاہتے ہیں کچھ ممبروں کو اس لیے ایسا کرتے ہیں۔ اول تو میں ایسے ہی دیکھی ہوں کہ یہ جوائنٹ سلیکٹ کمیٹی جو بنتی ہے وہ کسی خاص موضوع میں بنے تو سمجھ میں آ سکتا ہے لیکن کچھ ممبروں کو ایک ممبر بنانے کے لیے دیکھیں کہ ہر ایک ممبر بن نہیں سکتا۔ 285 میں وہ 285 تو ممبر بنانے سے ہے۔ کچھ ممبروں کو اس لیے ایسا کرتے ہیں۔ اول تو میں ایسے ہی دیکھی ہوں کہ یہ جوائنٹ سلیکٹ کمیٹی جو بنتی ہے وہ کسی خاص موضوع میں بنے تو سمجھ میں آ سکتا ہے لیکن کچھ ممبروں کو ایک ممبر بنانے کے لیے

نہیں ہوا کہ جوائنٹ سلیکٹ کمیٹی کے نام سے انہیں اور یہ اس کو تبدیل کریں۔ اس لیے میں نے کہا کہ بجائے اس کے کہ ان کو دیکھیں نہ کہ اس کے لیے اس طرح سے ہی دیکھا جائے۔ اس کے لیے ان کا کوئی فائدہ نہیں ہے۔ شاید یہ کسی کو خواہش کرنا چاہتے ہیں کچھ ممبروں کو اس لیے ایسا کرتے ہیں۔ اول تو میں ایسے ہی دیکھی ہوں کہ یہ جوائنٹ سلیکٹ کمیٹی جو بنتی ہے وہ کسی خاص موضوع میں بنے تو سمجھ میں آ سکتا ہے لیکن کچھ ممبروں کو ایک ممبر بنانے کے لیے دیکھیں کہ ہر ایک ممبر بن نہیں سکتا۔ 285 میں وہ 285 تو ممبر بنانے سے ہے۔ کچھ ممبروں کو اس لیے ایسا کرتے ہیں۔ اول تو میں ایسے ہی دیکھی ہوں کہ یہ جوائنٹ سلیکٹ کمیٹی جو بنتی ہے وہ کسی خاص موضوع میں بنے تو سمجھ میں آ سکتا ہے لیکن کچھ ممبروں کو ایک ممبر بنانے کے لیے

[شری عبدالغنی قاد (گورگاہوں) :

میں نے عرض کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ اس سیشن میں چوتھی بار ہے کہ ناموں میں تبدیلی کی گئی۔ میں نے عرض کیا تھا کہ اس سورا کو اس وقت تک سے ہاؤس کے سامنے آنا چاہئے کہ یہ کسی کو پہنچا دیا جائے۔ چاہئے کہ اس میں کوئی اعتراض نہیں ہے کیونکہ ان کی میٹنگ میں کسی کو ہتھیار کسی کو دیکھیں لیکن اگر کسی کو آپ فائدہ پہنچانا چاہتے ہیں تو یہ بار بار جو ہاؤس کے سامنے آتا ہے یہ ٹھیک نہیں ہے کہ اس کے ساتھ آئے سال سے مجھے کبھی اسے تجربہ

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA (Cuttack): After adopting a decision of item No. 12 of the order paper, what happens is that the decision taken earlier is rescinded. What else remains? After the decision had been rescinded, does the motion remain? What is sought to be amended by item 13?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion which has been moved now.

MR. SRINIBAS MISRA: That motion does not contain all the names.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister will explain the position in his reply.

SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM: I vehemently oppose the amendment moved by the hon. Member Abdul Ghani Dhar.

Regarding the other point raised by Shri Srinibas Misra. I submit that after the motion adopted by this House had been rescinded, I hereby move another motion with certain minor amendments. Kindly refer to sub-para (ii) of the said motion:

"That the said motion for concurrence in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha for reference of the foreign Marriage Bill, 1963, to a Joint Committee, as amended, be adopted."

There is motion adopted by the Rajya Sabha recommending certain Members to the Joint Committee. The recommendation is already there I propose the adoption of that recommendation with same minor modifications. I shall read the names: Shri C. M. Krishna, I propose the substitute that by Shri S. M. Krishna, Shri Ramachandra J Amin, Shri A. E. T. Barrow.

Shri B. N. Bhargava, Shri Jyoti Basu—

AN HON. MEMBER: He is in Bengal.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Jyotirmoy Basu.

SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM: Yes; Jyotirmoy Basu, Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri, Shri D. K. Das Chowdhury

Shri Devinder Singh, Shri Shri Chand Goyal, Shri V. N. Jadhav, Shri Shiva Chandra Jha, Shri Z. M. Kahandole, Shri Dhireswar Kalita, Shri Liladhar Kotoki, Shri V. Krishnamoorthi, Shrimati Sangam Laxmi Bai, Shri Vikram Chand Mahajan, Dr. M. Santosham; and in the place of Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor, Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta; then Shrimati Shakuntala Nayar, Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey, Shri S. B. Patil, Shri Bhola Raut, Shri Mohammad Yunus Saleem, Shri P. A. Saminathan, Shri Shiv Kumar Shastri, Shri Janardan Jagannath Shinkre, Shri Sant Bux Singh, Shri Nagendra Prasad Yadav, and Shri P. Govinda Menon. These are the names.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is before the House.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA: After that motion is voted, is there any other motion before the House? You have to decide it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: There is the Rajya Sabha Motion.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA: Where is it circulated?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): It would have been a mere correction if, for Shri S. M. Krishna, he has mentioned it as Shri C. M. Krishna, because there is only one Krishna in this House. But so far as the name of Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor is concerned, the person is here and his name has been accepted. Now, in the amendment he wants to change that and being in an other person. How can that happen?

AN HON. MEMBER: Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor and Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta are different. The former belongs to the PSP.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: We have no quarrel and we are not claiming two people. So far as the motion is concerned, we have already accepted one particular name. If it is a mere correction of a name it may be all right, but now it is a different person altogether.

श्री अब्दुल गनी वार : स्पीकर साहब, मैंने तो इस ख्याल से इन की तबज़ह दिलाई थी कि पुरुषों के साथ स्त्रियों का भी उतना ही दर्जा है, जितना मर्दों का है। चूँकि इस में स्त्रियों को पूरी नुमाइन्दगी नहीं दी गई थी, इसलिये मैंने श्रीमती सुचेता कृपालानी और सरदारनी निर्लेप कौर का नाम पेश किया था इन्होंने इसे कुबूल नहीं किया है, इस लिये मैं इसे वापस लेना चाहता हूँ।

[اسی میں اضافی نو: سپیکر صاحب -

میں نے تو اس خیال سے انکی توجہ دلائی تھی، کہ پوروں کے ساتھ استریوں کا بھی اتنا ہی درجہ ہے جتنا مردوں کا ہے۔ چونکہ اس میں استریوں کو پوری نمائندگی نہیں دی گئی تھی اس لئے میں نے شریمتمتی سوجیتا کربلائی اور سردارنی نرلپ کور کا نام پش کیا تھا۔ انہوں نے اسے قبول نہیں کیا ہے اس لئے - ہر اسے واپس لینا چاہتا ہوں -]

SHRI S. KANDAPAN (Mettur) : You cannot remove an elected person ike that.

MR. SPEAKER : Why is it that Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor is to be replaced by Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta ?

SHRI M YUNUS SALEEM : It was by mistake that Shri Kapoor's name was mentioned. As a matter of fact, we wanted to have Shri Lakhan Lal Gupta.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor is also an elected Member.

SHRI PARTHASARATHY (Rajampet) : Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor is not in the Congress. (Interruption)

SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM : That motion is also rescinded now. Now, the question to be considered is whether I am permitted to move this

motion with these amendments or not. That motion which was already adopted has already been rescinded by this House. Therefore, we need not consider that motion. The motion was adopted already on the 13th August. Now, the question is whether this motion with these amendments should be adopted by this House or not. That is the only question.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : Then it has to be circulated. This motion comes in after we have adopted that motion. Now, if the Minister comes with another motion, that motion must be circulated.

MR. SPEAKER : He has read it out.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : It has to be circulated. After that, it will come. Where is that motion now ?

MR. SPEAKER : What the Rajya Sabha passes is agreed to and the motion is before the House. It is not something new. The Rajya Sabha message comes to the Lok Sabha, and the Lok Sabha messages go to the Rajya Sabha. This has been sent to the Lok Sabha and we send it to the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA . But what is the procedure of this House ? After we adopt a motion, there is no further motion. In order to move a motion here, he has to circulate it saying "this is the motion and I want to amend it" and so on.

MR. SPEAKER : The Rajya Sabha motion, I am told, is already placed before the House.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : It was placed, but where is our motion? Our motion has been adopted.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTHI (Madurai) Rule 338 has been suspended. The decision taken by the Lok Sabha on the 13th August, 1968 has been totally rescinded. What have we got now ? He should bring a fresh motion.

MR. SPEAKER : The motion before the House is the recommendation of the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTHI : That is not the only motion. He has added the names also. Let him bring a fresh motion with the list of names.

MR. SPEAKER : If you are taking objection on technical grounds, it can come up tomorrow. I thought it was waste of the time of the House and we can as well approve it today. But if you want, it can be taken up tomorrow.

SHRI DATTRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba) : It is not a question of our wanting it. The Rules of Procedure of the House require it.

SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM : If you consider the wording of the motion, the position will be clarified.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : It is a bad precedent that some hon. member who has been already elected should be removed on some ground.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. minister may bring it tomorrow.

SHRI M. YUNUS SALEEM : If that is your ruling, I will do it. But it is not necessary at all, if you consider the wording of the motion.

MR. SPEAKER : Hon. members are not happy that the name of an hon. member, who has been elected to the committee, should be changed. It might have been a mistake. May be you wanted to elect somebody else. But that name is existing and he has been elected. It is so urgent or important in national interest to remove his name and bring in another name? Absolutely not.

12.38 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE:
CONTINUING OF PRESIDENT'S
PROCLAMATION IN RESPECT OF
WEST BENGAL—*Contd.*

MR. SPEAKER : The House will now resume further discussion on the solution regarding West Bengal. 2

hours 50 minutes remain. Mr. Shukla may continue.

12.38½ hrs.

(MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : Sir, I had moved this resolution yesterday and given a general picture regarding the law and order situation and labour situation and other matters which concern West Bengal. There is only one additional point which I wish to make today. That is regarding the food situation and essential supplies in West Bengal. The House will remember that during the last 2 years, several times the question was raised in the House regarding food supplies in West Bengal. It was also urged that the Central Government was unsympathetic to the UF Government that they were not doing their best to give the necessary food supplies to West Bengal, that the West Bengal Government was not able to supply the necessary amount of rations to the people and the system of statutory rationing was not functioning well.

Sir, without making any comment on that I would like to give some figures to the House which will make this matter abundantly clear as to how this situation was there and how the situation could improve after the imposition of President's Rule in West Bengal. The main matter was regarding the internal procurement in the State of West Bengal itself. As against 626000 tonnes of rice which was procured in the earlier period there was only 103,000 tonnes of rice which was procured in the corresponding period between 22nd February to 4th July this year. This is the difference which explains why there was difficulty in the supply of food-grains to the people of West Bengal.

How was this difficulty solved? This difficulty was not solved by rushing additional supply or doing any such thing. It was all done by internal arrangements, intensifying the