

[Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman]

the Delimitation Commission
Act, 1962.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6598/66].

ANNUAL REPORT OF INDIAN CENTRAL
ARECANUT COMMITTEE

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri Shyam Dhar Misra): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the Indian Central Arecanut Committee for the year 1964-65. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-6599/66].

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER KERALA PANCHAYATS ACT AND ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES ACT

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri Shinde): I beg to lay on the Table:

- (1) A copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (3) of section 130 of the Kerala Panchayats Act, 1960, read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 24th March, 1965, issued by the Vice-President, discharging the functions of the President, in relation to the State of Kerala:—

- (i) The Kerala Panchayat Employees (Medical Attendance) Rules, 1966, published in Notification S.R.O. No. 33/66 in Kerala Gazette dated the 8th February, 1966.
- (ii) The Kerala Panchayats (Oath of Office by Members) Rules, 1966, published in Notification S.R.O. No. 76/66 in Kerala Gazette dated the 22nd February, 1966.
- (iii) S.R.O. No. 94/66 published in Kerala Gazette dated the 1st March, 1966, making certain amendment to the Kerala Panchayats (Proceedings of Panchayat Meet-

ings and Committees)
Rules, 1962.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6600/66].

- (2) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the Notifications mentioned in item (1) above.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6601/66].

- (3) A copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955:—

- (i) The Sugarcane Press-mud (Control) Amendment Order, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 630 in Gazette of India dated the 7th May, 1966.

- (ii) The Sugarcane (Control) Order, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1126 in Gazette of India dated the 16th July, 1966.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6602/66].

- (4) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the Notification mentioned at (i) of item (3) above.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6603/66].

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of clarification, I am somewhat reluctant to raise this point again and again, but unless it is driven home day after day, I am afraid the Government will not improve. That is why I crave your indulgence and the indulgence of the House to raise it today also.

Again, the same thing has occurred. The reasons for delay in laying the statements on the Table of the House are given in two places. There is a statement showing reasons for delay in laying the Notifications mentioned in item (1), and again there is a statement showing the reasons for delay

in laying the Notification mentioned at (i) of item (3). I would like to know whether we can look forward to a day in the near future when this matter will become a thing of the past.

There is another small point. It just caught my eye as I was casually glancing through the Order Paper. In item 4 of the Order paper there is a Gazette Notification dated 5th May, the laying of that is not considered to be late, but that of a Gazette Notification dated 7th May is considered so late that reasons have been given for the delay in laying it on the Table of the House. Why this curious anomaly that a Notification dated 5th May is not considered late, when a Notification dated 7th May is considered late? This is an anomaly which should be explained. The Ministry should not be so negligent and remiss, it is the same Ministry in both cases.

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri C. Subramaniam): I agree. I thought Parliament adjourned in the first week of May. Therefore, naturally after Parliament has reassembled again, we have placed it. In this case also, unfortunately we could not lay it immediately because Parliament had adjourned. We shall see that delays are avoided as far as possible.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Not the first, but third week of May.

Mr. Speaker: He means to say for 5th May there is no delay, for 7th May there is delay, why that difference.

12.16 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: MEMBERSHIP OF
ADVOCATES ACT REVIEW COM-
MITTEE

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Law (Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman): I beg to inform the House that it is proposed to appoint Shri C. N. Dikshit, Member, Lok Sabha, as a Member of the Advocates Act Review Committee in the vacancy caused by the sad demise of Shri S. V. Rama-

swamy. Shri Dikshit has agreed to serve on the Committee.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): What is this Review Committee about?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): This Committee was to review the Advocates Act which has been passed because there were anomalies. I want to know how long this is going to take and when it is going to give its report. Will the new Advocates Bill be passed by this Parliament?

Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman: I expect there will be one or two more meetings; they have already finished two meetings, and it will then be placed on the Table of the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I hope it will come before the last session of this Parliament.

12.17 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: JUDGMENT BY
INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE
ON SOUTH WEST AFRICA

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): The Government of India has seen with deep disappointment the judgment of the International Court of Justice on South West Africa. The Government of South Africa has persistently refused to place the territory of South West Africa under UN Trusteeship as required under the Charter. On the other hand, the South African Government has been taking measures to incorporate South West Africa as one of its provinces applying to it all the evils of apartheid to which it has subjected its own non-white population.

It will be recalled that certain aspects of the question of South West Africa were referred by the General Assembly to the International Court for advisory opinion which was given in 1950, in 1955 and again in 1958.