

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO UN-STARRED QUESTION No. 3533, DATED 12-4-1966, REGARDING PROCUREMENT OF PADDY AND RICE

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri Govinda Menon): For the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 3533, answered on the 12th April, 1966, the following may be substituted:

"(a) During the period from December, 1965 to February 1966 the Food Corporation of India purchased a quantity of 285 tonnes of rice in Mannargudi and 70 tonnes of rice in Thanjavur area from the millers. No paddy was procured from the producers in these areas and there was no delay in making payment for the purchase of rice mentioned above.

(b) to (d). Do not arise."

12.21 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

THERMO-NUCLEAR EXPLOSION BY CHINA

Mr. Speaker: I have received a calling-attention-notice about the explosion of a nuclear bomb by China, and I have admitted it. Shri Kamath might read it out now.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What about the one relating to power shortage?

Mr. Speaker: I can admit only one calling-attention-notice today. I shall admit the calling-attention-notice relating to power shortage, for tomorrow.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): When you admit calling-attention-notices, at least those persons who are interested should be informed about it.

Mr. Speaker: There is still time. The hon. Minister has asked for some

time. I shall inform all the hon. Members concerned.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: If the hon. Ministers are asking for some time, then what is the sense in asking for calling-attention-notices to be taken up here? I have a particular point to make, on this issue, if you, Sir, would permit me. On this calling-attention-notice, as a matter of fact yesterday I saw you also. I seldom like to go and ask for this calling-attention-notice or that calling-attention-notice to be taken up. We have been feeling quite exercised about this matter.

We gave notice of a calling-attention-notice regarding this particular matter when the information was furnished by the USA, and we wanted it to be discussed at that time, and we wanted that our Government should have reacted to it. We wanted that the Government should register their protest against it even earlier. But we were denied of that opportunity by our not having been permitted to raise it by way of a calling-attention-notice. Therefore, it is only natural that we feel excited about it.

Even for this post-mortem sort of thing, for which we have given a calling-attention-notice, we do not know what has happened to our notice, and you are asking Shri Kamath now to read out the notice. What is the practice followed? If you have admitted it, and if the Government have intimated to you, then there must be some uniform rule about it.

Mr. Speaker: There is a uniform rule, and we are following it always. The hon. Member has unnecessarily made that complaint. Of course, notices had been given earlier and I had disallowed them, because I thought that there was nothing that we could do here. Shri Harish Chandra Mathur has also written to me this morning that now this would be a post-mortem examination. But I do not think that even if we had examined it earlier during its life, when the earlier notice was given, we could have prevented it.