(iii) Supplementary Statement No. VIII	Fourth Session 1953.
(iv) Supplementary Statement No. XIII.	Third Session, 1953.
(v) Supplementary Statement No. X.	First Session, 1952.

[*See* Appendix VIII, Annexure Nos. 40, 41, 42, 43 and 44 for (I) to (V).]

Suggestions—

Statement No. II ...	Fifth Session, 1953.

[*See* Appendix VIII, Annexure No. 45.]

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE HINDU MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE BILL, 1952.

THE MINISTER FOB LAW AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI C. C. BISWAS): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to amend and codify the law relating to marriage and divorce among Hindus be extended up to Friday, the 24th September 1954."

instead of Wednesday, the 22nd, as in the order paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to amend and codify the law relating to marriage and divorce among Hindus be extended up to Friday, the 24th September 1954."

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA (Andhra): Sir, I oppose the granting of permission for extension of time because it shows the way the Government deals with the social legislations trying to post pone, whatever reasons they may give. The Government must have under stood after having seen the fate of the Hindu Code Bills for the last 7 years or so that there will be a section in the country, in Parliament, and in the Select Committee also, who wiH try to take as long a time as possible and to delay it. I cannot understand why Government had not taken steps to convene the Select Committee earlier as soon as the Parliament Session was over and finish the conclusions of it. This House adjourned some time hi the third week of May,, June, July and August—three clear months were there, for the Committee to finish its lab ours. This is a controversial Bill no doubt but a small Bill of 24 or 25 clauses.....

AN HON. MEMBER; 30 clauses.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: All right, it may even be 40. With regard to the Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill, which consists of 115 clauses, which is equally important and is also a controversial Bill, they are presenting, as far as the announcements go, their report on the 3rd September— practically within the time that has been given by Parliament. But in this case the Government comes here before this House and asks for extension of time for the submission of its report *hy* the Select Committee till practically the end of the Session which means that this Bill is not going to be discussed in this Session. This, once again, shows their luke-warm attitude if not antagonism to hastening social reform Bills in this Parliament. As such, permission for extending the time should not be given.

SHRI B. GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I support the objection raised by my hon. friend here.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Sir, I am sorry that motives should have been imputed to the hon. Law Minister for the motion that he has just now brought before the House. I can say

with all fairness, Sir, that none is more anxious than the hon. Law Minis ter himself to get the Hindu Marriage and Divorce Bill passed as soon as possible and as a member of the I Select Committee I can say that the , Law Minister is very keen on this. He has also explained how under the ;
stress of certain circumstances he could not convene the Select Com mittee earlier. There was a break from the 14th to the 20th of August and the .....

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Why !. should there have been a break?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I do not think it quite fair to impute motives to the j Law Minister, and to say that passage of an important piece of legislation is being procrastinated for certain ulterior motives. We are the victims of circumstances and we should all know our limitations.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, I wish to say a word.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think it is necessary.

SHRI B. GUPTA: Sir, I was on my legs and .....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sundarayya has already spoken for you.

SHRI B. GUPTA: But I have to say something more, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. What have you to say, Mr. Reddy?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, I only want to say that I wish Mr. Sundarayya had, before raising his objection to the motion, consulted the members of his own party who are on the Select Committee. If he had done that, they would certainly have apprised him of the progress made and of the necessity for this motion. This Bill is affecting important traditions, customs and law of large sections of Hindu society and every sentence, indeed every word of it, is being contested very keenly, and rightly too, for it is really a very difficult matter. And as my hon. friend Mr. Mahanty has said, the Law Minister has done his very best to push through the work and he has been trying to make the work of the Committee easier, as much as he can. But in spite of all that, it is taking time, and rightly too.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I have consulted the members of the Select Committee.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: Sir, the Government has been used to this kind of criticism for quite a long time and therefore it does not affect me personally. I know I have done my duty and I have tried to assist the Joint Select Committee in their labours to the utmost extent.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: Why was not the Select Committee convened in the month of June?

SHRI C. C. BISWAS: If my htJnT friend who took exception had only consulted members of the Select Committee, they would have informed him of the necessity for this motion.

SHRI P. SUNDARAYYA: I have consulted them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, please sit down. That will do.

The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to amend and codify the law relating to marriage and divorce among Hindus be extended up to Friday, the 24th September 1954."

The motion was adopted.

THE RAILWAY STORES (UNLAWFUL POSSESSION) BILL, 1954 — *continued*

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, the other day when this