

[Shri H. D. Rajah.] or is it not amounting to a bribe? Therefore what I am saying is that we have to go to the root of the problem before criminology is enforced upon people

----- the psychological factor that lies behind our actions. What is it? It is just like any other provision of this Government to whom I do not credit with much commonsense. This Government just like any other Government in the world thinks of only curing a disease. What is that disease? Go into the root cause of the disease. See that it does not occur anywhere at all. That is the way in which a society is built up. In that event, Sir, you will find that in India all these criminal legislations will be of no use. If you have to tackle that problem from that point of view, I will suggest further that the police will not be necessary. The police, I will say, are also bribe takers. The Special Police are equally bribe takers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member will continue tomorrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We have received a message from the House of the People which the Secretary will read.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE PREVENTIVE
DETENTION (SECOND AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1952

SECRETARY : Sir, I have to report to the council the following message received from the House of the People signed by the Secretary to the House:

"I am directed to inform the Council of States that the annexed motion has been passed in the House of the People at its sitting held on Wednesday, the 23rd July 1952 and to request that the concurrence of the Council of States in the said motion and further that the names of the Members of the Council of States to be appointed to the Joint Committee be communicated to this House.

The motion is :

"That the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 42 Members ; 30 Members from this House and 12 Members from the Council ;

that the Joint Committee is also authorised to consider all amendments to those sections of the original Act which are not sought to be amended by the Bill under reference to the Committee ;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee ;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 29th July, 1952 ;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make ; and

that this House recommends to the Council that the the Council do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by the Council to the Joint Committee*."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I will read the message to the House. The motion is that the Bill be referred to.....

(Interruption.)

SHRi C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): I wanted to submit....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The message from the House of the People takes precedence over other business of the House.

SHRi B. GUPTA (West Bengal): On a point of order, Sir. My point is this that we do not have any Bill at all for our purposes from the point of view of this House. There does not exist any such Bill before us. We may have read something in the papers. That is a different matter. But we do not have any cognizance of any such Bill as far as this House is concerned. Now here the motion is being placed before us in connection with the Select Committee for the consideration of a Bill which does not, constitutionally speaking, exist as far as this House is concerned. I think, Sir, it is an astounding procedure. Therefore, Sir, I submit that this question cannot be brought in-the question of appointment of the Select Committee whether it is a Joint

Select Committee or a separate Select Committee to go into that. The Bill should be brought here and general discussion should be initiated after which this House will consider whether the question of appointing a Select Committee or a Joint Select Committee and to participate in it does arise or not.

Therefore I submit that at present the question of appointing a Committee does not arise. It is *ultra vires* of the rules of the Council, it is *ultra vires* of all the accepted procedure under the Constitution, and I would request the Government not press this matter which goes against every tenet of Parliamentary practice.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : I rise on a point of order. In the List of Business is put down what the House is to discuss between 12-30 and 1 o'clock, and nothing can come before the House except that business. I should like to draw attention, Sir, to the proviso to rule 22 which says :

"Provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the Chairman is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation."

Then there is another rule, rule 28(1) :

"A list of business for the day shall be prepared by the Secretary, and a copy thereof, etc."

Then it goes on :

"Save as otherwise provided in these rules, no business not included in the list of business for the day shall be transacted at any meeting without the leave of the Chairman."

Now, what I suggest is that the leave of the Chairman should be sought and also that he should be satisfied that there are reasons why the list of business should be changed. So far as this House is concerned, we do not know why any alteration in the business should be made. I most respectfully submit that it would be very wrong for the list of business to be changed without any notice whatever to this House. As it is, we have a discussion on another matter at 12-30. Even if change was to be made in order it this is something which ought not

to have been placed before us. I therefore request that no alteration should be made in the list of business without giving any notice for the very simple reason that we are not prepared to consider any other proposition before this House. I would once again most respectfully ask you not to allow any alteration in the business but proceed with what has been put down in the list of business for today.

SHRI B. RATH (Orissa) : Another point of order, can a Member be interrupted in the course of his speech for a discussion of some other matter which is not within the agenda? According to the rules, after 12-30 business can be interrupted to raise a discussion arising out of the answer to any question. That is why the speech was interrupted. No business other than that which was to be discussed can be taken up now. So, either the speech will continue or the question will be discussed.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : May I request that my point of order may be disposed of first ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is being attended to.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa) : Under rule 56 of the Rules of Business of this House, I think this procedure is quite unwarranted. If we are going to refer this Bill to a Joint Committee, we will be committing ourselves without even discussing it. Tint will make us a mere rubber stamp. I think this is a serious invasion on the rights and privileges of this House and I hope, Sir—I have full confidence in you—as the trustee of this House you will safeguard our rights. Without discussing the contents of the Bill, we are not going to commit ourselves to it. Under rule 56 :

"When a Bill is introduced, or on some subsequent occasion, the Member in charge may make one of the following motions in regard to his Bill, namely:

(*) that it be taken into consideration ; or
(ff) that it be referred to a Select Committee of the Council ; or

[Shri S. Mahanty.J
(in) that it be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses with the concurrence of the House; or

(iv) that it be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon:

Provided that no such motion shall be made until after copies of the Bill have been..... etc."

We are not going to give blindfolded concurrence.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh) : Which particular Rule is the hon. Member referring to?

SHRI S. MAHANTY : The second point is I think we are following the procedure of the British Parliament. According to May's Parliamentary Procedure for the Joint Committee there should be an equal number of Members from both the Houses. I would request you to look up that.....

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR : On a point of order. We are not now considering the merits of the proposition. He is entering into the merits. He is referring to Rule 56 which relates to measures for the Introduction of Bills. It does not relate to any measure which has been recommended to us by the other House. If a Bill were to be introduced, Rule 56 would have been applicable.

PRINCIPAL DEVAPRASAD GHOSH (West Bengal) : The Bill is not before us.

SHRI S. MAHANTY : We are not going to give a blind-folded concurrence and I have every faith in the Chair as trustee to uphold the dignity of the House.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh) . The appointment of a Joint Select Committee is a matter of convention. There are no rules relating to it. I don't think even in the British Parliament there are any rules relating to it. The Joint Select Committees are appointed with the concurrence of both the Houses. There is nothing in any rule to prevent

either this House or the other House from agreeing to a proposal for a Joint Select Committee. But I gather that the desire of hon. Members is that a discussion should take place on the matter. I don't think that discussion can be ruled out. The House could have appointed its own representatives without a debate but if hon. Members desire, there should be a discussion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : This motion is only for concurrence. It is not a motion for the election of names to the Joint Select Committee. On this there need be no discussion.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras) : Concurrence would mean our acceptance of the other Bill, which is not introduced here. That point requires clarification.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : When a Joint Select Committee is appointed it may be appointed only on a proposal made by one of the two Houses and with the concurrence of the other. The need for concurrence therefore does not raise any new point. You cannot have a proposal for a Joint Select Committee being under discussion simultaneously in both the Houses. It will be proposed by the House that is considering the Bill and its decision in favour of it will then be communicated to the other House and the representatives of that House can be appointed only with the concurrence of the House. Both the concurrence and the appointment of the Members are involved in this proposition.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There are two different things. Concurrence is one and the motion for appointment of Members is another.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal) : The point was that if we agree to serve on the Select Committee then we probably accept the principle of the Bill. Otherwise you cannot go on to a Select Committee. There may be a point that there will be hon. Members

who would like to send it for circulation. Now we don't know what the procedure is. My suggestion is this would you mind taking up this question tomorrow morning ? We can find out as to what has been the practice in other countries on these matters. Otherwise as soon as we agree to appoint Members to the Select Committee, it will mean agreement on the principle of the Bill. On that point there may be difference of opinion. As we are setting up a precedent I think it would be much better if we set any precedent after mature deliberation. Because whatever we do today will apply for the future and we shall be bound by what we do here today. Therefore I think it would not very much matter if we take up this matter instead of just now, tomorrow morning after the question hour.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : May I say something ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have already had your say.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY : It was about my point of order. I wish to say something about the appointment of a Joint Select Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have held that a Message of the House of the People shall have precedence. Already it has been read out and the motion for concurrence is before the House. The point of order is ruled out.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : May I submit that while the Message from the other House has precedence over the other Business of the House, it does not mean that the discussion over the Message must begin immediately. That is not laid down in any rule at all. All that is laid down is that the communication of a Message from the other House to this House will have precedence over other Business.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH : Nobody has moved any motion here, Sir.

SHRI S. MAHANTY : Sir, when we examine what the real meaning of the word "concurrence" is, we find that the.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mahanty has already spoken. He may sit down.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : There are three stages of a Bill. The Bill is first laid on the Table. If the Bill had been laid on the Table we could certainly have considered the message from the other House for the appointment of a select committee. But now the Bill has not even been laid on the Table of the House. The House has not taken cognizance of the Bill. Therefore I submit it cannot be considered now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I call upon the Law Minister to.....

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras) : Before you call upon the Law Minister to speak on this point, may I say a few words on the point just now raised ? If we accept the principle that every Bill should be laid on the Table, that would be a new procedure. It may not be necessary for every Bill to be laid on the Table, when it comes to this House with the recommendation from the other House. In that case this House may waive the other procedure and take it up and fix its own time to discuss it. The point is whether this House is to be impounded into doing things without having the privilege of choosing its own time for its discussions. I am sure even the Chair has not been given proper time. The Chair has not been given information in the manner it should have been informed. It did not know that this message was going to come here and as a result of that all other work should be stopped. That is not correct.

Secondly, this message has come quite suddenly and the Chair has to take notice of it. The Chair in its discretion has given precedence to it and stopped the hon. Member who was speaking and set at naught the other time-table fixed earlier for the conduct

Iff of. G. Ranga.] of business. Now, after that has been done, what is to be done next? Even if we are to have an extraordinary procedure it was necessary for the Treasury Bench occupants, any one of them, to have made a motion. One of them could have moved that such and such message has come from the other House and in the light of that message this House may be pleased to give precedence to that matter. They should show as much respect to the Chair as they expect other sections of the House to do. It is the discretion of the Chair to fix the time for discussion. The Chair should not be hustled. The Chair means all. The dignity of the Chair is the dignity of the whole House. The Chair is the repository of the dignity of the whole House, and as such it should not be treated in the manner in which the Treasury Benches have sought to treat it. It is not merely the dignity of one individual who happens to be in the Chair, it is actually the dignity of the Chair, the dignity of the whole House that is involved in this matter. From this point of view, I submit the Chair should insist that time should be given to us in order that we may be able to give proper consideration to this matter. And the Treasury Bench may come forward tomorrow with this proposition and thus save their own face and save our face too by bringing forward a formal motion.

Another consideration is this. The Chair has fixed the time-table for other business. That should have precedence over everything else except this message. Let us give precedence to it for one minute and let that one minute be deducted from the time given to my hon. friend there. To rob all this time from the other important business of the House and on the top of it to establish a precedent here and now with regard to the introduction of an item of business is not proper at all. Moreover, the Chair has decided that the time-table for this discussion should be 12-30 p.m. and this should not be ignored. That the Chair should ignore this time-table previously fixed and accommodate the Treasury

Bench is a proposition which should not come forward from the Treasury Bench. I would expect them to show that salutary respect towards the Chair which they expect us to do because the Chair is everybody's possession. It is above us all and ought to be respected by every body. So I would appeal to them to come forward with the proposal to take up the matter tomorrow and save the Chair also from any kind of embarrassment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have called upon the Law Minister.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : Just one point on which the Law Minister may please throw some light. May I know whether concurrence now would not commit this council to the acceptance of the principle of the Bill ?

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR. : Sir, the point whether we should concur or not has not yet come before us. The only point for consideration now that has come before the House is whether we should take up the proposition at all now. After we decide that, then we have to consider whether we concur or do not concur, whether we associate ourselves with the Select Committee or not. The only point for consideration before us just now is whether the message coming from the other House, asking us to associate ourselves with the Select Committee should be put before the House or not. That being so, I cannot understand what is the point of order that has been raised now by my friend from that side of the House. Unless and until we are seized of the message by its being put before the House in the form of a specific proposition, the question whether or not we associate ourselves in the Select Committee does not arise. As regards the question whether it should be put forward from the Chair or the Treasury Bench, I think it better that the message from the other House is put before the House by the Chair and not by anyone on the Treasury Benches, because it is not something that comes from the Government.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No Member on the Treasury Benches has put the message before the House. It was read by the Secretary of the Council and I am asking the Council whether there is concurrence or not. Before that is over the point of order has been raised.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR : Yes, Sir, that is exactly as it ought to be. You are proposing to ask whether we are agreeable to it or not. After you have put it before the House it will be thrown upon to discussion and hon. Members can place their views before the House and then we can decide whether to associate ourselves with the Select Committee or not. If we even then decide that we do not associate ourselves with this Select Committee, there is an end of the matter. But that comes only at a later stage. Now we cannot object that the message from the other House should not be placed before us at all.

THE MINISTER FOR LAW AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI C. C. BISWAS) : Sir, I shall be failing in my duty if I did not at once give to the House on my behalf and on behalf of the Treasury Benches the assurance that there never was and there never can be the slightest intention to show any disrespect to the Chair or to the House. As a matter of fact, Sir, my friends opposite raised points of order before the matter could be placed before them either by you, Sir, from the Chair or before I was permitted to move the necessary motion.

Sir, these points of order are premature. As a matter of fact, Sir, you asked for the concurrence of the House. I was prepared to move formally that the House should give its concurrence to the proposal which has come over from the other House. So far as that message is concerned, it has been admitted by hon. friends on the other side that there was nothing wrong in your placing that message before the House interrupting the other business. It was the Chair which placed the message before the House and not any

23 CSD

member of the Treasury Benches. It was after that that it should have been my duty and my privilege to place the substantive motion before the House. Before I had an opportunity of doing so, points of order were raised from all sides of the House and the whole discussion has gone on these points of order. Sir, the motion which I propose to place, if I may now.....

HON. MEMBERS : No. no.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : My motion only seeks the House to give its concurrence for certain Members of this House serving on the Joint Select Committee suggested by the other House and then to communicate the names of these Members.

SHRI S. MAHANTY : What is the meaning and connotation of "concurrence" ?

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : I would refer my hon. friend to the lexicon for the purpose of understanding the meaning of the word concurrence. Concurrence is concurrence. No commentary or connotation from me or anybody else is required.

The point I was making was

SHRI P. V. N ARA YANA (Madras) : There is no motion before the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. He is speaking on the points of order. Will the hon. Member kindly resume his seat ?

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : I was going to point out to them that no motion for concurrence is necessary in view of your having asked for the concurrence of the House from the Chair. It is open to the House to decide, after taking into consideration the fact that they have not got the copy of the Bill and that they may be committing themselves to the Bill. If a motion was moved, they might make it clear that they were giving their concurrence without committing themselves to the principle of the Bill and it is always open to them to d.o.,

[Shri C. C. Biswas.] so. I can inform my hon. friends here that some Members of the other House also have reserved their right so far as the question of the principle of the Bill was concerned, although they have agreed to sit on the Select Committee. I suggest in utmost humility that it will be always open to the House, if it so desires, *(Interruption from Opposition Benches)*....if some Members feel that they may not agree in principle with the Bill, they may say that their concurrence is subject to the condition that it will not commit them to the acceptance of the principle of the Bill. Well, there is this gesture from the other House and we should clearly accept it and join the Joint Select Committee. What Members will do depends upon themselves. Nobody is compelling them to vote one way or the other.

SHRI B. C. GHOSH : A point of order, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Phase let him continue.

SHRI C. C. BISWAS : This is not a point of order. There is nothing for a point of order in this. A message has been placed before the House and you have suggested that the House should consider whether it should give its concurrence or not. The House is always free to decide the matter one way or the other. The point of order does not arise and, therefore, I shall, with your permission and at the appropriate moment, move a formal motion. Hon. Members may rest assured that they do not commit themselves to the acceptance of the principle merely by agreeing to serve on the Joint Select Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think the points of order raised by certain members have been sufficiently discussed. I am going to give the ruling. This is a simple message from the House of the People asking for concurrence from this House as to whether it is willing to serve on the Joint Select Committee or not. This is not a motion for reference to Select

Committee. I have also got the proceedings of the House of Commons wherein reference of a Bill to a Joint Select Committee was referred from the House of Lords to the House of Commons. There was no discussion on such a motion for concurrence and the House of Commons sent a message to the House of Lords saying that they concur to serve on the Select Committee. One of the hon. Members has asked whether such a concurrence would be acceptance of the principles of the Bill or not. It is my opinion that it is not acceptance of the principles of the Bill. There will be a full debate on the principles of the Bill when a motion is made by the hon. Member for nomination of Members to the Joint Select Committee. That will come only after the House has expressed its opinion as to whether it concurs in the message sent by the House of the People or not. I think that there is no point of order and I place this message from the House of the People before the House. The House may express its opinion as to whether it concurs or not.

(Sri P. V. Narayana rose)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have given my ruling, Mr. Venkata Narayana. I have told you that the principles of the Bill can be discussed by you. You may or may not agree to them Under rule 56.....

SHRI P. V. NARAYANA : Rule 56, Sir, is in respect of Bills moved by this House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You may or may not agree with the principles of this Bill. So far as the motion is concerned

PROF. G. RANGA : Even the Law Minister said he will move the motion for concurrence.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Two people cannot stand in this House at the same time. So? when I am on my legs I request hon. Members to resume their seats. Do the Members want me to read the names also?

HON. MEMBERS : Yes, yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Do :

" That the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 42 Members: 30 Members from this House, namely:—

- (1) Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.
- (2) Shri Halaharvi Sitarama Reddy.
- (3) Shri Balvantray Gopaljee Mehta.
- (4) Shri Narendra P. Nathwani.
- (5) Shri Ganesh Sadashiv Altekar.
- (6) Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar.
- (7) Shri B. Shiva Rao.
- (8) Shri A.M. Thomas.
- (9) Pandit Algu Rai Shastri.
- (10) Shri Venkatesh Narayan Tivary.
- (11) Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh.
- (12) Shri Feroze Gandhi.
- (13) Shri Narhar Vishnu Gadgil.
- (14) Shri Kotha Raghuramiah.
- (15) Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra.
- (16) Shri Syed Ahmed.
- (17) Shri A.K. Basu.
- (18) Shri S.V. Ramaswamy.
- (19) Shri Dev Kanta Borooah.
- (20) Shri Jaipal Singh.
- (21) Shri Jaswant Raj.
- (22) Dr. Kailas Nath Katju.
- (23) Shri Hukam Singh.
- (24) Dr. A. Krishnaswami.
- (25) Shri N.C. Chatterjee.
- (26) Shri Sarangdhar Das.
- (27) Shri K.A. Damodara Menon.
- (28) Shri A.K. Gopalan.
- (29) Shri Shankar Shantaram More, and
- (30) Dr. Panjabrao, S. Deshmukh.

and 12 Members from the Council ;

that the Joint Committee is also authorised to consider all amendments to those sections of the original Act which are not sought to be amended by the Bill under reference to the Committee ;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee ;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 29th July, 1952 ;

that in other respects the rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make and

that this House recommends to the Council that the Council do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of Members to be appointed by the Council to the Joint Committee."

Is the pleasure of the House.....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: On a point of order, if you will please, Sir

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : At this stage, there is no point of order. I have already given the ruling.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : A point does arise, Sir. The point is whether after the communication of the message from the other House, the discussion on it could begin in supersession of the business on the agenda. The time from 12-30 was allotted for the discussion of a particular matter for which the hon. Member had given notice. Do you rule that the matter must be discussed now and be given priority over the other business for which notice has been given ? There is nothing under the rules to warrant this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Which matter does the hon. Member refer to ?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : At 12.-30 a particular discussion was to have taken place. Then, a message was received from the other House and it was read out by the Secretary. The requirements of the rules were satisfied. Now, you want that the original business which was interrupted on account of the message should not be taken up, but that the discussion of the message should be taken up. That is the point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : By convention a message from the House of the People, I have already ruled, takes precedence over other business. I have also got the proceedings of the House of Commons where there has been no discussion on a mere motion for concurrence. It is a formal affair.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU : They major may not have had any discussion. But you cannot take away the right of this House to discuss the matter.

PROF. G. RANGA : After all what was in discussion in the House of Commons we do not know. Simply because they had no discussion there, it does not mean that we have come to the conclusion that there should be no discussion. This question has never come up before the Rules Committee. Is it your pleasure, Sir, that you want to rule here and now that merely because of that practice in the House of Commons, there should be no discussion here?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Discussion on the point whether the House should concur or not?

PROF. G. RANGA : Why does the Chair insist upon giving its own decision even in regard to that matter here and now? That is one point. The other point is this. Supposing the Chair comes to that conclusion, even then would it be all right, would it not be quite an extraordinary procedure for the Chair to follow that the Chair itself makes the motion instead of allowing any one of the Members of this House to make a motion saying that this House do concur in the recommendation made by the other House? These are the two things involved and I do not want the Chair to commit itself all so suddenly.

THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL (SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI) : If I may say a word or two, the question that was raised by my hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru was whether the Chair could put aside the business which had been set down in the agenda of the day and take something else in its place. Now, Sir, I think we need not go to the House of Commons. Our own Rule 22 provides that "on days allotted for the transaction of Government business that business shall have precedence,

..... provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that that business is set down for disposal unless the Chairman is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation." I submit, Sir, the Chairman has sufficient grounds for variation so far as today is concerned.

DONE BY SADAN IN THIS SESSION

.....
We have an important Bill which was dealt with by the other House and a Select Committee has been appointed by the other House and that Select Committee has to report before a particular date. A message is sent to this House at once for the purpose of ascertaining whether it concurs in the recommendation of the other House that a number of members of this House should join that Select Committee for the purpose of examining the Bill. I think, Sir, those are sufficient reasons for you to put aside the business that was set down for 12.30 p.m. and take up this particular item of business.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The Bill will come up for discussion when a substantive motion is made for nomination of Members to the Joint Select Committee.

SHRI N. GOPALASWAMI : May I know, Sir, what the implication of that is? I was not here when my hon. colleague (pointing to the Minister for Law and Minority Affairs) spoke. The Bill is now in the other House. The other House is *in seisin* of this particular Bill. It has passed a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee and it has passed that motion with the proviso that it should be a Joint Select Committee if this Council concurs in that recommendation. I do not think, Sir, that there is any provision for our making a motion in this House referring that particular Bill to a Select Committee. What we are asked to say now as a result of the message that we have received from the other House is whether under the circumstances, that is to say, at this stage, when that House has passed a motion for reference to a Select Committee and invites us to send certain members to that Select Committee, whether we are willing to do so or not. That is all. I do not think, Sir, there is going to be a separate motion in this House for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee.

SHRI B. GUPTA : I shall take my stand where you have left. I

assume that a message has been received and unless you place before this House

SHRI H.N. : Can we now discuss this tomorrow? Is it necessary that we must do every thing today?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I thought this was a very simple matter.

Should this motion for concurrence be taken up now or not?

(Cries of 'Yes' and 'No'.)

We will take it up tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Thursday, the- 24th July 1952.