

was killed in that attack. In fact, when yesterday those nine pictures were put up there his picture was not even there. Understandably, it may be because he was a private citizen. But can we do something for this gallant media person's widow and his family?

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): Sir, I associate myself with the matter raised by Shri Derek O'Brien.

श्री तरुण विजय (उत्तराखंड): सर, मैं इस विषय के साथ खुद को सम्बद्ध करता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The entire House associate itself with it. The Government may take note of it. Now Special Mentions to be laid on the Table of the House.

SPECIAL MENTIONS*

**Demand to take measures to ensure food security for the poor
in the country**

DR. GYAN PRAKASH PILANIA (Rajasthan): It is a matter of grave concern that India's food security situation continues to rank as "alarming" according to the International Food Policy Research Institute's Global Hunger Index, 2011. It ranks 67th of the 81 countries of the world with the worst food security status. This means that there are only 14 countries in the world whose people have a worse nutritional status. India's GHI for 2011 was 23.7, lower than it was last year, but higher than it was 15 years ago, giving it a rank of 67th. Pakistan, Nepal, Rwanda and Sudan all did better than India. India has the ignominy of being among the countries with the least improvement in the last ten years. It has, however, moved from having an "extremely alarming" food security situation — the worst grade given by the IFPRI — to "alarming", that is, having GHI between 20 and 29.9. China, Iran and Brazil are among the countries that have more than halved their GHI scores over the last decade. The GHI is composed of three equally weighted indicators — the proportion of the population that is undernourished, the proportion of children who are underweight, and under-five child mortality. The poorest and most vulnerable people bear the heaviest burden when food prices spike or swing unpredictably.

In view of above alarming scenario, I would urge the hon. Minister for Food and Public Distribution for ensuring food security for the poor.

**Demand to pay royalty on crude oil to the State of Gujarat
at market driven prices**

SHRI DILIPBHAI PANDYA (Gujarat): Sir, the royalty on crude oil is to be paid to the concerned States including the State of Gujarat in accordance with the provisions as

*Laid on the table of the House.

prescribed *vide* notification dated 16.12.2004 and 20.08.2007 and resolution of 17.03.2003 of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas and the same is based on well head price of the crude oil. The well head price has been clearly defined in resolution dated 17.03.2003 as being derived from the market driven price obtained/obtainable by the producers based on “arms’ length transactions” for the purpose of royalty calculation. The Government of Gujarat had taken up the matter with the Secretary, Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas in the year 2008 and requested for the payments of royalty to the State Government as per the ongoing methodology *i.e.* at a market driven price. Further, hon. Chief Minister of Gujarat State has requested the hon. Prime Minister to make payment of the royalty at the market driven price *vide* letter dated 24.12.2008, however, the Ministry of Petroleum has not accepted the request of the State Government.

The estimated short payment of royalty is Rs.2807 crore and penalty is approximately Rs.700 crore. The State Government expects that the Ministry of Petroleum should direct the ONGC to make a payment of this amount as well as future royalty at pre-discounted price.

It is to be noted that ONGC has made payment of royalty on crude oil till April, 2008 (March-2008 production) on post discount price. As per the directives of the Ministry, ONGCL started to offer discount in oil prices sold to down stream oil companies under the Government of India.

Through this august House, I request the hon. Minister to take this matter on priority basis and resolve this issue, and issue directives to ONGC to make the payments of royalty to the Government of Gujarat at the earliest.

Demand to change the name the Bombay High Court as Mumbai High Court

DR. BHALCHANDRA MUNGEKAR (Nominated): Mr Deputy Chairman, nomenclature of Bombay was changed into Mumbai in 1995 under article 3 of the Indian Constitution. Two main purposes of changing the nomenclature were: one, to get rid of the colonial legacy of naming the cities according to the convenience of the colonial rulers, *i.e.*, the Britishers; and two, to rename them as they have been identified with the aspirations of the local people who have shaped these cities.

However, this exercise of noble intent remained half-hearted as many institutes retained their nomenclature as Bombay. One such prime institute is Bombay High Court. Since the Bombay High Court’s jurisdiction, alongwith its Benches at Aurangabad, Nagpur and Goa, covers a significantly large population, many litigants, lawyers and Hon. Judges have to unwillingly use this obsolete nomenclature. Even the media has to use the term Bombay High Court without choice. Neither the State Executive nor the State Legislature can ensure changes