

## PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

## OFFICIAL REPORT

2093

2094

## HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Saturday, 13th March, 1954

*The House met at One of the Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(No Questions: Part I not published.)

## MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member, Shri Gopalan, has sent to me notice of an adjournment motion. I think he better see me first in the Chamber, and then I will decide.

PRESS (OBJECTIONABLE MATTER)  
AMENDMENT BILL—*contd.*Clause 3.—(Amendment of section  
2)—*contd.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up the further consideration of the Bill to amend the Press (Objectionable Matter) Act, 1951.

Yesterday, I believe clause 3 was under consideration, and Mr. Sadhan Gupta was on his legs. Before I call upon Mr. Gupta, I must invite the attention of the House to the timetable. There is only half an hour left for all the remaining stages of the Bill. There are a number of amendments to clause 4. If they like, hon.

Members may make a selection.

24 P.S.D.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee** (Hooghly): Yes, we shall make a selection.

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall see when we come to clause 4. All the amendments to clause 3 have been disposed of yesterday. Mr. Sadhan Gupta may continue his speech.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta** (Calcutta South-East): Yesterday, I was pointing out how through a small amendment a great change had been effected in the law, by making the penalty for printing matters without the name of the printer and the publisher from undeclared presses more drastic than under the original Act. I said that that should not be done without taking the opinion of the House. I can well imagine the Home Minister throwing up his hands in holy horror and saying, "Do you want undeclared presses to continue? Do you want things to be printed and published without the names of the printer and the publisher?" Even assuming that it is very wrong, my point is not that it is being penalised but my point is that it is being penalised so drastically without giving the House an opportunity to discuss the matter, without giving the House the reason why so drastic a penalty should be imposed.

**Mr. Speaker:** I shall now put clause 3 to the House.

The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 3 was added to the Bill.*