

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

109

110

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Tuesday, 17th November, 1953

—

*The House met at Half Past One
of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

2-29 P.M.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATION UNDER INDIAN AIRCRAFT
ACT.

The Minister of Communications
(Shri Jagjivan Ram): I beg to lay
on the Table, under sub-section (3)
of section 5 of the Indian Aircraft
Act, 1934, a copy of the Ministry of
Communications Notification No. 10-A
/34-50, dated the 6th September, 1952,
together with an explanatory note.
[Placed in Library, See No. S-151/53.]

—

REHABILITATION FINANCE AD-
MINISTRATION (AMENDMENT)
BILL)—conold.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now
proceed with the further considera-
tion of the Rehabilitation Finance
Administration Bill. I believe the
motion for third reading was moved
yesterday.

The Deputy Minister of Finance
(Shri A. C. Guha): I moved yes-
terday for the passing of the Bill, as
amended.

505 PSD

Mr. Speaker: I shall place the mo-
tion before the House.

Motion moved:

“That the Bill, as amended, be
passed.”

I will now make one thing clear
before the discussion proceeds, so that
we may not have to waste any time
and I may not have to invite the
attention of hon. Member to what is
irrelevant during the third reading.
The Bill was duly considered. The
clauses were considered. The only scope
of discussion on the third reading
motion is to discuss the amendments
adopted by the House—not threadbare,
but their general effect. It is also
open to Members to object to the Bill
being passed and in that case, they
might shortly state the reason why
the Bill should be rejected. The object
of the third reading is not to repeat
the arguments, not to treat it as an
opportunity for those Members who
have not spoken, to speak at length
as if they were speaking on the con-
sideration motion or during the
clause-by-clause stage. These are the
restrictions. It is very difficult for
the Chair to limit the discussion
quite within the scope of relevancy
but Members will bear in mind what
I have stated.

Sardar Hukam Singh: (Kapurthala-
Bhatinda): Can we not refer to the
amendments that ought to have been
accepted and the effect that they
would have had on the Bill if they
had been accepted?

Mr. Speaker: That would be wid-
ening the scope too much and reopen-
ing the consideration as a whole.