

मैनेजिंग एजेंसी को समाप्त करने के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार कर रहे हैं और केवल कुछ समय का ही सवाल है, तो उसके लिये मैं अड़ने वाला नहीं हूँ।

श्री पीलू मोदी ने कहा है कि मैंने चन्दे और मैनेजिंग एजेंसी का सम्बन्ध जोड़ा है। मैं उनकी जानकारी के लिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि परिवार व्यवस्था की जगह पर प्रोफेशनल मैनेजमेंट आए, इसलिये मैं यह सुझाव दे रहा हूँ। उसका और चन्दे का सम्बन्ध नहीं है, सम्पत्ति के केन्द्रिकरण का जरूर है। चूँकि एक ही बिल, अर्थात् कम्पनी कानून में, मैनेजिंग एजेंसी और चन्दे के बारे में दो अलग-अलग धारारें हैं, इसलिये उनमें संशोधन करने के लिये मुझे इस बिल में ये दोनों बातें रखनी पड़ी हैं।

मंत्री महोदय ने यह आश्वासन दिया है कि वह सभी बातों पर विचार करके अगले सत्र में एक व्यापक विधेयक पेश करेंगे। मैं उस आश्वासन को स्वीकार करने के लिये उन को मौका देने के लिये तैयार हूँ। इसलिये मैं आपकी और सदन की इजाजत से अपने विधेयक को वापस लेना चाहता हूँ।

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** Does the hon'ble Member have leave of the House to withdraw his Bill?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS :** Yes.

*The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.*

16-55 Hrs.

#### LOKPAL BILL

**SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) :** I beg to move :

"That the Bill to make provision for the appointment and functions of an authority name Lokpal for the investigation of administrative acts in certain cases and for matters, connected therewith, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the next session."

Sir, this Bill should have been considered and passed long ago. Sir, as the President's recommendation is not forthcoming, I am

constrained to move this resolution that the Bill to make provision for appointment and function of an authority named Lokpal for the investigation of administrative acts in certain cases and for matters connected therewith be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the next session.

In this connection I would like to point out that corruption which with its cancerous growth has been corroding the moral fibre of this nation. Citizens have been subjected to improper and unjust administrative acts to which they do not find any adequate remedy. Then, we hear of encroachment of citizens' rights and many cases of administrative delinquencies to which also there is no proper remedy. Sir, I do not want to wash the dirty linens of the administration in this House, but there is no denying of the fact that very often the opinion expressed inside the Parliament and outside this Parliament to root out corruption and to magnify all the evils of it and it is a fact in the country,—has gone to wilderness. So, I beg to submit that the only answer to this question lies, not in the reiteration by the Government that everything is OK in the administrative front but to realise the reality and come with some concrete suggestion.

The Third Lok Sabha period was conspicuous by the various memoranda submitted to the President by many citizens of this country and by leaders of the Opposition against certain acts and misdeeds, about the allegations of corruption, favouritism and improprieties against the Chief Ministers of many States like Orissa, Mysore, Rajasthan and Bihar. But, in all cases, the Prime Minister in this House exonerated them except in the case of Orissa where the CBI report saw the light of the day. It is because of the historic ruling of the Speaker in this House on my exposure of the CBI report, a top secret document, but even then the Treasury Benches did not agree to the institution of a Commission of Inquiry, they made a decision for these two former Chief Ministers to step down from their present offices. I congratulate them, but, at the same time, I beg to submit—I would like this to go on record that—when a noble and bold effort

[Shri P. K. Deo] has been made by the Orissa Government, in their campaign against corruption, to institute a Commission of Inquiry to go into the various allegations against the former Ministry, co-operation from the Central Government is not forthcoming. I am sorry to say that the CBI report which more or less because a public document after it was placed on the table of this House, was declined by the Central Government to be given to the Commission. The original copy was refused to facilitate the investigation at the inquiry stage.

This problem has been agitating the minds of the public and, Sir, the only answer is that an institution on the analogy of Ombudsman of the Scandinavian type, should be instituted in this country.

17 Hrs.

[SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK *in the Chair*]

He Should be appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister who will tender the advice after consultation with the Chief Justice of India and the Leader of the Opposition. When there is no recognised Leader of the Opposition, this House will provide the procedure to elect a leader for that purpose. On the advice of these two persons, the Lokpal would be appointed. It will be a sort of people's tribune. It will draw authority from the people and from the people's representatives. It will go into the various grievances of the people and submit reports to Parliament.

It is a good thing that the various administrative failures and achievements can be publicly viewed in their proper perspective. It will be good for the services also because this institution will give an opportunity to project the correct picture of the services in their true character. So, this should be welcomed by Government.

What is democracy? It is government of the people, by the people, for the people. In the prosperity of the people lies the strength of the government and the stability of democracy. But for the ventilation and redress of grievances of citizens, there are only two avenues left. First there is Parliament. We in the Opposition, as the watchdog of the citizens' rights, have always been vigilant and trying to focus the various grievances of citizens in the country. But

the remedy is not adequate. This Parliament cannot give time to deal with individual grievances. Only questions of public importance could be discussed here. So Parliament's functions in this regard are limited. Then come the courts. So far as the courts are concerned, they could go into it, but it is dilatory and expensive. So in many cases, the citizen who is aggrieved cannot afford this process.

Government was conscious of the importance of this matter and on 5th January, 1966, they appointed the Administrative Reforms Commission headed by no less a personality than Morarjibhai. Morarjibhai today is the Deputy Prime Minister. We thought this Government would lose no time in accepting the various recommendations made by this Commission. Under their terms of reference, they were supposed to give consideration to the need for ensuring the highest standards of efficiency and integrity in public services. The last term of reference was, 'the problem of redress of citizens' grievances'. But the Commission thought this to be the most important item and within a period of 10 months submitted a unanimous report making a specific recommendation for appointment of two authorities, the Lokpal and the Lokayukt... They were alive to the urgency of the problem.

In the last para of the recommendation, they say :

"We should like to emphasise the fact that we attach the highest importance to the implementation at an early date of the recommendations contained in our interim report. We are not alone in recognising the urgency of such a measure. It is clear from the British example we have quoted above."

Last April, even in Britain they appointed a Parliamentary Commissioner, and Sir Edmund Campion, former Auditor General, occupied the distinguished post.

We cannot brook any delay in this regard. Some action has to be taken. In the past the state activity was very much limited like the collection of revenue and maintenance of law and order. But state activities today have become multifarious. The various tentacles of state activity have spread so far that today the citizen is exposed at

numerous points to their impact like controls on commodities of daily use, contractual relationship, laws of social security, insurance, banking, labour and so many other things. In most of these cases, discretion is in the hands of the administrative authority. How far they are correct and justified in the exercise of their discretion is a question which has to be kept under constant examination. Their action cannot be regulated only by rules, instructions and orders. Even in the exercise of their judgment or discretion, it is not always expected that it will be just. So it is necessary to provide an institution to which the citizen can have access for redress of grievances. Hence the necessity to appoint a Lokpal. He would be the authority to deal with complaints against administrative acts of Ministers and Secretaries; the Lokayukt will deal with complaints against the administrative acts of lower officials.

Here I would like to trace the history of the ombudsman which makes a very interesting study. The oldest institution of this type called Chancellor of Justice was instituted in 1713. It changed its name to Ombudsman in 1809. This was in Sweden. It was followed by Finland in 1919, by Denmark in 1955 and by Norway in 1962. In 1962, even New Zealand, a commonwealth country, appointed the Parliamentary investigation Commissioner. Lately, as I pointed out, even in Britain which is a conservative country, they have adopted this progressive measure.

In this country, since 1952 this Parliament has been discussing this problem when considering the Prevention of Corruption Bill. Discussions on that occasion highlighted the importance of an institution of this kind. On 3rd April, 1963, the Minister of Law gave an assurance on the floor of the House that very soon he was going to have an institution of this type. I would like to pay my compliment to a former colleague of ours, Shri H. C. Mathur, who headed the Rajasthan Government's Administrative Reforms Committee. They also recommended that an ombudsman-type organisation would go a long way in meeting our requirements.

The Lokpal is appointed by the President; he will have his own staff; he will be answerable to Parliament. At the same time, he will be free from the influence of the Judiciary, the legislature and the executive.

He will have the status of Chief Justice or Supreme Court and he will be an absolutely independent body.

If this measure is accepted, I think it will be a correct forward step to eradicate corruption from the country. It is a non-controversial Bill and needs no persuasion to accept it. So I request Government and the House to accept it *in toto* because it is a carbon copy of the Bill which has been recommended by the Administrative Reforms Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :

"That the Bill to make provision for the appointment and functions of an authority named Lokpal for the investigation of administrative acts in certain cases and for matters connected therewith, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the next session".

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : मैंने देव जी के बिल को बगौर पढ़ा है। बात उनकी बड़ी अच्छी है, उसूल भी बहुत अच्छा है। लेकिन यह बिल महद्द नौय्यत का है।

17.11 Hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the chair*.]

आपको मालूम ही होगा कि देश की हकूमतों ने पहले से ही ऐंटी करप्शन एक्ट बनाये हुए हैं। आपको यह भी याद होगा कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से पिछले सेशन में ऐंटी करप्शन एक्ट में कुछ तरमीम की गई थी। आपको बह भी याद होगा कि मिनिस्टर साहब की तरफ से कहा गया था कि पब्लिक सर्वेंट की डेफिनेशन में मिनिस्टर भी आ जाते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह जो बिल है इसका दायरा थोड़ा-सा बसी किया जाना चाहिये। इस बिल के जरिये से जो कैटेगरीज क्रियेट की गई हैं वे थोड़ी हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर्स के अलावा इसमें दूसरे लोग भी जो इम्पार्टेंट पोर्जीशनज होल्ड करते हैं, चाहे वे पार्टीज के लीडर हों, अफसर हों, नान-आफिशल लीडर हों, किसी सोसाइटी के मालिक हों, जनता के लीडर हों, जो भी हों, जो-जो भी अपनी पोर्जीशन को एक्सप्लायट करते हैं फिर चाहे वे कांग्रेस

## [श्री रणधीर सिंह]

पार्टी के लीडर हों, चाहे जन संघ पार्टी के लीडर हों, स्वतंत्र पार्टी के लीडर हों, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के लीडर हों, डी० एम० के० पार्टी के लीडर हों, कोई भी हों, जो चौधरी बन जाते हैं, बड़े बन जाते हैं वे अगर अपनी पोर्जेशन को एक्सप्लायट करते हैं तो उनको भी इसके दायरे अखत्यार में ले आना चाहिये। कुर्रप्शन एक बहुत बसी लफ्ज आज बन गया है। अगर यह कहा जाये कि रूस से पैसे मिलता है तो वह कुर्रप्शन नहीं है तो मैं इसको नहीं मान सकता हूँ। अगर चीन से मिल जाता है और वह कुर्रप्शन नहीं है तो मैं इसको नहीं मानता हूँ। यूगोस्लाविया की एम्बेसी से या मिश्र की एम्बेसी से मिल जाता है चाहे किसी भी पार्टी को मिल जाता हो और उसके बारे में अगर यह कहा जाता है कि वह कुर्रप्शन नहीं है तो मैं इसको नहीं मानता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस डेफ़ीनीशन में सारी पोलिटिकल पार्टीज के लीडर और बड़े-बड़े जो चौधरी हैं, सारे एम० पी० सारे एम० एल० एज० आ जाने चाहिये। सेक्रेटरीज का इन्होंने चिक्क किया है। मैं सिर्फ उससे सहमत नहीं हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर्ज और सेक्रेटरीज के साथ-साथ जो नान-आफिशियल हैं जिनकी कैटेगरी देने दो है उनको भी शामिल कर लिया जाना चाहिये। जितने हैड्ज आफ दी डिपार्टमेंट्स हैं सेंटर में और स्टेट्स में, चाहे वे डायरेक्टर हों, चाहे आई० जी० पुलिस हों, चाहे चीफ इंजीनियर हों, फौज के जनरल हों, सबको इस डेफ़ीनीशन में शामिल कर लिया जाना चाहिये। इसमें सेमी गवर्नमेंट या आटो-नोमस बार्डीज के बड़े-बड़े आदमी भी, वाइस चांसलर भी शामिल होने चाहिये। वे आदमी भी बड़ी पोर्जेशन होल्ड करते हैं। यह देखा गया है कि कुर्रप्शन आजकल सिर्फ पैसे की नहीं है, फिर कुर्रप्शन किसी तबके के आदमियों तक ही महदद नहीं है। आजकल पोर्जेशन ऐसी हो गई है कि बाकायदा सबका हिस्सा निकलता है। एक बड़ा लाइसेंस दिया जाता है, ठेका दिया जाता है इर्रिगेशन डिपार्टमेंट

की तरफ से या इलैक्ट्रिसिटी डिपार्टमेंट की तरफ से या एक्साइज डिपार्टमेंट की तरफ से तो वहां ऊपर मिनिस्टर से लेकर नीचे तक उनका हिस्सा रहता है और पैसे बनाये जाते हैं। मैं नाम नहीं लेता हूँ। सभी पार्टीज भी अपनी पोर्जेशन को एक्सप्लायट करती हैं। और तो और एम० पी० जो यहां हैं वहां भी बिजिनेस चलता है। मैं किसी का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। लेजिस्लेचर्ज में बिजिनेस चलता है। मेरे भाई ने बड़े पते की बात कही है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह चीज हो। मैं हकूमत को बघाई देना चाहता हूँ कि वह इस कुर्रप्शन के मामले में पहले से ही जागरूक है। यह सवाल माननीय सदस्य ने पहली दफा नहीं उठाया है। ओम्बड्जमैन की जो इंस्टी-ट्यूशन है यह बहुत पुरानी इंस्टीट्यूशन है, कई देशों में इस इंस्टीट्यूशन को अपनाया जा चुका है और वहां यह बड़ी खूबी के साथ चल रही है। हमारे देश में भी इस इंस्टीट्यूशन की बड़ी भारी जरूरत है। कुर्रप्शन आज सोसायटी के अंग-अंग में घुस चुकी है। हमारा देश एक आदर्शवादी देश रहा है, इसका चलन बहुत ऊंचा रहा है। इसकी आइडियोलोजी ने दुनिया को प्रभावित किया है। लेकिन आज इस कुर्रप्शन ने सारी की सारी कौम को, सारी की सारी सोसायटी को बरबाद कर के रख दिया है। इस कुर्रप्शन ने हमें कहीं का नहीं छोड़ा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक पीनल कोड का सम्बन्ध है, कुर्रप्शन ला के अखत्यारात का सम्बन्ध है, वह इंडिपेंडेंट चीज हो। नीचे गांव पंचायत के सरपंच से लेकर प्राइम मिनिस्टर और प्रेजिडेंट तक ओम्बड्जमैन के दायरे अखत्यार में आ जाने चाहिये। जहां स्टेट लेवल पर लोकपाल हो वहां मैं कहूंगा कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट लेवल, ताल्लुका लेवल पर भी ये होने चाहिये। मैं तो यहां तक कहता हूँ कि गांव के लेवल तक यह चीज जाय ताकि सारी सोसायटी को इस कुर्रप्शन से पर्ज किया जा सके। देश में से कुर्रप्शन दूर कर दी जायेगी तो देश ऊंचा हो जायेगा।

मुझे खुशी है कि मेरी पार्टी की तरफ से, मेरे लीडरों की तरफ से, हमारी हकूमत की तरफ से इसको खत्म करने का पूरा जोर लगाया जा रहा है। उसने एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म्स कमीशन बनाया है, संतानम कमेटी बनाई थी और जो उनकी सिफारिशें हैं उन पर अमल भी हो रहा है। एक दोस्त ने माना है कि वे भी इसके लिये क्रेडिट लेना चाहते हैं। लेकिन मैं कांग्रेस बैचिज को शाबाश देता हूँ कि कांग्रेस ने हकूमत से इसको रूट आउट करने के लिये कदम उठाने पर जोर दिया है। इस में थोड़ा-बहुत यह भी शामिल हो जाना चाहते हैं और गाड़ी में थोड़ा-बहुत ये भी जुड़ जाना चाहते हैं ताकि इनका भी नाम हो जाये। मैं इनको कहना चाहता हूँ कि उंगली पर जरा-सा खून लगा कर शहीद बनने की कोशिश मत करो। यह एक अच्छा काम है, इसको मैं मानता हूँ। मधु लिमये जी ने पहले जो कहा वह भी कांग्रेस वाले कर रहे हैं। कांग्रेस ने इस चीज को सब से पहले रीयलाइज किया था कि कुरप्शन रूट आउट होनी चाहिये। इसको रूट आउट करने की हम कोशिश कर रहे हैं। यह काम जल्दी हो यह हम जरूर चाहते हैं। इतना बड़ा बिल पेश करके आपने थोड़े-से आदमियों को पकड़ा है और बाकियों को छोड़ दिया है। सौ में से सिर्फ दो आदमियों को आपने लिया है और बाकी 98 को छोड़ दिया है। सारी की सारी समाज को आपको लेना चाहिये। एक मेजर अप्रेशन की जरूरत है। मामूली टीके से काम नहीं चलेगा। यह तपेदिक का मर्ज है। सारी कौम की नीचे से ऊपर तक तौहीन इस में है। कोई अगर यह भी पूछता है कि यह एंटी कुरप्शन अफसर क्या होता है, यह ओम्बुड्समैन क्या है और क्या यहां भारत में, कुरप्शन है, इस वास्ते ये संस्थाएँ हैं तो इस में हमारे देश की तौहीन है, हमारी खुद-दारी पर यह बड़ी भारी ठेस है। मैं कहूँगा कि इस बिल को महद्द नैय्यत का न हो कर वसी किया जाना चाहिये।

एक कानूनी बात कह कर मैं खत्म करता हूँ। इस में एक साल की मियाद रखी है। एक साल की मियाद से कुछ नहीं होगा। एक साल लैप्स हो जायेगा तो कम्प्लेट लार्ड नहीं करेगी। यह बिल्कुल रांग है। मैं कहूँगा कि कोई लिमिट नहीं होनी चाहिये। बीस साल बाद भी कुरप्शन का केस लोग निकालें तो जिम्मेदार आदमी को दंड दो। मैं अपने दोस्तों से कहूँगा कि वे इस मंशर को अपनी स्पॉट दें। मिनिस्टर साहब ने पहले से इस काम को उठाया हुआ है। यह बड़ा सुन्दर काम है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह अगवानी करें और इसको पास करें ताकि देश और मुल्क का फायदा हो।

MR. SPEAKER : Only 10 minutes are left. Will it be possible for the Minister to reply and for Mr. Deo also to reply?

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : All of us will cooperate, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : All right. The Minister.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : I also will cooperate with the hon. Members and finish in 2 or 3 minutes. This Bill has been brought by the hon. member with a very laudable object. But I would like to inform the House that this measure, recommended by the Administrative Reforms Commission, was considered by the Government and it has been decided to bring an official Bill for this purpose, if possible during this session. There was some difficulty, because this measure relates not only to the Central Government, but also to the State Governments. Promptly the proposed Bill was referred to various State Governments. We have received replies from 10 State Governments. Some have agreed and some have not. Since we do not want to delay the introduction of this institution in the centre, we have decided to bring forward legislation here which will be applicable only to the Central Government. Since the Bill which is being discussed now concerns the States as well as the Central Government, I would

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]  
request the hon. member to withdraw the Bill. I say this because we ourselves are anxious to bring forward a Bill on the lines suggested by the Administrative Reforms Commission with slight modification. The States have not yet given their full and final opinion. It is our belief, as the hon. Members will also agree, that a Bill of this kind which will be applicable to States as well as the Centre has to depend on a common consensus between the Centre and the States. Since that consensus cannot be available in the foreseeable future, we have decided, instead of delaying this important Bill we should immediately try to bring it forward here before this hon. House. Because of this I would request the hon. Member again to take this assurance from us that we are bringing forward a Bill with suitable modification before this House and withdraw his Bill.

SHRI RANGA (Srikulam) : May I ask one clarification? Is it not possible for the Union Government to so formulate their feeling as to accommodate an enabling clause in it so that each one of the States going through the process of legislating separately with the cooperation of their legislative assemblies will not be necessary and all that they need have to do is to get a resolution passed in their respective legislative assemblies adopting the central Act for their own purposes also? That would expedite adoption of this particular administrative reform not only at the Centre but also in the States. Otherwise it would take a long time and any one or two States may go on obstructing it and the usefulness of this particular administrative reform would be lost.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : I agree with the view point expressed by Shri Ranga. But, as I said, several State Governments do not even agree to the concept of this Bill and the kind of reaction that we have received from them does not go to show any hope that we will be able to get a consensus from them. So we have decided that instead of delaying the whole thing and trying to get a consensus from various States we should institute the central Lokpal and make a beginning with it, and we hope that after it begins in the Centre and succeeds here the States will follow suit. That is why we are anxious that rather

than embarrass all the State Governments with this Bill that has been proposed by the hon. Member, we could have a Bill to deal with the central Lokpal to begin with and then later on as soon as other State Governments agree we can have another Bill to create identical institutions for them also.

SHRI P. K. DEO : Sir, I cannot appreciate why there should be any hesitancy on the part of the Government to accept such a simple proposal to send this Bill for eliciting public opinion. I do not want to hustle through a Bill of this importance without taking into consideration the various pros and cons of it. So far as I know this matter was discussed in the Chief Ministers' Conference. So far as the Orissa Chief Minister—Swatantra Chief Minister—is concerned, he agreed with this proposition. It is only a few Congress Chief Ministers who have objected to such a proposal.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : That is not correct. Many non-Congress Chief Ministers have also objected to it.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : बिहार ने तो हाँ की है।

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : U.P. has perhaps opposed it.

SHRI P. K. DEO : So, in this regard, I beg to submit, there is absolutely no ground in the argument of the Minister of State for Home Affairs to ask me to withdraw the Bill.

So far as the bona fides of this Government are concerned, I beg to submit, I have my grave doubts. The way the President's recommendation has been intentionally delayed and withheld has created grave doubts in my mind about their bona fides. There should be no hesitancy in accepting this proposal. I hope I will get the unanimous support to my motion that this Bill be sent for eliciting public opinion by the first day of the next session.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill to make provision for the appointment and functions of an authority named Lokpal for the investigation of administrative acts in certain cases and for matters connected therewith, be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the first day of the next session."

*The Lok Sabha divided 1*

## Division No. 7)

## AYES

[17.30 hrs.]

Adichan, Shri P. C.  
 Anbazhagan, Shri  
 Bakshi, Shri Ghulam Mohammed  
 Banerjee, Shri S. M.  
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri  
 Chauhan, Shri Bharat Singh  
 Deo, Shri P. K.  
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh  
 Fernandes, Shri George  
 Goel, Shri Shri Chand  
 Gopalan, Shri A. K.  
 Gopalan, Shri P.  
 Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela  
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana  
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal  
 Kamalanathan, Shri  
 Kameshwar Singh, Shri  
 Karni Singh, Dr.  
 Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali  
 Khan, Shri Latafat Ali  
 Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali  
 Kundu, Shri S.  
 Lakkappa, Shri K.  
 Limaye, Shri Madhu

Madhok, Shri Bal Raj  
 Maiti, Shri S. N.  
 Majhi, Shri M. C.  
 Maran, Shri Murasoli  
 Menon, Shri Vishwanatha  
 Mody, Shri Piloo  
 Mohan Swarup, Shri  
 Naik, Shri G. C.  
 Naik, Shri R. V.  
 Nair, Shri Vasudevan  
 Patil, Shri N. R.  
 Rajaram, Shri  
 Ram Charan, Shri  
 Ramamurti, Shri P.  
 Ranga, Shri  
 Samanta, Shri S. C.  
 Sezhiyan, Shri  
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar  
 Somani, Shri N. K.  
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.  
 Subravelu, Shri  
 Tyagi, Shri O. P.  
 Umanath, Shri  
 Viswanathan Shri G.

## NOES

Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.  
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata  
 Baswant, Shri  
 Bhola Nath, Shri  
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.  
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri  
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.  
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram  
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri  
 Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas  
 Jaggaiah, Shri K.  
 Kamala Kumari, Shrimati  
 Karan Singh, Dr.  
 Khadilkar, Shri  
 Mandal, Shri B. P.  
 Mandal, Dr. P.  
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad  
 Masuriya Din, Shri  
 Mehta, Shri P. M.  
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri  
 Nahata, Shri Amrit

श्री मधु लिमये : सरकार से हट जाइये ।

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Resign.

SHRI RANGA : The Government must resign.

MR: SPEAKER : We have to make corrections.

Pahadja, Shri Jagannath  
 Pant, Shri K. C.  
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
 Patil, Shri Deorao  
 Ram Kishan, Shri  
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.  
 Randhir Singh, Shri  
 Sanji Rupji, Shri  
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara  
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.  
 Sayyad Ali, Shri  
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan  
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben  
 Sher Singh, Shri  
 Shinkre, Shri  
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan  
 Singh, Shri D. N.  
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari  
 Sonavane, Shri  
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar  
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
 Tamaskar, Shri

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) : Sir, you should come out to dismiss the Ministry now.

SHRI PILLO MODY (Godhra) : Dismiss the Ministry.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudakkottai) : You can give a ruling on the lines of the West Bengal Speaker now.

MR. SPEAKER : But this is the Indian Parliament, not West Bengal Assembly. The result of the division is :

Ayes—48; Noes—46.

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Karni Singhji.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I do not understand why the Ministers don't smile. We lose here everyday and we keep smiling. They have lost once, by two votes, and look at their faces.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Allow us to occupy those seats. I assure you, we shall make you Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, I call Dr. Karni Singhji.

17.31 hrs.

#### CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of Eighth Schedule) by Dr. Karni Singh.

DR. KARNI SINGH (Bikaner) : I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 48 Members, 12 from this House, namely :—

1. Shri Onkar Lal Berwa
2. Shri Surendranath Dwivedy
3. Shri Lalit Sen
4. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
5. Shri Amrit Nahata
6. Shri K. Ananda Nambiar
7. Shri Nath Pai
8. Shri Era Sezhiyan
9. Shri Vidya Charan Shukla
10. Shri N. K. Somani
11. Shri Surendra Kumar Tapuriah
12. H. H. Maharaja Dr. Karni Singh  
of Bikaner, and 6 from Rajya Sabha;

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 first day of the next session;

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

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 6 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

At the very outset, I would like to thank hon. Members from both sides and you, Sir for allowing me to move the motion.

MR. SPEAKER : He may continue next time.

17.32 hrs.

#### BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE NINTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH) : Sir, I beg to present the Ninth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

श्री मधु लियये (मुंगेर) : अरे, आप कैसे कर सकते हैं ? आप को अधिकार ही नहीं है। आप हारे हुए हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन को कैसे इजाजत देते हैं ?

MR. SPEAKER : Now we will take up the Half-an-hour discussion.

17.33 hrs.

#### DETENTION OF SHEIKH ABDULLAH\*

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (Kasergod) : Sir, I wish to raise a discussion on the points arising out of the answer given on the 15th November, 1967 to Starred Question No. 71 regarding the detention of Sheikh Abdullah.

Here is a man, an undisputed leader of the Quit Kashmir Movement. He inspired the people of Kashmir and he has got an abiding place in the hearts of the people of Kashmir. He was the Prime Minister of the State and he was the idol of the people in the State. In 1953, he was arrested and detained by an order of the head of the State. He is inside the jail now. No chance was given to him and the people also do

\*Half-an-hour discussion.