

[श्री राधा रमण]

चाहिए जिससे कि हम दंश के सामने यह रख सकें कि यह भयंकर बीमारी हमारे बीच से कम हो गयी है या खत्म हो गयी है।

इतना कह कर मैं आपका कृतज्ञ हूँ कि आपने मुझे समय दिया, और मैं इस विधेयक को पास करने के लिए संसद से अनुरोध करता हूँ।

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** I beg to move:

"That the question be now put."

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the question be now put."

*The motion was adopted*

राजकुमारी अमृतकर : सभापति जी, मुझे बहुत कहना नहीं है। मैं इतना ही कहना चाहती हूँ कि मैं लोक सभा के सदस्यों को हार्दिक धन्यवाद देती हूँ कि उन्होंने तमाम इस बिल के बनाने में मेरे साथ सहयोग किया। जब से मैं स्वास्थ्य के मुद्दकमे में सेवा करने के लिए आयी हूँ तब से मेरा दिल दुखता रहता था कि हमारे बच्चों को पानी मिला दूध मिलता है, शुद्ध घी दंश में नजर नहीं आता। चाहे चावल हो या आटा, जो भी हो सब चीज में मिलावट होती है। इसलिए यह मेरी दिली ख्वाहिश थी कि यह मिलावट किसी न किसी तरह दूर कर दी जाय और जब भी मेरे हाथ में यह शक्ति आयी कि मैं इस बिल को लोक सभा के सामने रख सकूँ तो मैं ने उस बिल को रखा। मुझे इतना ही अफसोस है कि सिलेक्ट कमेटी से आने के बाद यह बिल डेढ़ साल तक पड़ा रहा और केवल आज ही यहां आ सका। लेकिन आज भी आया तो भी अच्छा है, और मैं आशा करती हूँ कि इससे हमें बहुत कुछ फायदा पहुंचेगा। जैसा आप लोगों ने सहयोग यहां दिया है, आप लोगों से मेरा यही निवेदन है कि बाहर भी मुझे वही सहयोग दें और इस बीमारी को मैं इसे एक बहुत भयानक बीमारी समझती हूँ जो कि तमाम दंश में फैली हुई है दूर करें। जरूरत

इस बात की है कि हम सब मिल कर इस की रोकथाम में जुट जाय ताकि यह हमारे दंश से दूर हो जाय और हमारी जनता की और खास कर हमारे बच्चों की सेहत की रक्षा हो।

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

## UNTOUCHABILITY (OFFENCES) BILL

**The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju):** I beg to move:

"That the Bill to prescribe punishment for the practice of untouchability or the enforcement of any disability arising therefrom, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 49 members, 33 from this House, namely, Shri Upendranath Barman, Shri Narayan Sdoba Kajrolkar, Shri T. Sanganna, Shri Pannalall Barupal, Shri Naval Prabhakar, Shri Ajit Singh, Shri Ganeshi Lal Chaudhary, Shri Bahadurbhai Kunthabhai Patel, Shrimati Minimata, Shri Motilal Malviya, Shri Doda Thimmaiah, Shri Rameshwar Sahu, Shri M. R. Krishna, Shri Ram Dass, Shri Nemi Saran Jain, Pandit Algu Rai Shastri, Shri Shree Narayan Das, Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, Shri Resham Lal Jangde, Shri Balwant Nagesh Datar, Shri P. T. Punnoose, Shri Mangalagiri Nanadas, Shri P. N. Rajabhoj, Rt. Rev. John Richardson, Shri A. Jayaraman, Shri V. G. Deshpande, Shri B. S. Murthy, Shri Vijneswar Missir, Shri R. Velayudhan, Shri N. M. Lingam, Shri Mohanlal Saksena, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, and Dr. Kailas Nath Katju and 16 members from the 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 last

day of the first week of the next session:

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

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

I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, to make any long speech. Indeed, I might, with great respect, say to the House to accept this motion for reference to a Committee without any great debate because I think it is recognised on all hands that an Untouchability Bill is required. The Constitution has already abolished untouchability and I have heard over and over again that such a Bill has long been overdue. I notice that one of the amendments tabled is that the Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion. I respectfully suggest that this procedure might be useful where there may be a possibility of a difference of opinion and one might like to ascertain in what direction the current of public opinion is flowing. But where there is no room for doubt or dispute, no room for any divergence of opinion and there is, if I may put it that way, universal agreement that the Bill is necessary and should be urgently passed, where is the necessity for such a procedure? Indeed, some Members have already complained against me that there has been delay in the introduction or in the passage of this Bill. I therefore think that in a case like this, this eliciting of public opinion is really not a necessary process. I dare say the Select Committee will take some time over it. The Bill has been before the public for seven or eight months. And organisations, groups, individuals, anyone who wants to

voice his own opinion or to offer suggestions would himself come forward and let the Committee have memoranda, or write to them, or ask for oral examination. I am personally anxious that this Bill should find its way on the statute book as early as possible. I would have really liked to put through this Bill in the last Session. But there was such congestion of legislative business that it could not be brought forward at that time. That is about this small matter of referring the Bill for eliciting public opinion by a certain date.

Now, I imagine hon. Members have read through the Bill and so the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It is, what I call, a coercive measure. And all legislation must, of necessity, be of a coercive nature: "well, this is the law of the land; you must obey". The laws of the land are intended to be obeyed till they are altered by Parliament or by proper legislative process. And if the laws of the land are not obeyed, then it is not a matter of mollycoddling and trying to tell the people "do not do it". You are punished

Therefore, every clause of this Untouchability (Offences) Bill is of a coercive nature. It states that untouchability has been abolished and directs that the so-called untouchables should be treated with respect, should be accorded equal rights which are guaranteed to them by the Constitution. It is not a question of rights guaranteed to them; rights are guaranteed to every citizen, irrespective of class, caste or creed.

Hon. Members know what are the general provisions. So far as I know—and I imagine hon. Members will share my opinion—in the urban areas there is not much of untouchability left, because there is a good deal of political consciousness, there are public speeches, political discussions, and the provisions of the Constitution have become well known. So there is not much of untouchability left. But the complaints, which I hear, which

[Dr. Katju]

hon. Members hear and which are represented on the floor of this House and State Legislatures, are that it still persists in the rural areas. Even among the rural areas conditions differ from State to State. So far as what was termed in the olden days as British India was concerned, that has been undergoing a continuous process of political education, and social education under the great and inspiring leadership of Gandhiji for the last thirty years and his message had reached every single village in British India. But what we used to call in the olden days the Indian States areas which are now represented by Part 'B' and Part 'C' States, I fear that the conditions existing there are not so advanced in this particular matter as conditions in other parts of India. In Rajasthan, Madhya Bharat, PEPSU and other places all things still persist. In these matters progress is bound to be slow and a good deal of propaganda and persuasive education is required and what is more necessary is a personality. The man who preaches should be one who inspires respect, and veneration. If he goes and conveys the message, people listen to him; Gandhiji said the same thing, and even today we are seeing in Bihar and in many other places it is not what is spoken but people sometimes attach greater weight as to who speaks. If you get the same message, you get the same education, you get the same speech you see by whom it is delivered? Is it delivered by one whom the people venerate, like and admire? Well, he carries influence. If it is delivered by someone else, it is a speech and nothing more. So the conditions in rural areas differ. I have always held the view, Mr. Chairman, that while the Legislature must act, is bound to act, should act and take measures to show to every citizen of India that this untouchability business shall no longer be tolerated; at the same time, we must always bear in mind Gandhiji's teachings that there should be to supplement the legal process active

social propaganda among the people. He used to teach all of us that there should be, so to say, *prayaschit* to be performed by the so-called high caste people for the great inequities which they practised for the last one thousand or two thousand years. They must change their outlook on life. There must be an active change of heart. That I venture to suggest to you, is of the utmost consequence because sometimes a discursive course prevails. I will give you just one instance. I was in Calcutta. I read one morning in the newspaper that some action had been taken against a barber. There is some State law there because he had refused to shave a Harijan. I do not know whether he was a high caste barber or whether he was one of the Harijans. You know there are distinctions between Harijans and Harijans. There are grades and he was fined Rs. 15/- The barber approached an outstanding man there. He was a great advocate who took up the case and fought it. He must have been paid a large sum by the barber. The barber said: 'I have done nothing. I am not bound to shave everybody who comes to me. It is my fundamental right either to shave or not to shave.' He will say, if you say that I must shave everyone, this is opposed to the Constitution. I do not know what the argument was. But, the newspapers said that the revision was rejected. You have to change the heart of the barber. Otherwise, he will say, if you compel me to shave a Harijan, I am not going to carry on this trade at all, I will rather sit at home. I do not remember, probably Shri H. N. Mukerjee might, whether he was running a hair-cutting saloon or whether he was a wayside barber. Supposing he says, I shut my hair-cutting saloon or I do not sit on the wayside in Chowringhee, I go home, if anybody comes to my house, I will shave, otherwise I won't, what happens?

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore):  
What has Shri H. N. Mukerjee to do with this?

Dr. Katju: The law does not help. Let us think over this matter. I should like to ask all my brethren here who represent the Harijan community what they want. Do they want equality or do they want a particular right? This has always struck me in the case of the right of entry into temples, the right of drawing water, etc. You go to a village in Rajasthan or Madhya Bharat: backward areas. The old notions persist there. Supposing a man is forbidden to draw water from a well in accordance with existing customs; we enforce the law and send the man to jail for six months. He draws water. It is not a fictitious supposition. Suppose the people in that village combine and say, this well has now become *brasht*, has become defiled, we will sink another well; so far as this well is concerned, we won't use it. The result is that that well is practically confined to the use of my brethren of the Scheduled Castes. Would that make them happy? It would not make me happy. What they want is equal user. What I think they want is that everybody should go to that well and use it just as I use a third class compartment in a railway carriage. The carriage is crowded. Brahmins, Kshatriyas, everybody is there; Hindus and Muslims. We have got the railway ticket. We never enquire from our neighbour, what is your caste, shall I sit with you, are you an untouchable, etc. We all use it. I have talked to them. What these people want is not the facility for drawing water. What they want, and rightly want and should have, is complete equality with the Hindus, the right of rubbing shoulders with them, and that applies to temples also. Suppose I go to a temple limited to the high castes, Brahmins or anybody, and the *pujari* says that it has been defiled, people stop going there. I know this and this came to me as a flash of light. I was talking to a lady. She said, I used to go to such and such temple of Deviji. Then, I asked her, what has happened, don't you go nowadays? She said, I have given it up. I asked why? She said,

"*brasht ho gaya*". I asked, what has become, *brasht*. She said, the doors have been opened to the Harijans and, therefore, I do not go there now. Supposing that spreads, the Harijans will not be happy.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): On a point of order, Sir,

हम लोगों को हरिजन शब्द अच्छा नहीं लगता है। हम लोग अछूत हैं, हम को अछूत कहो। हरिजन शब्द बहुत खराब है, हम लोगों के लिये हरिजन शब्द नहीं कहना चाहिये। दलित कहो, अछूत कहो लेकिन हरिजन नहीं कहना चाहिये।

Dr. Katju: I should like to assure my hon. friend, Shri P. N. Rajabhoj that for the last 20 years, I have been in season and out of season taking the strongest objection to the naming of any *ashram* as Harijan Ashram or the use of the word Harijan anywhere.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : यह बहुत खराब शब्द है।

Dr. Katju: Do not get up too often.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I welcome that word. It is commonly used.

Dr. Katju: It is not a question of...

श्री नवल प्रभाकर (वाहय दिल्ली—रिजर्व—अनुसूचित जातियां): सभापति महोदय, श्री राजभोज ने अभी हरिजनों के लिये अछूत शब्द कहा। हम उस के ऊपर एतराज करते हैं। हम लोग न अछूत हैं और न अछूत बनना चाहते हैं।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : यह काँग्रेस हरिजन हैं जो हरिजन शब्द को बहुत खराब मानते हैं।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Will the hon. Member resume his seat? It is not fair. May I ask the hon. Member to resume his seat and not shout?

[Mr. Chairman]

After all, the dignity of the House must be kept. If several Members rise up and begin to speak all at once, there will be nothing but pandemonium here. I would request Members to keep cool and speak with dignity, one by one; so that the dignity of the House may be maintained.

श्री पी० एन० राजगोपाल : अच्छा मैं नमूना से कहना चाहता हूँ कि चेयरमैन महोदय कृपा करके होम मिनिस्टर साहब को यह शब्द न बोलने दें ।

Mr. Chairman: This request has been made by the hon. Member once before. Other Members from the Scheduled Castes say that they do not like the word "Achhut". The request has been made, and let the hon. Minister use such word as he pleases. After all, the word "Harijan" is not one to which all Members take exception. If all the Members begin to take exception to one word or the other, I think it will be difficult to find any word which will properly describe the Scheduled Castes.

Dr. Katju: So far as I am concerned, I have just coined a phrase. I will always refer to "the brethren of the community under present discussion" That should please everybody. I will not use the word "untouchable", nor the word "Scheduled Castes" because that is a monstrosity, nor "Harijan" nor anything. I will say "brethren of the community now under discussion". I think that ought to satisfy all.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): On a point of clarification. The Bill refers to offenders who commit certain offences, and the community under discussion is the offenders. Is he referring to them as offenders?

Dr. Katju: The offender am I. They are the offended. You are again mistaken. This Bill deals with offen-

ders and the offenders are always the opposite party, people who prevent others from going to drawing in a well, people who do not shave, people who refuse to let them enter into hotels and so on and so forth.

Shri S. S. More: Again, on a point of clarification. My friend Shri Asoka Mehta does not shave. Does he refer to people like him?

Dr. Katju: What is my hon. friend thinking of?

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): He wants to provoke you. That is all.

1 P.M.

Dr. Katju: I said so far as this Bill is concerned, probably it will receive wide acclamation. I was trying to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we should not rest content with the passage of the Bill. It is the duty of every one of us here and outside, people who want to represent public opinion, guide public opinion, lead public opinion, to make the utmost effort to persuade people, particularly of the other sections of the community, to see that these distinctions are abolished for ever, because it is not only a question of creating hostility, because I am sometimes afraid of even law and order problems. You pass a law of this description, and supposing public opinion is not behind it in an overwhelming measure, then what is the result? Riots take place. There is assault, disturbances. I have heard them with my own ears. When I go to villages, people come and say: "What is to be done? Please protect us." Therefore, I insist upon that aspect. And I tell you, unless and until you get this public education and overwhelming public opinion of crores of people behind you, these laws will not succeed. When I used to go to Bengal, I was rather amused by a particular instance. You know, in the villages there; it is usual to have large gatherings of boys and girls,

etc. In Bengal, it is very easy to distinguish among the people present, as to whether a girl is a married girl or still a maiden, by looking for the *sindoor* over her head. On one occasion, this is what I noticed. Here was a girl about nine years old, and there was the *sindoor* quite all right on her head. I immediately thought of the Sarda Act. I just asked the girl to come up, and asked her, what is your age. Without hesitation, that small girl replied, fourteen. Here was a girl eight or nine years old, and she had learnt that lesson to say fourteen. In Bengal, the Sarda Act is really a dead letter, not in the cities, but in the villages. (*Interruptions*). You may pass a law, but you cannot enforce it unless you have public opinion behind it. I say the same thing about this Bill also. Every section which is a justified section ought to be more stringent, and when cases are taken to the courts, there will be no softness in those cases. If any citizen of India is not permitted to go into a temple or to exercise rights conferred upon every other citizen on public highways, in schools, dispensaries, colleges, public eating places, hotels etc. then, the offenders ought to be punished. But please remember that mere punishments do not increase affection. If you get somebody punished and sent to jail for six months, please do not be under a false notion that by having that man punished, you have brought the two communities together; you have really estranged them. Unless and until the community, to which the man who has been punished belongs, is so strongly and so solidly behind the provisions of this Bill that they are prepared to condemn that man and say that he has brought a disgrace upon their community by acting in that manner, you will not succeed. But if in that community the overwhelming opinion or the majority opinion is in favour of the offender, then, from what I know of human nature, I can say the result will be even increase in crime, increase in disabilities social boycott and what not.

This was what I intended to say. I will not take any more of your time. I do entreat that we should get along with this Bill as quickly as possible. The House will have a comparatively short session, and the Select Committee, if this Bill is referred to the Select Committee, will be meeting, I hope, sometime in October or early November. Then, we may be able to place this Bill on the statute-book before the end of the year, and satisfy my brethren of the community who are under discussion.

**Shri Velayudhan:** We are not satisfied with Bills only.

**Dr. Katju:** We mean business by them, and our professions are not merely empty professions, but every one of us is most anxious that untouchability should be banished from this land root and branch.

**Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That the Bill to prescribe punishment for the practice of untouchability or the enforcement of any disability arising therefrom, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 49 Members, 33 from this House, namely, Shri Upendranath Barman, Shri Narayan Sadoba Kajrolkar, Shri T. Sanganna, Shri Pannalal Barupal, Shri Naval Prabhakar, Shri Ajit Singh, Shri Ganeshi Lal Chaudhary, Shri Bahadurbhai Kunthabhai Patel, Shrimati Minimata, Shri Motilal Malviya, Shri Dodda Thimmalah, Shri Rameshwar Sahu, Shri M. R. Krishna, Shri Ram Dass, Shri Nemi Saran Jain, Pandit Aigu Rai Shastri, Shri Shree Narayan Das, Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, Shri Resham Lal Jangde; Shri Balwant Nagesh Datar, Shri P. T. Punnoose, Shri Mangalagiri Nanadas, Shri P. N. Rajabhoj, Rt. Rev. John, Richardson, Shri A. Jayaraman, Shri V. G. Deshpande, Shri B. S. Murthy,

[Mr. Chairman]

Shri Vijneshwar Missir, Shri R. Velayudhan, Shri N. M. Lingam, Shri Mohanlal Saksena, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, and Dr. Kailas Nath Katju and 16 Members from the 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 last day of the first week of the next Session;

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

**Shri P. N. Rajabhoj:** Who will be the Chairman of the Committee?

**Mr. Chairman:** That will be decided by the Speaker.

**Shri P. N. Rajabhoj:** I will suggest Dr. Ambedkar's name. He should be taken from the other House.

**Mr. Chairman:** We do not know whether the motion will be carried. If the motion is carried, then the question will arise. It is ultimately for the Speaker to decide.

**Shri Lokanath Mishra (Puri):** The Chairman should be from the Lok Sabha.

**Mr. Chairman:** There are many amendments to this motion. I would like to know from hon. Members which motions are going to be moved. One is in the name of Shri Velayudhan.

**Shri Velayudhan:** I am not moving it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Then there is an amendment by Shri P. N. Rajabhoj. Does he want to move it?

**Shri P. N. Rajabhoj:** I do not want to move it.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna):** I wish to move my amendment No. 4.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon from the various political, social and religious organisations in the country including the organisations devoted exclusively to the cause of scheduled castes by the 30th November, 1954."

**Mr. Chairman:** Amendment moved:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon from the various political, social and religious organisations in the country including the organisations devoted exclusively to the cause of scheduled castes by the 30th November, 1954."

**Shri Thimmaiah (Kolar—Reserved—Sch. Castes):** I am not moving my amendment.

**Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore):** On a point of order, Sir.....

**Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar—South):** I wish to move my amendment No. 2 in list No. 1.

**Mr. Chairman:** Then there is one amendment by Shri Somana. But is it not the same as the one by Shri V. G. Deshpande?

**Shri S. S. More:** But can Shri Deshpande move his amendment?

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** I can move it.

**Shri S. S. More:** On a point of order, Sir. He has accepted membership of the Select Committee and we assume that when his name was mentioned, he had given his consent to work on the Select Committee. By consenting to work on the Select Committee, he knocks out the bottom of his own motion. He cannot move his motion.

**Mr. Chairman:** It is for him to say whether he wants to remain a member of the Select Committee.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh** (Shahabad South): He has already accepted the membership of the Select Committee.

**Shri S. S. More:** He is a member of the Select Committee.

**Mr. Chairman:** Yes, as the hon. Member has accepted nomination to the Select Committee, I suppose he is agreeable to the principles underlying the Bill.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** I may submit one thing.....

**Shri C. K. Nair** (Outer Delhi): But the House has not accepted it....

**Mr. Chairman:** There is no point in asking whether the House has accepted it or not. When a Member gives his consent to work on a Committee.....

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** What I am saying is that I accept the principle. But other things should not be forced on me. I accept the principle of the Bill. That is taken for granted by being a member of the Select Committee. But is there any legal bar to my moving a motion that public opinion should be ascertained before this Bill is sent to the Select Committee?

**Mr. Chairman:** This is the convention of the House; if a member accepts membership of a Select Com-

mittee, he cannot be allowed to move a motion of this nature. I hope the hon. Member is agreeable to serve on the Committee.

**Shri V. G. Deshpande:** If it is not admissible, then I will not move it.

**Mr. Chairman:** So far as the motion by Shri Bogawat is concerned. I am afraid I shall have to rule it out, as the names of the persons are not indicated.

**Shri Bogawat:** I have moved the motion only to have the names of the Lok Sabha Members who are the representatives of the voters.

**Mr. Chairman:** He has not indicated them.

**Shri Bogawat:** I said I would give the names at the time of making the motion. 33 names.

**Mr. Chairman:** I now see here the names. So, there are two motions—one by Shri Bogawat and the other by the hon. Home Minister.

**Shri N. Somana** (Coorg): I am moving my amendment.

**Shri D. C. Sharma** (Hoshiarpur): I have already moved my amendment.

**Shri Bogawat:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri Upendranath Barman, Shri Narayan Sadoba Kajrokar, Shri T. Sanganna, Shri Pannalal Barupal, Shri Naval Prabhakar, Shri Ajit Singh, Shri Ganeshi Lal Chaudhary, Shri Bahadurbhai Kuntabhai Patel, Shrimati Minimata, Shri Motilal Malviya, Shri Dodda Thimmaiah, Shri Rameshwar Sahu, Shri M. R. Krishna, Shri Ram Dass, Shri Nemi Saran Jain, Pandit Algu Raj Shastri, Shri Shree Narayan Das, Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, Shri Resham Lal Jangde, Shri Balwant Nagesh Datar, Shri P. T. Punnoose, Shri



[Shri Bogawat]

Mangalagiri Nanadas, Shri P. N. Rajabhoj, Rt. Rev. John Richardson, Shri A. Jayaraman, Shri V. G. Deshpande, Shri B. S. Murthy, Shri Vijneswar Missir, Shri R. Velayudhan, Shri N. M. Lingam, Shri Mohanlal Saksena, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, and Dr. Kailas Nath Katju with instructions to report by the 30th September, 1954."

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri Upendranath Barman, Shri Narayan Sadoba Kajrolkar, Shri T. Sanganna, Shri Pannalal Burupal, Shri Naval Prabhakar, Shri Ajit Singh, Shri Ganeshi Lal Chaudhary, Shri Bahadurbhai, Kuntabhai Patel, Shrimati Minimata, Shri Motilal Malviya, Shri Dadda Thimmasah, Shri Rameshwar Sahu, Shri M. R. Krishna, Shri Ram Dass, Shri Nemi Saran Jain, Pandit Algu Raj Shastri, Shri Shree Narayan Das, Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, Shri Resham Lal Jangde, Shri Balwant Nagesh Datar, Shri P. T. Punnoose, Shri Mangalagiri Nanadas, Shri P. N. Rajabhoj, Rt. Rev. John Richardson, Shri A. Jayaraman, Shri V. G. Deshpande, Shri B. S. Murthy, Shri Vijneswar Missir, Shri R. Velayudhan, Shri N. M. Lingam, Shri Mohanlal Saksena, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, and Dr. Kailas Nath Katju with instructions to report by the 30th September, 1954."

Shri B. K. Chaudhuri: On a point of information from the hon. Minister. Why is it that we are always having 49 Members in the Joint Select Committee? Why not one more or one less? The number 49 indicates in Ayurvedic Shastra a very dangerous mentality. From my own experience of 49 Members has not been very satisfactory.

Dr. Katju: I shall bear that in mind in future.

Shri N. Somana: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 31st October, 1954."

My amendment is that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 31st October, 1954. At the outset, I must make my position very clear that it was not with a view to have any dilatory tactics that I have placed this motion before this House. I thought, as the hon. Minister has stated, that this Bill does not go so far as the country would have liked it to go. I would like to state that this Bill is only in the nature of a negative provision and there is absolutely no provision which provides for a positive action on behalf of the Government. I therefore suggest that it is necessary to take the opinion of the country as to what positive measures the Government could take in regard to this measure of removing this curse from our land. The hon. Home Minister while moving the motion, has admitted that there must really be a change of heart and a change of attitude on the part of the so-called upper classes towards their brethren, and unless that is there, no measure of this kind will ever help. My humble submission is that if that is to be done, as I submitted, there must really be positive measures which would certainly create an atmosphere in this country, which would create a society which would certainly look upon this curse as a curse and would try to remove it for ever. I am submitting my reasons for this. Such Bills and such Acts have been passed in some States. Especially in the State from which I come, an Act was passed in 1949, and I may respectfully submit that that Act has become a dead letter. As a matter of fact, no prosecution of any kind was ever undertaken under that Act and today, the position is

that the Harijans will or can attend no temple in the country, nor do the restaurants and hotels in the country give admission to those down-trodden brethren of ours. So, I feel that even if we pass this Bill into an Act this curse will not be removed. It will again be a dead letter and I am sure the provisions of this Act will not be brought into force in any part of our country.

**An Hon. Member:** What is your suggestion?

**Shri N. Somana:** I therefore suggest that there must be provision in this Bill for providing social amenities. With this view, I feel that this measure must be sent to the country to

elicit their opinion, because we know there are several associations and persons who have been working for the uplift of these brethren of ours and it is necessary that their opinion must be taken into consideration before we pass this measure into law.

**Mr. Chairman:** May I take it that the hon. Member wants to continue?

**Shri N. Somana:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. Chairman:** Then he may continue tomorrow.

The House now stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. tomorrow.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Friday, the 27th August, 1954.*

---