

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

1941

1942

LOK SABHA

Monday, 14th March, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of
the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12 NOON

DEATH OF KING TRIBHUVAN

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Leader of the House (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, with your permission, I should like to inform the House of the sad event that took place yesterday afternoon. This was the death of His Majesty the King of Nepal in Zurich in Switzerland where he had gone for treatment. Unfortunately, the treatment has ended in his death.

Any event connected with the Kingdom of Nepal is naturally of interest to us, because we are closely associated by friendly bonds. But, this particular event moves us even more than otherwise because of what has happened during the last few years. I wonder how many in this House remember those rather unusual happenings that brought about a change in Nepal, a change from a hundred year old regime. The King who is dead was an unusual kind of a King, far from having even the restricted authority which Kings are supposed to possess today. He had no authority at all. All authority was concentrated in an authoritarian way in others. Another thing happened namely that this King, in a sense, became the leader of a liberal movement, which is unusual for Kings to

716 LSD.

do. As a result of this, it so happened that the King had to seek the hospitality of our Embassy in Kathmandu and later he came to Delhi as our honoured guest and spent some months here. Fortunately, the leaders in Nepal were wise and it was our privilege also to some extent to advise them, and they arrived at an understanding, an agreement, and a compromise. That, too was rather a remarkable event: that a change essentially of a revolutionary nature should be brought about in that relatively peaceful way by a compromise. It was obvious that that was not a permanent solution of the problems of Nepal.

Nepal had suddenly become really an independent country which, we might well remember, was not so when there was the British rule in India although it was styled as such. The people got a large measure of democratic freedom without the apparatus to exercise that freedom, or the machinery for it. They had many difficulties. But, always, His Majesty the late King was some kind of an anchor and he used his authority wisely in trying to soothe the people and bring them together.

So, during the last few years, Nepal has passed through this revolutionary period and it has been a troubled period. Even now many difficulties continue. During the last two months or so, the late King gave full authority to the Crown Prince to act on his behalf because he was away in Switzerland. The Crown Prince who is now the King and who will formally be declared King possibly in the course of the next hour or so in Kathmandu, has been exercising that authority in trying to bring about a strong and stable Government. Both the old King and the present new King declared, and declared with

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

sincerity, their desire to promote democratic institutions in Nepal and I have no doubt that the new King will persist in that desire and in trying to give effect to it.

So, on the passing of His Majesty King Tribhuvan Bir Bikram Shah, the late King, I am sure this House would like to express its sorrow and would like it to be conveyed to his family. Also, at the same time, I am sure this House would like to send its greetings to the new King Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah and wish him all success in the difficult responsibilities and burdens that have come to him. Above all, we would send our good wishes to the people of Nepal in the great adventures in building up their country on a democratic and prosperous basis that they are indulging in.

Mr. Speaker: On behalf of the House, I associate myself with what the hon. Leader of the House has said. We certainly send our greetings and all best wishes for the new King and for the people of Nepal. As a mark of respect and our sense of sorrow at the demise of the late King, the House will stand in silence for a minute.

CONSTITUTION (FOURTH AMENDMENT) BILL

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): 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 45 Members, 30 Members from this House, namely, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar, Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, Shri Ghamandi Lal Bansal, Shri Chimanlal Chakubhai Shah, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad Sinha, Shrimati B. Khongmen, Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh, Shri Tribhuvan Narayan Singh, Pandit Munishwar Dutt Upadhyay, Shri Diwan Chand

Sharma, Shri Radheshyam Ram Kumar Morarka, Shri Ahmed Mohiuddin, Shri Radhey Lal Vyas, Shri Wasudeo Kirolikar, Shri Upendranath Barman, Shri T. Sanganna, Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah, Shri Tekur Subrahmanyam, Shri R. Venkataraman, Shri C. P. Matthen, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri Jaipal Singh, Shri Uma Charan Patnaik, Shri Shankar Shantaram More, Shri Amjad Ali, Shri Asoka Mehta, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty, Shri Kamal Kumar Basu and the Mover, and 15 Members 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 31st March, 1955;

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

To move an amendment to the Constitution, Sir, is never a simple matter. The Constitution itself has provided a somewhat complicated procedure for this purpose. It is obvious, therefore, that one does not take lightly to the moving of an amendment to the Constitution.

Some had told us that the Constitution should be treated as some sacred unchanging document which should not be tampered with easily. And yet, those very persons who have so said have, in another context, suggested changes to the Constitution. That is to say, when the changes were to their liking, the Constitution became something which