

An Hon. Member: It is already 4.30 P.M.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me proceed. Whatever time is taken up now in the unofficial period, that will be made good after seven o'clock.

Shri Gadgil: This railway was never known for any speed, but the Bill in respect of the railway is rushing swiftly.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members went on as slowly, if not more slowly, as the railway. As a matter of fact, there is nothing here. The amendments are all out of order.

Shri S. S. More: You promised to give me time on that account. Have you changed your mind like the management of the Barsi Railway?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let not the Chairman be compared to any of these things. Now I have been compared to the management of the Barsi Railway. Let it go. I merely gave my first impression. I am giving the time.

The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3.— (Payment by Company to the Central Government)

Shri S. S. More: Sir, I will take some time.

An Hon. Member: Do please.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. We are on the point of order.

Shri S. S. More: I want to satisfy you.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: First of all let me state my doubts. There are two items here, gratuity and provident fund. Bonus is not an item which is contemplated in this Bill. How is it relevant to introduce this amendment?

Shri S. S. More: In order to satisfy you, Sir, on this particular point, I would refer you to rule No. 117 of the Rules of Procedure. But as we are to

go to another business, will it not be much more convenient to adjourn it to the next day because, otherwise, I will have to hurry up with the arguments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This will stand over.

MOTION RE FIRST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the other matter. There are four Bills relating to amendment of the Constitution. There was a motion moved by Shri Altekar that the House agrees with the First Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills. Mrs. Renu Chakravartty could not finish her speech the other day. She wanted a few minutes more. The House was impatient, but she wanted to have some more discussion. The Chair agreed that it can be continued the next day and finished within five minutes. That order stands, that agreement stands.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would like to bring one point to your notice and that is that the recommendations which have been made in the Report actually go against both the spirit of the Constitution and the rights granted under the Constitution as well as the rules of procedure guiding the functions of the Committee to examine Private Members' Bills. According to article 368 in the Constitution every Member has the right to amend the Constitution and the only limitation put by the Constitution is that it is required to have two-thirds of the Members of the House present and voting. Beyond that nobody else can put any sort of limitation on the right of Members to bring forward amendments to the Constitution. Now, on that ground the Rules of Procedure have been framed. I would like to say that the functions of the Committee, as they have been enumerated, are, firstly, to examine every Bill seeking to

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

amend the Constitution, notice of which has been given by a private Member, before a motion for leave to introduce the Bill is included in the list of business. That is the most important clause. The right has been given to examine before the motion for leave to introduce the Bill is included in the list of business. There is nothing, therefore, to say that the Committee has a right to make a recommendation of the nature whereby it can limit the right of a Member to introduce that Bill. All it can do is, maybe, go into the drafting of the Bill, whether it is correct or incorrect. They can even call upon the Members for a discussion with them, as laid down also in the procedure. They can have a discussion and tell them their opinion, but the final authority remains with that particular Member, whether he wants to introduce the Bill in Parliament or not. No recommendation of any nature can be made to the House by the Committee that the Member should not introduce the Bill, whatever may be the reasons given for it. Therefore, I say, Sir, that the recommendations made by the Committee are not correct, and that they cannot be voted upon.

The other point which I would also like to say is that there are certain powers and privileges given to Members of Parliament according to article 105 (3), and I think that the recommendations made here also go contrary to the spirit of that article. Therefore, I really do not see how we can even ask this House to vote on this. This is outside the scope of the functions of the Committee and as such I would urge that this particular report should not be accepted by this House. The only two recommendatory clauses which have been laid down when enumerating the functions of the Committee are, sub-clause (c) and sub-clause (e) of Rule 44. Sub-clause (c) says:

“to recommend the time that should be allocated for the discussion of the stage or stages of each private member's Bill and also to

indicate in the time-table so drawn up the different hours at which the various stages of the Bill in a day shall be completed”.

I say, Sir, that this is perfectly within the jurisdiction and powers of the Rules of Procedure. It is something that helps the procedure, helps the proper functioning and does not hit at the fundamental rights granted by the Constitution. Look again at sub-clause (e). There again the only recommendatory power given to this Committee is “to recommend time-limit for the discussion of private members' resolutions and other ancillary matters”. These are the only two sub-clauses in which recommendatory powers have been given. Besides that the only other powers given are the powers of examining but not making any recommendations which will be voted upon by this House. Therefore, Sir, I submit to you within the time-limit which you have given me, that I would like to oppose this motion; especially the first part of it should not be placed before this House and there should be no question of voting upon it.

Lastly, I would like to say a few words about the opinions given in the report about the Bills. I have already stated earlier that we were not a party to the making of the Constitution. We accept certain parts. Certain other parts we would like to be amended. It is on that basis that we have been elected. We have got the mandate of the electorate to change them or try to change them and bring before this Parliament certain very necessary amendments of the Constitution. Therefore, it is our right that we should do so. For instance, take the Bill which has been brought forward by Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy. That raises the question whether the Governors of States should be appointed by the President or whether they should be elected. The elective principle is a democratic principle. I believe that in the Constituent Assembly there was a great amount of debate and discussion on it and finally it was decided that the Governors should be

appointed. Well, that was the onus of the Constituent Assembly. Now, new Members have come in; new parties have come in; a new section of public opinion has been created. Certainly we have the right to bring forward before the House amendments if we consider it necessary that the elective principle should be introduced. I think that with such powers as are given, the Governor should, as far as possible, be above party and local politics. As you know yourself, Sir, the Speaker himself said that he is a party-man, that he is a Congressman. We know very many Governors are directly political beings and members of the Congress party like Shri Munshi and Shri Sri Prakasa. The Members on the other side may certainly think that as soon as they go up the pedestal and sit in the Governor's chair, automatically they become non-party men. We are not prepared to accept that. Therefore, we say we are not prepared to accept such clauses. Take the Bill No. 124 of Shri S. V. Ramaswamy. Here is a case in which I think the examining powers of the Committee have been fruitful. They have called Shri S. V. Ramaswamy; Shri S. V. Ramaswamy may have said, I do not need to introduce this Bill. The Committee must have been able to persuade him and tell him that it is an unnecessary Bill. But, where there are people who do think that it is very necessary and politically important to bring forward these Bills, I do say, that nobody can curb that right or limit that right.

Lastly, about the allotment of time for the Bills, I do submit that allotment of time is something that is within the purview of this Committee. The report says:

"The Committee also consider that in regard to Bills which had been introduced and taken up for consideration in the House, the maximum allotment of time for consideration and subsequent stages of such a Bill should be four hours."

I should like to put it to the House that no such generalisation should be

made. We have to determine and distinguish between Bill and Bill. If these are very important Bills, certainly, they should have more time allotted to them. I believe that this is a general rule that you have enunciated. But, I do think that it should be generally four hours, but where the Bills will be regarded as more important, further time may be allotted to them. Some such clause may be there because we have to decide taking into consideration the importance of the Bill from all these points of view. Therefore, I place before you my motion that we should not accept the motion of the Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Sir,

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member tabled any amendment?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: No: I have got one Bill.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): On a point of order, Sir, this is an important matter which is being discussed. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is not present here.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): He is busy with extra-Parliamentary business.

Dr. Krishnaswami: There is not even a Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is a Minister now.

Dr. Krishnaswami: Somebody must be present here when we are discussing an important matter. (Interruption.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I agree. I should think that the hon. Minister who is responsible and who is going to answer must stand by this motion. Of course, the motion was made by Shri Altekur. Government also, if they want, must have a say in the matter, because they oppose these Bills. I thought that the hon. Home

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Minister was here to reply to this matter. I do not know who is responsible for this.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): Is there any epidemic among the Ministers in Delhi?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ministers are also Members.

Shri Natesan (Tiruvallur): We are here Members of the Committee on Private Members' Bills. We, all of us, represent the general body of Parliament on the Private Members' Bills Committee. Every one of us will be able to answer the points raised by the Opposition. I do not think it is such a serious matter that a Minister must be present here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There must be both sides placed before the House. First of all, let us understand the scope of the question. To the best of my ability, I want to say in a few words what the scope of the matter before the House is. The hon. Member Shrimati Renu Chakravartty said that this curtails the right of the Members. This does not curtail the right of the Members. Certainly, nothing can be framed by way of a rule which is opposed to the Constitution. No power is given to any person including the Speaker to take away the rights granted by the Constitution. What are the rules? A number of Bills were waiting for introduction. Some of them had absolutely no chance of being introduced at all. First, a rule was framed that preference should be given to all Bills at the introduction stage, and that they need wait until other Bills which have been already introduced and which have reached the stage of consideration are disposed of. The former provision under which there was no chance for many of these Bills was dispensed with. Hon. Members, including Shri Nambiar, from time to time, were asking me to frame a rule under which, at the introduction stage, the Bills need not be delayed so that the Members may know what further steps should be

taken. Today, all the Bills of which notice has been given may be introduced without waiting for the disposal of other Bills which have already been introduced and with respect to which notice of motion for consideration has been given. That is one step in advance. So far as the Bills relating to the amendment of the Constitution are concerned, one small recommendation is made. It is only recommendatory as hon. Members may be aware. On an earlier occasion when another Bill relating to the amendment of the Constitution was placed before the House by a non-official Member, the hon. Prime Minister said that he would like to look into the matter so that he may oppose it at the introduction stage, or allow it. What does the rule contemplate? This Committee goes into those Bills, which relate to the amendment of the Constitution, at the introduction stage and makes a recommendation to the House. This is a recommendation as a matter of fact that these Bills need not be brought before the House. The same rule says that an hon. Member who wants to have a Bill introduced may give notice of an amendment that the Bill shall be introduced. If that notice is there, what exactly takes place is this. This is practically the introduction stage. As soon as he gives notice of this amendment, he states as to why the Bill ought to be introduced. The other side may oppose. What exactly will happen even without this rule and without any recommendation? If a Bill is to be introduced, it is open to the other side to oppose it even at the introduction stage. Normally it is not done. In many cases where matters of high policy are involved in a particular Bill, it is open to the other side to take exception. The new rules provide, and the old rules also provided, that even though at the introduction stage exception is taken and introduction is opposed, the Speaker may ask the Member who wants to introduce the Bill to state his points in a few words, and the Member who wants to oppose to state his reasons for opposing, and then immediately put it to the vote of the House as to

whether they should allow it to be introduced or not. We are going through the same stages. These four Bills have been considered and this is the recommendation of the Committee. It is only for the purpose of guidance. So far as the Constitution is concerned, the House may or may not accept this recommendation. Regarding opportunities, hon. Members who have sought leave to introduce the Bills are invited to the Committee, their arguments are heard and ultimately they themselves may be satisfied that introduction of the Bills is not necessary, in which case they will keep quiet, they will not move an amendment. In other cases where they differ from the opinion of the Committee or the recommendation of the Committee, they can move an amendment, and that is the introduction stage. Then what is done is that hon. Member who moves the amendment is asked to state what his points are. Then the other side is also asked to give the reasons for opposing the introduction. Then immediately it is put to the vote of the House. How is the right of the House taken away? On the other hand, the House has got an advantage of having a Committee which hears all the parties and then comes to its own conclusion. You may treat it as useless. You may or may not accept it. It is not binding. If, on the recommendation of the Committee, the hon. Member concerned does not want to move for introduction, Mrs. Renu Chakravarty cannot take it up. As a matter of fact, I was wondering how any hon. Member here who has not tabled an amendment or who has not given notice of introduction of a Bill can be allowed to speak on this. Because this is a matter of first impression, I allowed to speak on this. Because only persons who are concerned with this, or against whom a recommendation has been made that his Bill should not be allowed to be introduced, will be heard for five minutes. For instance, Mr. Ramaswamy has given notice of a Bill. If the Committee has recommended that his Bill ought not to be allowed to be introduced, he can move an amendment. He can say

"I am not prepared to accept this recommendation. I appeal to the House. These are the grounds on which leave should be granted for the introduction of my Bill." Similarly, the other side will give its reasons for opposing introduction. Then it will be put to the vote of the House. There is no taking away of rights.

Mr. Gurupadaswamy has not tabled an amendment notwithstanding the fact that he wanted to introduce a Bill. He was also heard. That means he does not want to introduce the Bill.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: No, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whether he says "No" or "Yes", it does not matter. There is a procedure. If you want to introduce a Bill not accepting the Committee's recommendation, say so. There is an opportunity given. How is the opportunity taken away?

We will assume this Committee has not come into existence, and there is no recommendation of the Committee. What, then, will be done? An hon. Member wants to introduce a Bill. I ask the hon. Minister: "Are you willing to accept?" He says "No". It is open to the hon. Member to keep quiet, not to introduce his Bill at all, or ask for leave to introduce it. On such occasions, it is only those who have tabled a motion for introducing Bills who will be asked to state their points and the Government or any other hon. Members who might oppose the introduction. That is all that will be done. We do not have even such a general discussion like this. Because the first impression seems to be that this Committee is taking away rights vested by the Constitution in Members, I said the other day that I will allow the discussion, but still the same misunderstanding persists. Therefore, Mr. Gurupadaswamy has no right to speak.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: May I ask for a clarification? Certain principles have been laid down by this Committee. It is not on the merits of any particular Bill. You have argued and placed the principles before the House.

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

The general convention is that Members are allowed to introduce their Bills. Generally, neither the Opposition nor the Government opposes the introduction. Up to now there has not been a single private Member's Bill which has been opposed at the introduction stage.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There have been a number of cases. I can ask the office to give a list. Normally, at the introduction stage no Bill is opposed, but even here with respect to the other Bills there is no Committee sitting and making a recommendation, i.e., excepting Bills seeking to amend the Constitution. There is nothing in the Rules to prevent it, nor a convention to that effect.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): In regard to the other Bills also there is a provision. Mr. Kamath's Bill was thrown out at the introduction stage.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He wanted to have the right to commit suicide. I will give one other instance. The Preventive Detention Bill was opposed at the stage of introduction. Therefore, it is wrong to think that any Bill can be introduced automatically. This is only a recommendation, both in letter and spirit, by the Committee to the House. It may be accepted or it may not be accepted. So far as the general principles are concerned, least it should be thought that the Committee conceived something of its own imagination, the reasons that induced it to come to the conclusion are given,—it is to enable the House to come to a conclusion whether the recommendations are right or wrong. It does not mean that these are the general principles which ought to be accepted by the House for ever.

Dr. Krishnaswami: On a point of information. At the time a Bill is introduced, the hon. Member introducing the Bill is not expected to make a speech. Therefore, if there is a recommendation of the Committee that the Bill should not be introduced and if he persists in introducing it, can he

have a right to explain the reasons for introducing that particular Bill? I should like to have elucidation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even without these new Rules, when leave to introduce a Bill is opposed, the hon. Member who asks for leave is asked to state his point. Then the person opposing it is asked to state his point. It is not an elaborate discussion. Then immediately it is put to the vote of the House. The only thing that has intervened here is that the House is now in possession of some kind of recommendation by an expert Committee which represents the House. The House may accept it or may not accept it. It is only to regulate their desire to vote.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): May I have an elucidation on this point?

I take it that every Member has the inherent right to bring a motion before the House. Whether it is accepted or not is a very different proposition. But can a Committee on Private Members' Bills make a recommendation to this House on the merits of pending legislation which a certain Member wishes to introduce? If I have given notice of a Bill to amend the Constitution, I have to go through certain kinds of procedure. If I am stopped at the initial stage by a recommendation of the Private Members' Bills Committee which says to the House that it should not be accepted and thereby prejudices the House's mind against my proposition, then I say the Committee is going beyond its jurisdiction. The Committee has no business to enter into the merits of the proposition any Member might bring forward.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will answer this point. It is a short point.

Even at the introduction stage it is not open to the House to go straight into the matter and say: "This seems to be one of 'first impression'. Let us look into the Bill. What are the consequences that will follow? Let us

have three or four Members to go into this matter. We have not got time now. Let the Committee consider what are the grounds for such a novel Bill to be brought up. What is the hurry? Why should not the Member wait?" It is always open to the House to set up a Committee of the House to advise it on particular matters. We will assume some hon. Member opposes the introduction and gives all the reasons that we have given here in this recommendation. Then what will happen? After all, it is not a stranger who gives the advice. It is not a court. We are always open to conviction even at the last moment. Merely because there is a recommendation, nobody is prevented from discussing it. No newspaper is prevented from saying that it ought not to be taken up, it is obnoxious etc. Therefore, there is no question of prejudice.

The second point that was raised by Mr. Mukerjee is that leave to introduce is blocked. No, it is not so. Mr. Ramaswamy has given notice of an amendment. That means, he says: "I want to introduce my Bill. I will now place it before you. I do not agree with this recommendation." The amendment is only the form. The substance of it is: "Notwithstanding the fact that the Committee does not want me to introduce the Bill, on this ground I do want to introduce the Bill. I will satisfy the House." He introduces the Bill if his motion is passed. It is automatic. The House will not be asked to decide the matter once again.

5 P.M.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I make a submission, if you would bear with me for a moment? If, for example, I give notice tomorrow of a Bill to amend the Constitution, and if the Committee on Private Members' Bills pronounces upon it and tells the House that it should not be introduced at all, if we accept the report which is placed before the House today, the result is that I am really deprived of my right at any moment. I think it to bring in a Bill to amend the Constitution, because that has to be decided

upon by a Committee, the composition of which, in the present circumstances, is bound to be of a particular character, and which, therefore, is bound to pronounce against certain changes in the Constitution. That being so, it is a very serious infraction of the rights of private Members, particularly belonging to the Opposition, as well as the independent Members, who may have very serious grounds of controversy with the majority party in the House.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I should like to address the House on one particular aspect. My hon. friend the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party has said just now that there is an inherent right for every Member of the House to bring forward a Bill. Nobody disputes that. But I would beg the House also to consider the state of affairs at present, viz. that the House is congested with business, but no progress is being made, and legislative business is being held up. We are going to have discussion on the General Budget, the Railway Budget, the Demands for Grants, and so on. I would suggest therefore that we should make an effort by committee procedure to cut short as much discussion about details in the House as possible. From your speech, I gathered that it is not the intention of this Committee to say finally that no Bill should be introduced. What the Committee probably has in view is that they will have a detailed discussion among themselves, and then they will give their recommendations. If they say that a particular Bill can come before the House, and be introduced, then there is no question about it, and that Bill is introduced. If they say in respect of any particular Bill that it should not be introduced, then the sponsor of the Bill may not agree with that recommendation, and it is open to him to bring a motion before the House and say, 'I do not accept the view of the Committee, I want to satisfy the House, and I want to go forward with my Bill.' He explains his stand in about two or three minutes, and disposes of his

[Dr. Katju]

motion. Then the question is put to the vote, and the discussion thereon comes to an end.

On the wider question, I would suggest respectfully that we must adopt some procedure by which the House—if I may put it that way—may be in session before lunch, in the morning, (there being a series of select committees or other committees going into these matters, and examining every provision of these Bills in detail), while in the afternoon, after lunch, the discussion on the floor of the House should be very limited and confined to basic principles underlying any piece of legislation. Otherwise, we would never be able to make any progress. All sorts of big questions, like foreign policy, economic policy are coming before us, as also motions for adjournment, etc. every day, and at this rate, we shall never be able to get on with legislation, unless we have this committee procedure. It does not involve any infraction of the rights of private Members, (as my hon. friend there has tried to suggest), either individually, or the rights of the House collectively. The Committee represents in some way the opinion of the House, and that Committee is intended to shorten discussions, as I understand it, on the floor of the House.

I would therefore suggest that this procedure might well be accepted, and while the right of every single private Member to bring forward his Bill is safeguarded, the advantage that the House has is that the discussion on the floor of the House is shortened.

Dr. Krishnaswami: This is a Bill to amend the Constitution.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: That is really an attack on the Opposition Members.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I have allowed the hon. Member to speak once, twice, thrice and four times. How many times am I to allow her to speak?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: This is a completely wrong way of dealing with....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I am not going to allow this kind of an interruption. The hon. Member is going on speaking...

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: But why should attacks be made consistently, and yet we should not be allowed to speak....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member has got a bee in her bonnet. There is no attack involved in what the hon. Home Minister has said. What is the good of saying, there is an attack? I would not allow this kind of remark any more. I have given absolute indulgence till now, and I have allowed a number of hon. Members to speak. In order that I may be able to gather their first impressions. The hon. Member has had her say once. But she goes on rising in her seat every minute, even though I am calling upon other hon. Members. As this is the first occasion when a report of this nature is being placed before the House, I wanted to have the general impressions of the hon. Members, and so I allowed discussion for about half an hour. But the hon. Member goes on rising in her seat, and says, she will go on speaking. (*Interruptions*): I will now give an opportunity to Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy also to speak, because he has tabled a Bill in his name. This is the occasion when hon. Members who have tabled Bills in their names, seeking to amend the Constitution, can have their say; this is the occasion when they have got an opportunity to introduce their Bills and explain their reasons for doing so. Whoever has given an amendment to the original motion has got the right now to explain his stand, and to have his Bill introduced with the consent of the House. There is nothing else in the Rules. The House is absolutely competent in this matter. Ordinarily, when hon. Members ask for leave to

introduce their Bills, they can only state their main points, but now they have an opportunity to state in extenso the reasons why they want to introduce their Bills; similarly, the other hon. Members who want to oppose the introduction of particular Bills, have got an opportunity to state the reasons why they object to the introduction. Formerly, hon. Members might not have looked into the provisions of the Bills in detail, but now they are having the benefit of the report of a Committee which has gone into all these details. They can take advantage of it, and explain why particular Bills ought to be allowed to be introduced, and equally other hon. Members may explain why particular Bills ought not to be introduced; then the matter is put to vote. The Committee's recommendation or report is purely recommendatory. Therefore, no fear need be expressed that there is an infraction of the rights of individual Members.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): May I put one question? Is there any similar Committee for Government Bills, where hon. Members of this House are allowed to participate? That is the information I want.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as the constitution of this Committee is concerned, it is meant only for non-official Bills, i.e. private Members' Bills.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I ask on a point of decorum, if not of order? I am sorry I have to put it this way, but I do not know how else to put it. The kind of language which is bandied about normally and legitimately by either side of the House, is, I submit, not the kind of language which should come from you. That is why I ask you whether it was right for you to use the expression about a particular Member of this House, viz. that 'she has a bee in her bonnet'. Exactly that is the kind of expression, which if Dr. Katju had used, we would not have minded in the least. If you say it, I think we are entitled to have some kind of an explanation as to how it is consistent with the

rules of decorum which you are supposed to administer in this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have no hesitation in saying that I did not mean any offence to the lady Member. I thought she had some other point in her mind, because she had been getting up again and again, that she thought this being a very important matter, very far-reaching consequences would come out of this. I meant only this and nothing more. I understood this in one particular manner, and I had no intention to offend the hon. Member. I am exceedingly sorry that such an impression should have been created in the mind of the hon. Member. If I had known that it would mean some offence, I would not have used such an expression at all. I used it in a language in which I thought there was absolutely no offence meant. Whenever I have given offence, I am always ready to admit that I have offended. But on this particular occasion, I never meant any offence to the hon. lady Member.

Now, so far as this matter is concerned, let us close it here. There is absolutely no purpose served by continuing it any further. The Bills are there waiting to be introduced. I shall first give an opportunity to those who have tabled amendments to the main motion. With respect to others, who have not tabled amendments, I am prepared to go out of the way and give them an opportunity. First, I shall allow Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy an opportunity to explain his position, notwithstanding the fact that he had not tabled an amendment, though he had the right to do so.

An Hon. Member: Just now you gave a ruling that Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy had no right to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am entitled to change my ruling also.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I rise to make a few observations regarding my Bill, and to say that it is quite in order. The recommendation of the Committee on Private Members' Bills is not at all satisfactory in regard to

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

this Bill. I submit that this Committee is only a creature of this Parliament, and as such, it cannot abrogate the right of a Member of this House to introduce any Bill, whether it is seeking to amend the Constitution or is meant for some other purpose. It is the fundamental right of every Member of this House to bring forward any Bill to amend the Constitution. The Committee has observed that the Constitution is a very sacred document and that it cannot be treated and tampered with lightly and that as far as possible private Members should restrain themselves before making amendments to this sacred document. I agree with the observations made by the Committee. We are all conscious, every Member of the House is conscious, that the Constitution is a very sacred document and should not be treated lightly.

In this connection I want to submit an instance. Suppose there is a statue of a deity and it is cracking. To say that the deity is a very auspicious god or goddess and therefore it should not be tampered with and should not be repaired is, I think, a foolish argument to make. If there is something bad in that sacred thing, mere announcing it as sacred does not make it really so. To say that we should not do anything to set it in order is, I think, a very absurd position to take. I do feel, Sir, that the Constitution is a very important document and that it is not to be violated and should not be treated in a light-hearted manner. I agree with all these points made by the Committee, but the Committee should not assume that the Member who moves an amendment to the Constitution is treating it in a light-hearted manner. The Committee should go into the question whether the amendment suggested is lightly done or is important. I beg to submit that my amendment is a very serious amendment. It refers to the fundamental character of the Constitution and I have suggested that hereafter the offices of Governors should be elective. What

is happening now is that Governors are appointed by the President, and the President is guided eventually by the Ministry and the Ministry is controlled in turn by the Congress party. So, in the ultimate analysis, Governors are the nominees of the Congress party and therefore are not above party. The Committee has observed that if the post of Governor is made an elective one, then the Governor cannot be above party, there would be controversy, party politics, and fight for the election of Governors, and therefore, the Governor cannot be an impartial Head of the State. But I do submit that even now, though the Governor is appointed by the President, he is under the thumb of the ruling party and he is expected to carry out the policies set up by the party. So, he is not above party and he is a party-man. Invariably, Members belonging to one party are selected as Governors. People who are defeated in the last elections, people who are not able to get into the Ministry, people who are not able to get the place of ambassadors abroad—such people are invariably selected to function as Governors.

Shri Nambiar: The latest is Shri Kumaraswami Raja.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: They are party-men and are acting in a partisan way. The nomination of such people is most undemocratic. So, I suggest that hereafter the place of Governor should be made an elective one, and there should be a democratic procedure for their election. By doing so, we will be making the Constitution itself more democratic. I agree it is a very serious amendment. We know the consequences of such an amendment. We feel that it should be done. So, I submit that the Committee has done a very wrong thing in not recommending my amendment. In my opinion the Committee has not taken a good, impartial view of things.

I know that even in the Committee one or two Members had expressed

their view that the Bill I proposed should be introduced in Parliament. I know that only the Members belonging to the Congress party did not want to introduce the Bill but other Members who belonged to the Opposition wanted the introduction of the Bill. So, even in the Committee, there was a rift. It is not a unanimous recommendation of the Committee. It is only a partial recommendation of the Committee. Only because the Chairman, or some people there who were working in that Committee, did not want, did not allow, a minute of dissent, there was no minute of dissent. Otherwise, there would have been a minute of dissent on this matter. It is a very serious matter. The Committee should not arrogate to itself the powers of Parliament, and the powers of the Members who belong to Parliament. It is the fundamental right of every Member to bring in any measure for the decision of the House. If the Committee do not agree with our amendments, let them do so, but I want the House to see and hear and discuss those things so that we may have the opinion of the House. In this matter the Committee cannot abrogate the right of the House, and cannot abridge the freedom of any Member of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nobody does so. I am going to put it to the vote of the House. I am not going to give a ruling myself. The hon. Member need have no suspicion about this.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: This measure is a very, very important measure and it is a very democratic measure. I want the House to allow the introduction of this Bill and I want that the procedure of elections be adopted so far as the appointment of Governors is concerned.

Shri Altekar (North Satara): The opposition to this motion is misconceived. The opposition fails to take into consideration the fact that the Committee on Private Members' Bills is a Committee of this very House and it reflects the general sense of the House. There are Members of all the parties in this Committee and

it is an all-party Committee. Therefore, I think the Committee reflects the general sense or opinion of this House. Members of the Opposition are represented there. The list of the Members of the Committee will show that, but I do not want to take the time of the House unnecessarily by reading that list.

Now, there is absolutely no hindrance placed by this Committee in the way of a Member who wants to move any amendment to the Constitution. The right that is conferred by article 368 of the Constitution is open to any Member of the House, and he can give notice of such an amendment. What the rules have provided is that there will be only a Committee which will thoroughly investigate in the matter and hear all the views of the Members, discuss them fully, and after discussing them, it may make recommendations to this House. It is purely a recommendation; nothing more and nothing less. If, as you have already said, Sir, a Member gives notice of an amendment to the Constitution, or of a Bill, it is placed before the House for introduction. He is asked to give his points; and if any one opposes, he too has to state his points. Immediately a vote is taken. But by making provision for such proceedings through this Committee, which has now been formed, ample and full opportunity has been given for the discussion of the amendments on merits, by going thoroughly into all aspects of them. A Member can discuss the amendments fully before that Committee and the Committee, after hearing him and coming to a conclusion, may make recommendations to this House which gives a wider opportunity for the same. It is no restriction but rather a wider opportunity for these various points being considered before the recommendation is made to the House. Under the old system, it would have been only a statement of points, but now owing to the rules that have been framed for the purposes of this Committee, there is a full discussion before the Committee on all aspects

[Shri Altekari]

of the amendment. So, I would submit that this is rather a widening of the power and not a restriction on the power of a Member to bring amendments before this House.

So far as the other aspects are concerned, I would like to reply to the point raised by the hon. lady Member on the opposite side that this report is in infringement of the rights conferred by article 105 of the Constitution. I submit that her point of view is entirely beside the point at issue. Article 105 (1) of the Constitution says:

"Subject to the provisions of this Constitution and to the rules and standing orders regulating the procedure of Parliament, there shall be freedom of speech in Parliament."

It is in concern with the protection and freedom of speech in this House. That is, what the hon. lady Member may say in this House in connection with any subject before the House. The article referred to by her goes on to say that a Member of Parliament will not be liable to any proceedings in any court in respect of anything said by him in Parliament. That is in regard to what is said by him in the course of his speech in this House. This is a privilege and protection given by this article. It has absolutely no bearing whatsoever on the moving of any amendment to the Constitution in this House. Therefore, I submit that the point that is raised in that connection is entirely beside the mark.

Then so far as the Bills that have been brought here are concerned, I would like to point out that these have been fully considered in all the various aspects. My hon. friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, has stated that it is a fundamental question of the democratic principle that the post of Governor should be elective. Now, this matter was discussed fully before the Constituent Assembly and all the pros and cons were fully considered, and after that the present

method has been adopted. Now, what are the recommendations of this Private Members' Bills Committee? They are, that when the matter has been so fully discussed and a certain principle was adopted, there should be a sufficiently fair trial given to that. It is only about three years since the Constitution has been brought into effect and a fair trial should be given to and sufficient experience should be had regarding the working of present system. Therefore, I submit that this is a sound principle that has been placed before the House. The House may accept it or reject it. The Private Members' Bills Committee's recommendations are after all recommendations; the House may accept them or reject them. They do not in any way take away the right of any Member of this House to move any amendment before this House. Therefore, the opponents' angle of vision in looking at the recommendations that are made by the Committee is rather misdirected. The House is quite free to accept or throw away these recommendations. Any hon. Member is quite free to move any amendment to the Constitution and it will come before this House. Just as any other amendment to the Constitution would have been moved formerly, it will also come up before the House after full discussion by the Committee for giving its opinion thereon. Therefore, there is absolutely no sort of hindrance to or any mitigation of the right that has been conferred on any Member for bringing in an amendment to the Constitution. From all these points of view, I would like to point out that the right of no hon. Member of this House is in any way infringed or encroached upon by the recommendations that have been made by this Private Members' Bills Committee, and I beg to submit that the report should be accepted. No right whatsoever is abrogated by the recommendations. It is already there and it can in no way be taken away by the recommendations that have been made by this Committee. My hon. friend, Mr. Mukerjee, has said

that these recommendations take away the inherent right of the Members. No inherent right has been taken away and any Member, as I have already said, is quite free to move any amendment to the Constitution; it will be fully discussed before the Committee and it will come before this House for acceptance or rejection. Under these circumstances, Sir, I submit that these recommendations that are made to this House should be taken in the spirit in which they are made and there is absolutely no infringement of any of the powers of this sovereign House.

Shri Namblar: On a point of clarification, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No. It should have been asked earlier.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: You won't allow any Member to speak?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more. I called upon the other gentleman, the Mover. We have given more than three hours to this.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): How will the voting be? Will it be in respect of each and every Bill or will it be in respect of motion generally?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will put the amendments to the motion first and then the motion itself. The motion is:

"That this House agrees with the First Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills presented to the House on the 9th December 1953"

to which I have received three amendments. One is by Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"That this House disagrees with the Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills."

That is a negation of the original motion and therefore, any voting that may take place will be a vote against the original motion.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): I want a clarification from you, Sir. Supposing a certain verdict of the House is to be recorded in this House, is it not necessary that the positive verdict as well as the negative verdict should be recorded, positively?

Shri K. K. Basu: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am positively of opinion that I have not been able to understand what the non-Member has said.

Shri K. K. Basu: My proposition is this. The way in which this motion is being dealt with is a violation of article 118 of the Constitution. The Constitution says...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That has already been said.

Shri K. K. Basu: No, Sir. You might have taken each Bill on its own motion. That is a different thing. But if you put it generally, it may be constructed differently later. This Private Members' Bills Committee is appointed by the Speaker and it is not a special committee appointed by a resolution of the House with a particular directive to sit in judgment on the particular Bills. Here it says that no amendment to the Constitution should be allowed to be introduced unless the Committee recommends. Therefore, I was enquiring from you. If you put each separately and take the verdict, that is quite different. But if you lump it all in a general motion, it might be construed that unless this Private Members' Bills Committee, which is appointed and nominated by the Speaker, recommends that such and such a Bill can be introduced, the Members have no right to do so. Therefore, I would submit to you that it violates article 118 of the Constitution which says that our rules should not be such as to go against article 366.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, so far as this matter is concerned, this procedure that we have adopted does not go against this.

Order, order. Those hon. Members in the front Benches are so absorbed in their conversation that they do not care to know what exactly is going on in the House. If it is so interesting, they may go to the Lobby.

Now the point is this. The report is there. It makes recommendations in respect of all the four Bills. If all the four hon. Members so want, it is open to each one of them to have tabled an amendment saying: 'This report is wrong. My Bill ought to be taken up' in which case I would have placed Bill after Bill before the House and even at the introduction stage the verdict of the House could have been obtained and leave to introduce given. If some hon. Member does not want to press it and does not table an amendment, it is open to him; it is the same thing as if he has not presented the Bill. Therefore, there is absolutely no verdict contrary to the rules, if the recommendation is accepted. All that it means is that those gentlemen themselves accept the recommendations and do not want to move them. In so far as the other matter is concerned, whenever one hon. Member has given notice that he considers that his Bill ought to be accepted, then leave to introduce is given. Therefore, I do not see any inherent inconsistency between the rules and the Constitution. After all, on many occasions it has been ruled by the Chair that the ultimate decision of the whole matter is in the hands of the House. I will put it now.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: On a point of order, Sir. I want to know where is the rule that I should move an amendment to the motion.

Shri Kasiwal (Kotah-Jhalawar): There is a rule.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think so. If not, I will correct it. Yes, there is Rule 47.

Dr. Katju: You might put it to vote now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A point of order is raised. I have to meet the point of order before I put it to the House. Rule 47 says:

"At any time after the report has been presented to the House a motion may be moved that the House agrees or agrees with amendments or disagrees with the report:

Provided that not more than half-an-hour shall be allowed for the discussion of the motion and no member shall speak for more than five minutes on such a motion:

Provided further that an amendment may be moved that the report be referred back to the Committee without limitations or with reference to any particular matter."

Rule 47 speaks of three positions; it may agree, or it may agree with amendments, or it may disagree. Therefore, if there is any amendment that so far as a particular Bill is concerned the report shall be modified, or that a particular Bill shall be excluded from the report, then I will put that amendment to the vote of the House.

Shri S. S. More: Will that not mean that if the main report is accepted, I will not be allowed to bring forward a motion for leave before the House and seek the leave of the House directly? The report will come before the House with the recommendation that Mr. More's notice should not be taken into consideration, and it will be submitted to the vote of the House. I will have to move an amendment that my notice should be accepted. If that amendment is defeated, then, it means that I am debarred. So, that is another way of putting a clog, which is against the Constitution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Where is the clog? After the report is made, he must indicate to the House by an amendment that he still wants to press his notice. That is my ruling.

Shri S. S. More: We have not been able to follow it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have been speaking English; I will speak slowly.

Shri S. S. More: I do protest against this, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Against what do you protest?

Shri S. S. More: Unfortunately, you are the Chairman of the Committee and now you are sitting in the Chair.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You can criticise me. You need not say that I am the Chairman and I am now presiding. You can say that my opinion is wrong. Several hon. Members have said so. There is no good clouding the issue. Far from debarring any hon. Member, this enables the House to come to the conclusion in a much better way. The original rules were cryptic. They only said that if a motion for leave is opposed, then the hon. Member who gave notice of the motion will state his points. Then the House had no means of knowing what exactly it was that he wanted to bring forward in his Bill. Here, this Committee hears both sides of the question put before it. All that Mr. More says is that he should once again be given an opportunity for moving for leave to introduce. After the Committee's report, the hon. Member who made the original motion may be satisfied or he may not. If he is not satisfied he gives an indication to the House that he does not agree with the report and wants leave to introduce. That is all that it says.

Shri S. S. More: Will that be enough?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His amendment is enough.

Shri S. S. More: With great respect to you, I still seek clarification.

Dr. Katju: I would only suggest, Sir, that there are only 2½ hours for private Members' business and that

it should be fully utilised. We have already lost one hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not carried away by this kind of argument. I am trying to satisfy myself and also the House. The hon. Home Minister need not be so much worried about Private Members' Business.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Crocodile tears.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is taking away their own time; they are also worried about it.

Shri S. S. More: I want some clarification because we are in the initial stages of our democracy. Supposing the report is submitted to the House; it also embodies my notice. Now, if I get upon my legs in the House and say that I want to have a chance on the floor of the House, will that be enough? Will it give me an opportunity of seeking leave in the open House?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is the amendment given.

Shri S. S. More: Then the majority vote will decide. Will the declaration be treated as being enough? If an amendment is given, it will depend upon the majority vote of the House, which it is very difficult to get.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Majority vote is the one that gives leave also to introduce. Even if a motion for leave to introduce a Bill is brought on the floor of the House the vote of the majority cannot be ignored. Therefore, what has to be done is to give notice of an amendment. If he accepts the report of the Committee he gives no notice of amendment but if he wants to reject the report, he gives notice of the amendment.

Shri S. S. More: Again, Sir,.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have given sufficient clarification. I am going to put the amendments and motion to the vote.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Mr. More has also a bee in his bonnet.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order, please.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): May I respectfully submit one point?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not going to allow any further discussion on this matter. I have given sufficient time to this. I will now put it to vote.

Shri Nambiar: I want to know....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order; I am putting the amendment of Mr. Ramaswamy to vote. He is not pressing it?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Not pressing.

Shri Nambiar: Mr. Gurupadaswamy has given notice of an amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order; I won't allow this. Unless there is an amendment tabled, I am not going to put it to the House.

Shri Nambiar: This is a new procedure which you are introducing. He now wants to move it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have given my ruling. I will now put the motion to the House.

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the First Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills presented to the House on the 9th December, 1953."

The 'Ayes' have it.

Shri Nambiar: The 'Noes' have it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those who are for the motion will rise in their seats.

Shri Nambiar: Sir, we must have a regular division; the bell must ring.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Members take any interest in it, they must be present here. I cannot bring them here.

Shri Nambiar: Sir, this is a matter which has been agitating our minds. It may be they are not wise enough to anticipate your ruling. So, you must accept our request, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: For the information of hon. Members who have just now come into the House after the division bell rang, I may state that the question before the House is about the adoption of the First Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills presented to the House on the 9th December, 1953. There have been amendments moved to this motion. One is by Shri Khub Chand Sodhia, through which he wants the leave of the House to introduce his particular Bill. Then, there is an amendment by Shri Ramaswamy, through which he wants that his Bill ought to be accepted and leave to introduce it should be given. Then, there is an amendment by Shrimati Renu Chakravarty which says that the Report ought not to be accepted by the House. It is a negative one, and its fate will be decided by the fate of the main motion. I will formally put the amendments, unless they are withdrawn. I find Shri Sodhia is not present, but I shall have his amendment put to the House. His amendment is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"That this House disagrees with the Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills on Bill No. 51 of 1953."

Dr. N. B. Khare: The main motion has already been placed before the House, and the Chair cannot go back to the amendments.

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Bilaspur): Shri Sodhia is not here, and he has not also moved his amendment formally.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: By his Bill, Shri Sodhia wants to raise the age from twenty five years to thirty years for becoming a Member of the House of the People and in the other case to raise it from thirty years to thirty five years.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: But his amendment has not been moved so far. The Member is not in the House. It cannot therefore be voted upon.

Shri Altekar: He has not moved it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has given notice, but I shall just see whether he has moved it.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: But he is not here to indicate whether it is to be put to vote or not.

Dr. N. B. Khare: The Chair has already put the main motion to the House and votes were recorded. I submit that the Chair cannot go back to the amendments.

Shri K. K. Basu: On a point of order. Can anybody ask a Member to go out of the House when his amendment is going to be put to vote? The hon. Member Mr. Ramaswamy was here and he was asked to go away.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why is there a pandemonium over this? Why should hon. Members create so much noise? They can also go away; they have gone away a number of times. We represent 360 millions of people and people from various parts of the world are watching our proceedings. Are we trying to make this House a place where we play?

Shri S. S. More: When the Chair is speaking, it is looking only to us; it would convey the impression that we are responsible for this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Khub Chand Sodhia, I find, made a reference to his amendment but does not seem to have moved it. Therefore, I do not put it. Then, Shri Ramaswamy had moved his amendment. I shall put it. The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"That this House disagrees with the Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills on Bill No. 127 of 1952"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shrimati Renu Chakravartty's amendment is a negation of the original motion. Therefore, I shall now put the motion itself to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That this House agrees with the First Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills presented to the House on the 9th December, 1953."

The House divided: Ayes 147; Noes 39

Division No. 2]

AYES

[5-45 P. M.]

Abdus Sattar, Shri
Agarwal, Shri S.N.
Agrawal, Shri M.L.
Akarpuri, Sardar
Altekar, Shri
Alva, Shri Joachim
Ansari, Dr.
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Badan Singh, Ch.
Balmiki, Shri
Barupal, Shri P.L.
Basappa, Shri
Bhandari, Shri
Bharati, Shri G.S.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Bhatt, Shri C.
Bhonsle, Shri J.K.
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri

Bogawat, Shri
Bose, Shri P.C.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Cherak, Th. Lakshman Singh
Chaudhary, Shri G.L.
Chinaria, Shri
Choudhuri, Shri M. Shafiq
Dabhi, Shri
Damar, Shri
Das, Dr. M.M.
Das, Shri S.N.
Dessai, Shri K.K.
Deshmukh, Shri K.G.
Dholakia, Shri
Dhusiya, Shri
Digambar Singh, Shri
Dube, Shri U.S.

Dubey, Shri R.G.
Dwivedi, Shri D.P.
Dwivedi, Shri M.L.
Gadgil, Shri
Gandhi, Shri V.B.
Ganapati Ram, Shri
Ghosh, Shri A.
Gounder, Shri K.P.
Govind Das, Seth
Hazari, Shri J.N.
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Ibrahim, Shri
Iyyani, Shri E.
Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Jain, Shri N.S.
Jayashri, Shrimati
Jena, Shri K.C.
Jena, Shri Niranjan

Jhanjhanwala, Shri
 Joshi, Shri M.D.
 Joshi, Shri N.L.
 Jwala Prashad, Shri
 Kajrolkar, Shri
 Kale, Shrimati A.*
 Kasliwal, Shri
 Kazmi, Shri
 Keskar, Dr.
 Khedkar, Shri G.B.
 Kirolikar, Shri
 Krishnappa, Shri M.V.
 Kureel, Shri B.N.
 Lakshmayya, Shri
 Lallanji, Shri
 Lingam, Shri N.M.
 Mahodaya, Shri
 Majhi, Shri R.C.
 Malviya, Shri K.D.
 Malliah, Shri U.S.
 Malvia, Shri B.N.
 Malviya, Pandit C.N.
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Mathew, Prof.
 Maydeo, Shrimati
 Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha
 Mehta, Shri B.G.
 Mishra, Shri S.N.
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri L.N.

Mishra, Shri Lokenath
 Misra, Shri R.D.
 Mohd. Akbar, Sofi
 Morarka, Shri
 Narasimhan, Shri C.R.
 Naskar, Shri P.S.
 Natesan, Shri
 Nathwani, Shri N.P.
 Nehru, Shrimati Uma
 Nijalingappa, Shri
 Pannalal, Shri
 Parekh, Dr. J.N.
 Parmar, Shri R.B.
 Patel, Shrimati Maniben
 Patil, Shri Shankargauda
 Prasad, Shri H.S.
 Rachiah, Shri N.
 Radha Raman, Shri
 Raghuramaiah, Shri
 Ram Dass, Shri
 Ram Saran, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramananda Tirtha, Swami
 Ramaswamy, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri S.V.
 Rup Narain, Shri
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Saigal, Sardar A.S.
 Saksena, Shri Mohanlal
 Sanganna, Shri

, i P.G.
 Sen, Shrimati Sushama
 Shah, Shri R.N.
 Shahnewaz Khan, Shri
 Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
 Sharma, Shri D.C.
 Sharma, Shri R.C.
 Singh, Shri D.N.
 Singh, Shri L. Jogeswar
 Sinha, Shri Jhulan
 Sinha, Shri Nageshwar Prasad
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarakeshwari
 Sinhasan Singh, Shri
 Soman, Shri N.
 Suresh Chandra, Dr.
 Swaminadhan, Shrimati Amma
 Tek Chand, Shri
 Telkikar, Shri
 Thomas, Shri A.M.
 Tivary, Shri V.N.
 Tiwari, Pandit B.L.
 Tiwary, Pandit D.N.
 Ukey, Shri
 Upadhyay, Shri S.D.
 Vaishnav, Shri H.G.
 Vaishya, Shri M.B.
 Venkataraman, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Radhela
 Wodeyar, Shri
 Zaidi, Col.

NOES

Achalu, Shri
 Basu, Shri K.K.
 Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu
 Chatterjee, Shri Tushar
 Chatterjee, Shri N.C.
 Chaudhuri, Shri T.K.
 Chowdhury, Shri N.B.
 Damodaran, Shri N.P.
 Das, Shri B.C.
 Das, Shri Sarangadhar
 Deshpande, Shri V.G.
 Gupta, Shri Sadhan
 Gusupadaswamy, Shri M.S.

Kandesamy, Shri
 Kelappan, Shri
 Khare, Dr. N.B.
 Krishnaswami, Dr.
 Lal Singh, Sardar
 Menon, Shri Damodara
 More, Shri S.S.
 Mukerjee, Shri H.N.
 Muniswamy, Shri
 Nambiar, Shri
 Pandey, Dr. Natabar
 Raghavachari, Shri
 Ramasami, Shri M.D.

Ramnarayan Singh, Babu
 Randaman Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri P. Subba
 Rao, Shri Seshagiri
 Rao, Shri T.B. Vittal
 Rishang Keishing, Shri
 Shah, Shrimati Kamledu Mati
 Sharma, Shri Nand Lal
 Shastri, Shri B.D.
 Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
 Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
 Trivedi, Shri U.M.
 Waghmare, Shri

The motion was adopted.

INDIAN RAILWAYS (AMEND- MENT) BILL

(Omission of sections 71A, 71B and amendment of sections 71C, 71D, etc.)

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Railways Act, 1890.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Railways Act, 1890.”

The motion was adopted.

Shri Nambiar: I introduce the Bill.