

introduce a Bill to amend the Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Act, 1957.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Public Employment (Requirement as to Residence) Act, 1957."

The motion was adopted.

Shri L. Achaw Singh: I introduce the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi. The hon. Member is absent.

14.37 hrs.

FIXATION OF PRICES OF FOOD GRAINS BILL—(by Shri Jhulan Sinha)—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Jhulan Sinha on the 18th August, 1961:

"That the Bill to provide for fixation of prices of foodgrains be taken into consideration."

Out of 1½ hours allotted, 1 hour and 14 minutes were taken up on the 18th August and 16 minutes are now available. Shri Raghunath Singh may continue and finish quickly.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां तक खाद्यान्न के मूल्यांकन का सम्बन्ध है, यह मूल्यांकन ऐसे वैज्ञानिक आधार पर होना चाहिये कि जो हमारे काश्तकार हैं उनको कुछ फायदा हो। अगर आर्थिक दृष्टि से काश्तकार को फायदा नहीं होगा तो चाहे हम कितना भी प्लान बनावें वह कामयाब नहीं होगा, वह तभी कामयाब

होगा जब कि काश्तकार को कुछ फायदा होगा।

आज आप देखें कि काश्तकार ईख ज्यादा बोता है। इसका यही कारण है कि ईख की आल इण्डिया प्राइस निश्चित है। काश्तकार को मालूम है कि उसको गन्ने से निश्चित फायदा होगा। पर खाद्यान्न के बारे में उसको पता नहीं कि उसको कितना फायदा होगा। काश्तकार जानता है कि अगर वह एक एकड़ में ईख बोएगा तो उसको इतना लाभ होगा। लेकिन खाद्यान्न का यह हाल है कि उसकी कोई कीमत निश्चित नहीं है, इसलिये उसको पता नहीं कि खाद्यान्न बोने से उसको फायदा होगा या नहीं। उदाहरण के लिये आज धान का भाव तीन सेर का है, कल चार सेर हो जाता है और परसों ६ सेर का हो जाता है। तो किसान परेशान हो जाता है कि धान बोने में उसको फायदा होगा या नहीं।

इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि आप खाद्यान्न की फ्लोर प्राइस मुकर्रर कर दें और उसके बाद मारकेट प्राइस तै करें। हम को यह नियम बनाना चाहिये कि फ्लोर प्राइस के बाद जो मारकेट प्राइस हो उसके अनुसार किसान का अनाज बेचा जाए।

आप देखें कि हमने अमरीका से इतना ज्यादा गेहूं मंगा लिया है कि हम अपने देश के खाद्यान्न की प्राइस को रेग्युलेट कर सकते हैं। हमारे पास खाद्यान्न का इस समय एक रिजर्व बन गया है। ऐसी स्थिति में हम देश में खाद्यान्न की प्राइससेज को रेग्युलेट कर सकते हैं।

हमारे देश की ६० प्रतिशत जनता खेती पर निर्भर है। इसलिये जब तक उसको आप खाद्यान्न की बिक्री से समुचित लाभ नहीं देंगे तब तक जनता में खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन करने

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

की प्रेरणा और उत्साह कैसे आएगा। आप इस बिल को स्वीकार करें या न करें लेकिन इस सिद्धान्त को आपको अवश्य स्वीकार करना चाहिये कि खाद्यान्न की कीमत निश्चित की जाए।

मैं आपको इस सम्बन्ध में रूस का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ भ्रष्टाचार नहीं होता क्योंकि वहाँ हर चीज के दाम निश्चित हैं। अगर एक फाउन्टेनपैन का दाम मास्को में एक रुपया है तो पोर्ट आर्थर में भी उसका दाम एक ही रुपया होगा, उजबेकिस्तान में भी वही दाम होगा। इसलिये वहाँ भ्रष्टाचार का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। कम से कम उन्होंने अपना आर्थिक आधार इतना सुन्दर बनाया है कि सारे देश में एक प्राइस है लिहाजा ब्लैक मार्केट का कोई सवाल नहीं होता है।

मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि खाद्यान्न का एक भाव देश में होना चाहिये ताकि खाद्यान्न में जो ब्लैक मार्केट होती है वह एक दम से बन्द हो जाय। इस वास्ते मेरी आप से यह प्रार्थना है कि आप इस बिल के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार करें और कार्टकारों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा सहूलियतें दें ताकि वह खाद्यान्न के उत्पादन में अपना ज्यादा से ज्यादा मन लगायें। आप खाद्यान्न की प्राइस का एक एक मल्यांकन अवश्य कर।

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am all in favour of the principle behind this Bill, and I am very glad that this opportunity has been taken by my hon. friend to introduce this Bill in order to bring this particular important question prominently to the notice of this House as well as the country. Only as a matter of principle, Government I think has already conceded that it is its duty to see that agricultural prices are

maintained at a reasonable level. I would like them also to concede the other associate principle that agricultural prices should be maintained at a remunerative level.

Secondly, I think Government has also conceded during the Third Five Year Plan the need for fixing and announcing agricultural prices well in advance of the sowing time or the harvest time, so that peasants would know what prices they could expect for their produce and therefore decide according to their planning.

But what steps have Government taken so far or propose to take in order to implement these two pious declarations of theirs as embodied in the Third Five Year Plan? If one reads very carefully the chapter on price policy in the Third Five Year Plan one gets the impression that although Government has paid lip-sym-pathy to these two needs of our peasants, Government all the time has kept in its mind the need for it to keep down prices in general that is what they say: 'in general.' But, at the same time, they go on repeatedly saying that the price levels in our country are dependent upon mostly prices of cereals, because our economy is considered to be a cereal economy and our wage-earners, the lower middle class people, the government employees and others spent so much more on cereals than upon other commodities. So it all comes to this, that their emphasis upon the need for keeping down the prices, if possible by bringing down the price levels, is to be implemented only by depressing and keeping down the agricultural prices. Therefore, there is very great need indeed for the Government to decide, and give an assurance in regard to that, upon the need for relating agricultural prices and price levels with the price levels prevailing for all other commodities. That is to say,

the general price level should be related to the agricultural price level and *vice-versa* just as the working class wages and wage levels are sought to be related to the cost of living index. That kind of relationship has got to be established. Whether Government has made up its mind in regard to this particular matter or not, it is not clear so far as the Third Five Year Plan is concerned. It is high time that Government give that assurance to the country, that they would not yield to the pressure from all those non-agricultural classes for a virtually unilateral depression or suppression of agricultural price levels in the interest of their passion for economic development, industrial development and so on.

Thirdly, sometime ago Government had given an assurance to the country that they were going to constitute some agricultural commission in order to assure our peasants a reasonable level or at least a minimum level of prices, but when it came to implementation something or the other happened between the Ministry concerned and the whole Cabinet or the Cabinet and the Planning Commission and they were not able to give any practical shape to their own proposal. If they were to have any kind of a nominal commission that would not be enough, because that commission should have the necessary powers and those powers should also be backed by the necessary funds and financial equipments.

Now, Government has taken sufficient care, I think, in the interest of the consumers as a whole and not only the non-agricultural classes. By building up, what they call, a buffer-stock, not only by purchasing our own surplus supplies but also by importing huge quantities of wheat and rice from other countries, they hope, and they are managing also, to keep down the price level so far as the food front is concerned.

Have they taken, have they begun to take, have they at least decided to

begin to take necessary steps similarly, practical steps, effective steps, in order to maintain the agricultural prices? In America these steps had been taken for years. For the last more than 20 years American farmers have been given this protection. So is the case with the Scandinavian countries. Even such a conservative country as England where the general majority of the people happen to be non-agriculturists and also urban people, has taken such protective steps and they have been implemented there. Their farmers are assured of not only a minimum price level but also a remunerative price level. The same thing can be said of Australia, New Zealand and even Japan. Ours seems to be the only country, the only exception and yet we pride ourselves upon the fact that we have the largest area of cultivable land available and brought under cultivation. To whose credit does it go. It goes to the credit of our peasants. Yet, what is the return that we give to them? What is the assurance that we give to them? Till now our Government have not played fair with them.

There was a Committee appointed with my hon. friend Shri Krishnappa as Chairman in order to study the ways and means by which the prices could be fixed. Before that committee made its recommendations, another committee known as the Asoka Mehta Committee was appointed. They made their recommendations also. They wanted to hold our peasants hand and foot tied down and then deny them the freedom to sell their produce in the open market by socialising marketing in agricultural produce. At the same time, their recommendation in favour of stabilisation of agricultural prices was given a go-by by the Ministry concerned as well as the Government as a whole. And, recently there were these abortive proposals—it is not that they appeared to be abortive proposals but they also proved to be abortive proposals—made by the new Food Minister. In the light of all these things, is it

[Shri Ranga]

not high time for the Government not merely to be satisfied with expressing its pious hopes in the Third Five Year Plan but really to take definite administrative as well as legislative steps to provide the necessary assurance for our farmers?

It may not be possible for them to start fixing the price for all the agricultural produce to begin with, but they should certainly start with some of the most important foodgrains, oil-seeds and fibres. They have not done up till now. Very recently we had the sad story of the plight of the jute growers. The Union Government and the West Bengal Government were confabulating with each other in order to assure these people a decent enough price and in order to assure themselves of a rising quantum of production of jute. Why is it that more and more land is being diverted to non-food crops? It is because of the failure of the Government in this direction. And what is more, even in the Third Plan Government have paid a great compliment to our peasants by saying that they are expecting increase in the production of almost every agricultural produce. Is there one produce, let them say, where they expect lower production? No, only more and more. But who is going to do it? Not the Government, but the farmers themselves without any outside help. A fresh instance of the failure of the Government has been displayed today morning when we put a question how is it that the fertilizers produced in Nangal Fertilizers are not made available to the south, which is badly in need of it, because of the failure of the railways. Therefore, it is the Government which is failing, not the farmers. And the farmers who were responsible for this kind of economic development during the last fifteen years deserve a better deal. I hope my hon. friend, the Minister in charge of this Ministry will find greater strength from this debate and will be able to give a little more strength to the shoulder of our own farmers.

Shri P. K. Deo rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry, there is no time. We have consumed those 16 minutes.

Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak): Considering that ours is an agricultural country and this Bill relates to agriculture, the time may be extended by one hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then the turn of the next member may perhaps not come. That is being dinned into my ears from this side by the hon. Member who has to move his own Bill for consideration. That is the difficulty. Now the hon. Minister.

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): At the outset, I may observe that the Government is in complete sympathy with the objective of this Bill. The objective is very laudable and I should congratulate my hon. friend, Shri Jhulan Sinha, for having brought forward this Bill and raised a question of vital importance to the agricultural economy of this country. I fully share the concern of the mover and also the other hon. Members who have spoken on this Bill, but I am opposing this Bill, not because, I have no sympathy with the objectives, as I have already stated....

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): Why this explanation?

Shri A. M. Thomas:..but because of other considerations and because of the impracticability of the measures envisaged in this Bill. I will come to that a little later.

I shall presently deal with the policy that is now being pursued by the Government so that it may satisfy the hon. Members who have raised several doubts regarding this question. My hon. friend, Shri Ranga, the reputed champion of the farmers, has referred to the policy laid down in the Third Plan and he has welcomed that, although the Third Plan as such is being hated by him. In order that I

may make the position of the Government clear regarding this matter. I may refer the hon. Members to Chapter VII of the Third Plan under the heading "Price Policy for the Third Plan", paras 28 and 29. I will read here a few sentences from the Plan.

"The producer of good grains must get a reasonable return. The farmer, in other words, should be assured that the prices of foodgrains and the other commodities that he produces will not be allowed to fall below a reasonable minimum. The Third Five Year Plan postulates extended use of fertilisers and adoption of improved practices by the farmer. The farmer should have the necessary incentive to make these investments and to put in a larger effort. A policy designed to prevent sharp fluctuations in prices and to guarantee a certain minimum level is essential in the interest of increased production. It is important also that the appropriate measures or policies should be enunciated and announced well in time to ensure that the benefit accrues to the farmer."

Later on, it says:

"It should be known that throughout the Plan period Government would buy if prices of foodgrains tended to sag and would sell if they tended to rise. While imports have assisted and will assist for some time more in adding to the stocks with Government, it will be essential more and more to add to these stocks by domestic purchases, as production increases. Similarly, whenever or wherever in the country prices of foodgrains tend to rise, Government should be prepared to sell adequate quantities from its stocks. These open market operations need to be undertaken flexibly and at a large number of places, so that their impact is felt

directly at the points where it is needed."

I took the time of the House in reading these principles that have been laid down in this Chapter because, as far as this question is concerned, Government is having a pragmatic approach to this whole question, not being governed by doctrinaire considerations such as fixation of minimum prices and other things.

As far as this Government is concerned, the House knows that in 1954-55 when the prices of foodgrains tended to fall to uneconomic levels, the Government of India announced price support for important cereals and gram and made purchases at those prices, although substantial quantities were not purchased because soon after the prices began to rise. It shows that the policy of price support is something which has been accepted by the Government even as early as 1954-55. The support prices were, however, not statutory minimum prices and sales and purchases beyond these prices were not legally prohibited. Now the hon. mover of this Bill wants not only to fix the minimum statutory price, but also prohibit on threat of punishment any sales even by a farmer below that price. A farmer cannot sell his produce below the minimum price, even if he is willing to do that because of his difficulties. Otherwise, he would be punished for that. Of course, I am not depending on such loopholes that we have found in the Bill for opposing it. We should be guided by larger considerations rather than the defects noticed in the Bill.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: You are doing the same thing in regard to sugar.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I may recapitulate for a moment what the measures taken by the Government were in the matter of giving support to the agricultural producer. In June 1957 Government had given an assurance to the agriculturists that the prices of foodgrains and other agricultural commodities would not be

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

allowed to fall below economic levels and that they would take suitable steps from time to time to achieve this end.

Shri Ranga: After they have fallen below the economic levels?

Shri A. M. Thomas: Even now the general level of prices have been quite high and I do not think there is any scope at present for announcing any support price or for making any purchases on that basis.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Have you defined "economic level"?

Shri A. M. Thomas: The House will recollect that both the Central Government and the State Governments in the past 4-5 years were making internal purchases of some of the foodgrains at the maximum controlled price or prices otherwise laid down for the purpose. We announced the maximum controlled price in Andhra and, in fact, we requisitioned certain stocks. We were also purchasing on voluntary basis. That has been the case in other States, like Madhya Pradesh, also and these prices which we announced, the maximum controlled price at which we purchase, have been fixed on a level fair to producers as well as to consumers and Government purchases at those rates have prevented the market prices going below the economical levels.

Shri Ranga: Which was that economic level?

15 hrs.

Shri A. M. Thomas: I would come to the difficulties also which have to be countenanced in arriving at this particular economic level.

In the State of Assam the minimum prices payable to the grower have been laid down by the State Government. In pursuance of our policy of giving a reasonable price to the grower and also to keep up the prices at a level which would not be hard on the consumer, bigger zones have been formed as in the case of the eastern rice zone comprising the States of Orissa and West Bengal in order to

ensure a better price for the producer of surplus States. Similarly, permission to move wheat and rice from Madhya Pradesh to Maharashtra and Gujarat has provided support to falling prices in Madhya Pradesh. More recently wheat within the country and also on the purchase of indigenous wheat by the roller flour mills in the open market. These various steps, the House would admit, have enabled the producer to get a reasonable price for his produce.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: No, no.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Complaints are being heard that the prices even now are prevailing at a higher level which can not be afforded by the poor consumer.

When you refer to the Bill, you will find that my hon. friend, Shri Jhulan Sinha wants to prescribe a minimum price not only for one or two commodities, as has been suggested by Shri Ranga. He defines foodgrains like this:

"'food grains' means paddy, wheat Gram, maize and their products and includes Jawar, Bajra and other coarse grains used for consumption by human beings for maintenance of life,"

Think of a situation in which the Government would be statutorily joined and, maybe, commanded by this House to fix prices for all the food grains within this country. It would be impracticable. It is all right to say that we can start with one or two grains. That will necessarily have its effect on other food grains too. So, the commodities dealt with by the hon. Member are so numerous that it is not possible of practical application or enforcement. I have already stated with regard to the steps taken by the Government.

Through his Bill, Shri Jhulan Sinha wants to stipulate that, namely,—

"Whoever sells, purchases or aids and abets the sale and purchase of food grains at a price

lower than that fixed by the Government shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months."

The Bill also provides that the Central Government should make rules laying down the formula for calculation of the price of food grains and that these rules, after they are made, should be laid before both the Houses of Parliament and should be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make. In other words, the Bill provides for the fixation of statutory minimum prices of food grains. The levels at which prices should be fixed are also not left to the discretion of Government.

My hon. friend, Shri Ranga, said that for all time we cannot fix a price. It can only be on an *ad hoc* basis. Even in the case of maximum controlled prices, speaking from experience, it has been very difficult to enforce them. So, much less would be the possibility and practicability of enforcing statutory minimum prices. It would be readily agreed that it would not be possible to enforce a statutorily fixed price by penalties as fine and imprisonment as contemplated in the Bill. It would be even more difficult to enforce statutorily fixed minimum prices than the maximum prices since there is nothing to prevent a needy farmer from disposing of his produce at prices below what are statutorily fixed. To obviate these distress sales Government have been encouraging the setting-up of warehouses and godowns where the farmer can store his produce and get a warehouse receipt which can be encashed. Government are also encouraging formation of co-operative marketing societies for the orderly disposal of the produce of the agriculturist.

I think two hon. Members who spoke the other day, Shri Jwala Prasad Jyotishi and Shri Braj Raj Singh have pleaded for fixation of prices on the basis of cost of production. In a way my hon. friend, Shri Ranga, also advocated that stand. It is worth-

while to remember the difficulties in the matter of fixation of prices on the basis of cost of production. The extensive surveys of cost of production covering the main agricultural regions of the country would, therefore, have to be undertaken. Cost of production varies from region to region. Not only does it vary from region to region but it also varies from producer to producer, as in the case of an agricultural family with hired labour and with their own labour also. So, how can we assess the value of labour that is put in by the father, the son, wife and other children in the family and other dependents for the matter of that? There cannot be any uniformity at all in the matter of fixation of minimum prices if we base them on the cost of production. Even if we agree that such allowances for the farmer's wife or his sons can be made, there is no agreement on what basis this should be done. So, these difficulties also have to be borne in mind.

I may also submit that having regard to these complex factors my senior colleague, the hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture, announced on a previous occasion in this House that it is his idea to have an Agricultural Commodities Advisory Committee. The setting up of this Committee is still under the consideration of the Government. It is not correct to suppose that that idea has been abandoned. My hon. friend, Shri Ranga, I think, meant the Agricultural Advisory Committee and not the Agricultural Commission.

With regard to the Agricultural Commission, the Government has the idea of appointing an Agricultural Commission but it is not the particular time for the appointment of an Agricultural Commission because having regard to the development projects that we have undertaken, namely, the package programme and other things, it is better to wait for some more time and assess the value of the steps that have already been taken and to formulate future schemes. That matter has been mentioned by the hon. Minister himself on the floor of this House.

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

He has not abandoned that idea. It is his idea to appoint an Agricultural Commission on the lines of the Agricultural Commission previously appointed, but for that we would have to wait for some time because then only a proper evaluation can be done of the steps that have already been taken and future policies can be formulated.

Much was made of the examples provided by countries like the United States of America.

Shri Ranga: Japan also.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Yes, Japan also. But it is better that the House knows of the limitations in under-developed countries like ours in giving price support. In advanced countries like the U.S.A., the U.K., Japan, etc., whose examples have been referred to here it is possible to give high price support by making the non-agricultural sector pay for the agricultural sector. The very reason put forward by Shri Ranga, namely, that 70 per cent. of the population of India is dependent upon agriculture and that it is a predominantly agricultural country, in fact, stands in the way of the announcement of support prices and of making purchases on a large scale based on those prices. It is possible in advanced countries to give high price support by making the non-agricultural sector pay for the agricultural sector. This point may be clearly borne in mind. In our country, such a transference of income is not possible since about 70 per cent. of the people are dependent on agriculture and about 50 per cent. of the national income is derived from agriculture itself, whereas in a country like the United States, only about 10 to 11 per cent. of the people are dependent upon agriculture and only 5 per cent. of the national income is contributed by agriculture. So, it is very easy to transfer the incidence of this to the non-agricultural sector which is the majority and which gets

a better income there, but here to whom are we to transfer? To this small population of the non-agricultural sector? For that there is not considerable scope. If it is to be borne by the agricultural sector itself, then it is only bearing in a way the burdens themselves indirectly. These limitations also may kindly be borne in mind.

Of course, with regard to announcement of statutory minimum prices, one feature I may just bring before the House. In the matter of sugarcane, we have announced minimum prices and factories are statutorily enjoined to pay a minimum price for the sugarcane that is bought. But, it is not possible of enforcement in that way in the case of foodgrains. In the case of foodgrains, what is possible would be only to announce support prices, the Government being prepared to purchase at that level. Sugar is in the organised sector. Both the producer sector and the manufacturing sector are organised, so much so, the manufacturers can be compelled to pay at that particular rate to sugarcane growers, because they are also organised. So also in the case of jute which is under contemplation. There also it is possible because it is an organised sector. The Jute Manufacturers Association, for example, can be compelled to pay or the factories can be compelled to pay to the jute growers at a particular rate. When it is a question of announcement of minimum prices, as far as commodities which go directly into the production of industrial goods just like sugarcane and jute bags are concerned, it would be possible of announcing of minimum prices and enforcing it. This aspect may kindly be borne in mind, when hon. Members plead for announcement of statutory minimum prices.

These are the various aspects which I would like this House to remember when we discuss a matter of this kind. As I have stated already in the very beginning, the Government is in sympathy with the objective of the Bill

and various steps are being taken in this direction. It is a pragmatic approach that we have to this problem. The general policy as far as the Government is concerned is laid down in the Third Five Year Plan. I believe, on the basis of this stand that I have explained and on this assurance, the hon. Member would be persuaded to withdraw his Bill unlike on a former occasion when I had the misfortune of not satisfying him.

Shri Jhulan Sinha (Siwan): Sir, I am very grateful to the House for the support that it has given to my Bill. I am particularly grateful to the grand old man of this House, Dr. Aney, who very rightly dived into my feelings that the Bill was merely an attempt to awaken the conscience of the Government. I am glad that I have succeeded in doing it.

So far as my own idea about fixing economic prices of food grains is concerned, I never meant that the growers will be put in a position where they can exploit the consumers or anybody else in this world. I belong to the class of growers. I never thought of doing anything to exploit the consumers or anybody else. I hope that is not the idea of any grower in this country, which boasts of a high civilisation. We never thought that because the Government is composed of persons elected by the masses of people, we will succeed in getting the prices fixed for the grower which the consumer cannot afford to pay or which would not be fair for him to pay. When I pleaded for fixation of prices for foodgrains, I expected that the Government would fix a price which was economic to the grower and economic to the consumer. We have very seriously taken the lesson of importing foodgrains from outside. Whatever else may be said about it, those of us who have been associated with public affairs in this country for long years, have felt it a degenerating thing for an agricultural country like India to go out asking for foodgrains to support our own people who are mainly agriculturists, who live on

agriculture. These are the feelings that actuated me in putting forward the Bill.

I am glad that despite all differences about the details of the Bill, the Government has been pleased to accept the principles underlying it. The reasons given by the hon. Deputy Minister, in the Third Plan and also the policy statement made by him have satisfied me. In spite of differences on a previous occasion where he did not succeed, inconvincing me, I feel convinced and I beg leave of the House to withdraw the Bill.

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.

15.14 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of Article 226) by Shri C. R. Narasimhan

Shri Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 1st November, 1961."

When this Bill was introduced, in the earlier stages, many of my esteemed colleagues had also appended their signatures. They included Shri Maniyangadan, Shri Kuttikrishnan Nair, Shri Siddiah, Shri K. S. Ramaswamy, Shri N. R. Muniswamy, Shri Rami Reddy, Shri Achar and Shri Sonavane. The object is to amend article 226 of the Constitution.

Article 226 of the Constitution is one of the provisions of the Constitution which goes farther than any known constitutional provision in the direction of securing effective, speedy remedies for the enforcement of rights guaranteed in the various parts of the Constitution. In fact, it is the chief armoury in the arsenal of the agitated