

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am told by the Secretariat that even yesterday's proceedings are not ready yet.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: It is no question, Madam Deputy Chairman. . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, I will look into it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Madam Deputy Chairman, the point is on how many occasions this has happened.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right. That is enough. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The question is whether you rule the House or Mr. Morarji Desai rules the House. You are the authority in this House, not Mr. Morarji Desai.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am giving you an assurance that I am going to look into it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I wanted this point also should be clarified whether the proceedings of that day were not shown to the Presiding Officer till the next evening or not. I may think it may not be ready but at least a typed copy could have been passed on to the Presiding Officer who is authorised to look into it. Whether this was provided or not, and if it was not provided, what was the reason, the Secretariat should explain. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A Commission of the House could be appointed under your leadership.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am giving a suggestion, or let this matter go to the Privileges Committee.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am telling the House that I am going to look into the matter that has been raised by Mr. Chandra Shekhar. Now, Mr. Jaipuria.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, my suggestion is this. You look into it, but refer it to the Privileges Com-

mittee for advice to you. We can cross-examine Mr. Nijalingappa and the rest of them.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You and I know the procedure. Mr. Jaipuria.

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1969 (to amend article 174)

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI SITARAM JAIPURIA: Madam, I introduce the Bill.

THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1969 (to amend section 33)

SHRI G. R. PATIL (Maharashtra): Madam, I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI G. R. PATIL: Madam, I introduce the Bill.

THE PUBLIC TRUSTS (PLACE OF REGISTRATION) BILL, 1969

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra): Madam, I move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the registration of public trusts created for purposes of charitable or religious nature having trust property in more than one State, either in the State where the trust has its office of administration or in any State where a portion of the trust property is situated.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Madam, I introduce the Bill.

THE STERILISATION OF THE UNFIT BILL, 1964—contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We come to the next business. Mr. Gowda.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support this Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I make an appeal to you? I think Mr. Mani wanted to speak first because he has to go away. If you do not mind, because I have called you . . .

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: All right, Madam.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Madam, I would like to give my support to the general principles of the Sterilisation of the Unfit Bill, 1964. I, Mr. Banka Behary Das and Mr. Bhargava have given notice of an amendment asking for the circulation of the Bill till the 31st of July, 1969. Our object in limiting this period of circulation is that it would take a considerable time for the matter to go to the Joint Select Committee of Parliament. State representatives will have to be invited as witnesses, and this will take perhaps more than a year or so. We felt therefore that circulation motion should be limited to 31st July so that opinion may be available from the concerned parties on the suitability or otherwise of this Bill.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Why not straightway refer to the Select Committee?

SHRI A. D. MANI: No. The difficulty is this. There has been opposition to this Bill from certain quarters, particularly State Governments, and a point has been taken that it is an infringement of article 14. I had a discussion with one of the most eminent jurists of this country and he was of the opinion that article 14 does not confer equality of rights to the unfit. Among equal people there should be equality under article 14. But if a person is incapacitated on account of mental defects or certain physical deficiencies on account of incurable ailments, it is open to Parliament to legislate for the whole country and prescribe the terms for a Sterilisation Act.

Quite a large number of people might think that Mrs. Paranjpye has taken upon herself a thankless task by sponsoring this Bill. But I must congratulate her for the passion and devotion with which she has pursued this matter not only in this House but for a number of years in this country.

She has been one of the leading exponents of the family planning movement in India and she has done notable work in the western part of the country. I think the House should give its very serious consideration to the terms of this Bill. Madam, as she pointed out earlier and I repeat it here, it is not a harebrained idea that we are trying to put forward before the House. In the U.S.A. the first sterilisation operation was performed in 1897. And the first Sterilization Act was passed in Indiana ten years later. Twenty-six States have got their own Sterilization Acts.

I mentioned earlier that the question of the constitutionality of this Act might be raised by some States. I would like to point out here that this matter was agitated before the Supreme Court of America. Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1927 in one of his famous judgments said—

“We have seen more than once that the public welfare may call upon its best citizens for their lives. It would be strange if it could not call upon those who already sap the strength of the States, for those lesser sacrifices, often not felt to be such by those concerned, in order to prevent our being swamped with incompetence.”

And he gave his decision in favour of sterilisation. This matter has therefore been agitated in the United States as far back as 42 years ago.

Madam, there are one or two matters in regard to this Bill which I would like to point out to the House and to my good friend, Shrimati Paranjpye. Health is on the Concurrent List. It is open to any State Government not to accept this and abrogate this Act by passing a Bill. This matter has got to have the co-operation of all the States concerned. I may point out in respect of the Industrial Disputes Act that the Bombay Government has got its own Industrial Relations Act, and it has virtually abrogated the Industrial Disputes Act for many classes of labour in Bombay. It is open therefore to an unwilling State to pass legislation saying that this Bill of Shrimati Paranjpye, if it is enacted into law, shall not be applicable to the citizens residing in that State. There is one danger, therefore, in the way of this Bill and it is necessary that Shrimati

[Shri A. D. Mani]

Paranjpye and those who are in favour of this Bill to get the support of the States concerned.

There are certain clauses in this Bill to which I would like to make a reference. The Bill says in clause 4—

“Whenever information is given to the Chairman of the Board that any person is unfit, the Board shall cause that person to be produced before it and examine him.”

I have shown this again to an eminent jurist in this country—I do not want to mention his name because it was a private consultation—and we felt that this clause as it stands will be unacceptable to the country. Now, there is a lot of frivolous, false and needless litigation going on in all parts of the country. A person may say that a particular man is mentally defective and he should be sterilised. That is defamation. It cannot be left to any individual to file a complaint before a board that this person is mentally defective and therefore he should be sterilised. This has got to be done under careful medical supervision. I may point out in this connection that in regard to heart transplantation operations speaking about another matter—the American Medical Association has asked for two doctors' opinions before a heart transplantation operation can be performed. If a person is mentally unfit or is suffering from incurable diseases, the best person to pronounce a judgment on the matter is not the layman but the doctor himself. So, sterilisation, I would venture to submit, should be undertaken only by a medically qualified person pronouncing his judgment that such and such a person should be sterilised. I would not like to give this right to anybody who comes forward and says that this person is mentally unfit and therefore he should be sterilised. I do not think that clause 4, as it stands now, would be accepted by many sections of opinion in the country. Shrimati Paranjpye will have to considerably modify this clause about a board to be set up, and give the right to a medical practitioner to certify that such and such a person is mentally unfit or is suffering from any incurable disease, and therefore he should be sterilised.

Now, there is also another provision to which I would like to draw attention, and it is clause 4(4), which says—

“If on the date fixed for appearance before the Board the person does not appear before it, the chairman of the board shall report the fact to the superintendent of police of the district.”

Already, Madam, police are wreaking havoc on the lives of a large number of people by paying domiciliary visits and harassing people. I do not think that this should be made a penal matter or made a cognizable offence. It cannot be a cognizable offence at all because once you take away the right of procreation from somebody, you are declaring him mentally unfit in the eyes of the society. This matter cannot be made a cognizable offence and I feel this clause will have to be deleted from the Bill and a less oppressive sub-clause should be introduced, if this Bill is to receive the assent of the President.

There is one more thing. Under clause 8, Shrimati Paranjpye provides that—

“Anyone who gives information against any person without any just or reasonable cause that that person is unfit with a view to induce the Board to proceed under this Act, and if that information is found to be false or fraudulent or given with a view to annoy, intimidate, defame or disgrace that person, the person giving such information shall be liable to a fine of five hundred rupees.”

If a person goes and says that A or B is mentally defective or is suffering from leprosy or from incurable venereal diseases, Shrimati Paranjpye wants him to be sterilised. If the information is found to be wrong and false, you cannot get away with imposing a fine of Rs. 500 only. There should be deterrent criminal punishment. There should be no obligation of fine. Such a person should be sent to prison for a term of three years, which is supposed to be a very hard sentence. I request Shrimati Paranjpye, the Mover of this Bill, to take a kindly view of the man who is brought before a Sterilization Board. He does not want to get sterilised. It is we the public-conscious people, it is we who read the reports of Dr. Chandrashekhar, our Minister, a population expert, about the imminent population explosion in the country, it is we who come and say that this man should be sterilised.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Fifty per cent of the Congressmen will have to be sterilised because of mutual recriminations and information against each other.

SHRI A. D. MANI: A large number of people may be disqualified. This is a very serious matter. If a person wants to have recourse to this Act for any action and if he gives a false report, he should be compulsorily sent to jail for a period of three years and nothing less. But then if you put a three-year term and you make it a penalty, I am afraid very few persons will come forward to give evidence for sterilisation or the need for sterilisation.

I would like to mention here—and Shrimati Paranjpye made a reference to this matter when she spoke of the Danish practice—that in Denmark,

“...provided with a fully developed health administration, preventive measures against the unrestricted procreation of high grade defectives have been taken.”

My hon. friend, Dr. Chandrashekhar, the Minister of State, knows that a Sterilization Board has been set up three to which a recommendation for the voluntary sterilisation of the mentally defective person is made when he is unfit adequately to educate his children or provide for them by his own work. Even if a man is not in a position to provide the means for his children's education, a person can be sterilised. But I do not think that we can go that far. We are prepared to go as far as the terms of Shrimati Paranjpye's Bill are concerned.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu): Family planning system provides for sterilisation of people who cannot educate their children.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am told that Dr. Chandrashekhar is now planning to distribute condoms. He is going to take a sensational step of giving contraceptives through Post Office Savings Bank. Is that so? He has gone one step further and they are available at the Post Offices. If anyone wants, he can get a condom there, he need not pay much money. I do not know whether this is going to promote family planning.

Coming back to the subject, I want this Bill to have the earnest support and deep consideration of this House.

We need not accept all the 1 P. M. provisions of this Bill. Mrs.

Paranjpye has thrown an idea amidst us. This Bill will come back, Madam, if my amendment is accepted on the 31st July. She has got to succeed in a ballot before this Bill is again brought forward for consideration in this House. Our term expires next year. I hope she will come back to pilot the Bill again. But whether she comes back or not this is an idea which deserves to be pursued. If Dr. Chandrasekhar's efforts at family planning are to succeed, and they must succeed, apart from all other incentives that he is going to give for family planning, sterilization should be undertaken in this country. It is not a hardship to anybody because it postulates the principles that a mentally or physically unfit person has no right whatever to send a new generation into the society.

Notwithstanding the revolutionary character of this Bill, I hope the Bill will get the support of all sections of the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one minute past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, **THE VICE-CHAIRMAN** (**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA**) in the Chair.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to support this Bill for the sterilization of the unfit introduced by Mrs. Shakuntala Paranjpye. I must congratulate her on her bold stand for having taken so much of pain, not from now, but from ever since she was in the Council at Bombay and struggled to put this Bill before the public. I am glad that now she has been able to introduce this Bill in this House. I support this Bill fully and commend it to the House for its support. She has very ably dealt with the aims and objects in her speech the other day when she introduced the Bill.

[Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda]

Sir, it is the accepted policy of this Government that family planning is very necessary in this country in order to check the tremendous population explosion which is taking place in this country because that is the only way by which our economic survival will be assured. Sir, when it has become the policy of the Government to introduce family planning in this country and also when the Government is spending so much money over the propagation of family planning in order to restrict the population, it is regrettable that procreation by the unfit persons is going on unchecked. Mrs. Paranjpye has so ably produced statistics regarding this. She has also quoted eminent authorities about the unchecked increased in population from those sections which are either mentally retarded or are suffering from incurable diseases.

Of course, there are some objections to it from the religious angle on the basis that it might infringe the fundamental rights of the individuals. Here the one other method which has been suggested is—if at all it is possible—the method of segregation of such persons. But as Mrs. Paranjpye has already said in her speech, this is not possible in a poor country like ours. It is common knowledge that it has not been possible even to segregate people suffering from severe contagious diseases, and the country being so poor it will be almost impossible to extend that sort of segregation to person whose procreation might be considered as undesirable in this country. So the only other alternative would be the one of sterilising persons who might breed mentally unhealthy children and then add to the already difficult situation of over population in this country. How that can be done is the problem, whether it should be on a voluntary basis or whether there should be compulsion regarding it. It is good if such persons offer for sterilisation voluntarily and should be encouraged, as it is done even now for healthy people in order to restrict families. But so far as the mentally retarded and other persons suffering from incurable diseases are concerned, voluntary sterilisation creates a problem. Unless there is some compulsion introduced it will not be possible to get those people agree to be sterilised.

In this connection Mrs. Paranjpye cited the example of countries like the

United States where, I am told, 26 of the States have enacted laws for compulsorily sterilising unfit persons. Because it is such an advanced country and the people themselves are voluntarily resorting to it, I am told, compulsion is no longer necessary. But it is entirely a different case so far as our people are concerned where in certain sections there is such rank ignorance about family planning. Therefore, it is really necessary that there should be some legislation which provides for compulsory sterilization of the unfit persons, mentally retarded people and people suffering from contagious diseases, etc.

There have been some views expressed about diseases like leprosy and T.B. not being carried by heredity and there being, as such, no need of sterilisation of such persons. But as has been pointed out by Mrs. Paranjpye and other Members, even though these may not be carried as hereditary diseases, there is the possibility of continuous association of the infants with such parents, which might result in the diseases spreading by contagion. It is certainly a better method to prevent such children being born rather than taking them away from their mothers as soon as they are born in order to see that the contagion does not affect them. Though some of these diseases may not be carried by heredity it is desirable that such persons should be sterilised.

Coming to the point of religious objection, Sir, it is evident that even in the case of normal family planning programme which has been accepted in this country there is objection from some religious sections. I know the chapter on fundamental rights requires that you should respect the religious feelings of a person. But if every section has to be consulted about their views on family planning I do not think it will be possible in this country to introduce any such legislation about family planning.

We have been hearing in this House itself many complaints about certain sections of the population not taking to it and only certain other sections taking to it seriously. I feel, Sir, that in such cases a common legislation is necessary and an element of compulsion should be there. Otherwise in a vast country like ours, with our economic backwardness and ignorance, it will not be possible to make any headway. Sir, so much money is being

spent and so much propaganda is done about family planning. But we hear now and then complaints that it has not made sufficient headway in certain rural areas mainly because of ignorance. In such cases, I think a certain amount of compulsion is necessary not only for sterilising the unfit but also for sterilising the fit after a certain number of births. The other day, speaking on this subject, my friend, Mr. Dharia, said that there should be compulsory sterilisation of everybody after the third child. There is quite a lot of sense in what he has said and it is an eye-opener to difficulties in the family planning making progress in this country to the desired extent. To-day, Mr. Mani pointed out certain difficulties regarding this Bill and he suggested that this should go out for eliciting public opinion. Even the other day Prof. Ruthnaswamy suggested that this Bill should be circulated for eliciting public opinion so that when it comes back we will be in a better position to make any changes that might be necessary in this Bill. Also certain constitutional difficulties might arise and if the Bill is sent out for eliciting public opinion, it will be possible to straighten out the difficulties with the States' consent. So I support the amendment that this Bill may be circulated for eliciting public opinion. But Mr. Krishan Kant has suggested in his amendment that the time for that may be till the 31st December 1969, whereas the amendment by Mr. Banka Behary Das and Mr. Mani seeks to restrict the time-limit to 31st July 1969. I whole-heartedly support the extension of time only up to 31st July 1969 so that time may not be wasted by allowing it up to 31st December 1969.

Sir, there are one or two points on which I would like to comment. Clause 4 of this Bill, in my opinion, requires re-drafting or changing. The clause reads as follows:

"4(1) Whenever information is given to the Chairman of the board that any person is unfit, the board shall cause that person to be produced before it and examine him."

That means that any person can report against any other person and that person will be dragged before the board for examination. Sir, for example, this might pose a big problem during the general elections when rival candidates

may say that the other person is unfit, and whether he goes through the actual process of sterilisation or not, he will be put into the embarrassing position of being examined, for being unfit. So, I feel, Sir, that this clause needs a thorough change. When this Bill comes back after eliciting public opinion I am sure some changes will be made.

Then, clause 8 which provides for punishment to people who give false information about the unfitness of persons has to be amended because here the punishment prescribed is only Rs. 500 and if one wants to embarrass another person, he can do it easily by paying a fine of Rs. 500. So that also needs change. I am sure these will be properly looked into when the Bill comes back after eliciting public opinion. After that, the Bill has to go through a Select Committee again and then when it comes before the House there will be ample opportunity for discussing these things.

Sir, in conclusion, I fully support this Bill and I support the amendment that this may be circulated for eliciting public opinion by the 31st July 1969, and I commend this Bill to the support of this august House.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : पाइन्ट ऑफ ऑर्डर ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आपका भाषण होगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं हमारा पाइन्ट ऑफ ऑर्डर है। व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि इस विधेयक की हिन्दी कपी हमको अभी तक नहीं मिली है। यदि मैं भूलता नहीं हूँ तो शायद आपके ही मुख्तारविन्द से यह घोषणा हुई थी कि आइन्द, भविष्य में ऐसी गलती नहीं होगी राज्यसभा सचिवालय से कि वह हिन्दी कपी विधेयक की प्रस्तुत न करे ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आप बैठें तो मैं अपनी व्यवस्था बता दूँ। जहाँ तक प्राइवेट मेम्बर्स के विल्स का सम्बन्ध है उनको हिन्दी कापी भेजनी होती है। मुझको अपने कई विलों के बारे में सूचना यहाँ से मिली

[उपसभाध्यक्ष]

कि हिन्दी का ट्रांसलेशन दीजिए। तो मेरा ख्याल यह है कि हिन्दी कापी सेक्रेटेरियट को प्राप्त नहीं हुई, इसलिए नहीं दी जा सकी।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, हमारा सुझाव...

उप सभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : सुझाव पीछे दीजिएगा, अब भाषण करिए।

श्री राजनारायण : जो कानून की व्यवस्था है वह प्राइवेट मेम्बर और सरकारी दोनों बिलों पर लागू होती है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : उसमें मैं एकमत हूँ।

श्री राजनारायण : उसमें जब आप एकमत हैं तो आपने ऐसी व्यवस्था देकर हमारा तो गला काट दिया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : मेम्बर को भी देना चाहिए।

श्री राजनारायण : देखा जाय हमारा सेक्रेटेरियट इतना सम्पन्न होना चाहिए...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : सेक्रेटेरियट से मुझको पता लगा कि जितने नए बिल हैं उनका ट्रांसलेशन हो रहा है। यह पुराना बिल है इसलिए अभी नहीं हो पाया। जो व्यवस्था मैंने दी है वह मानी जा रही है अब आप अपना भाषण करिए।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं यह देख रहा हूँ कि यह सरकार जानबूझकर हिन्दी की उपेक्षा कर रही है। कानून की पोथी में लिख जाने से कि 'हिन्दी चलेगी-हिन्दी चलेगी', हिन्दी तो नहीं चल पा रही है। हिन्दी का प्रचार और प्रभाव जितना पहले था उतना भी इस सरकार के समय में नहीं रह गया है। कानून बन चुका संविधान बन चुका कि हिन्दी के साथ साथ अंग्रेजी चलेगी, मगर व्यवहार में यह किया गया कि अंग्रेजी के साथ साथ कहीं कहीं हिन्दी चलाई जा रही है और कहीं-कहीं नहीं चलाई जा रही है। तो संविधान और कानून की हत्या हो रही है। मैं अवश्य इस विधेयक पर बोलना

चाहता था, मगर चूँकि इसकी हिन्दी कापी यहाँ उपलब्ध नहीं है मैं अब इस विवाद में भाग नहीं लूँगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारी वाणी इस सम्बन्ध में गुंजे और इस देश की जनता समझे कि राज्य सभा जो कि संविधान और कानून की सुरक्षा करने के लिए सर्वोच्च स्थल है वह भी आज संविधान और कानून की हत्या होने में लाचार है और निरीह होकर देखती चली जा रही है। कोई सुनवाई नहीं हो पा रही है और किसी न किसी तरह का काम चलाओ यानी कि सहूलियतवाद आज हमारे देश को खा रहा है। हम सहूलियतवादी नहीं हैं परिवर्तनवादी हैं हम परिवर्तन चाहते हैं। वह परिवर्तन आये तो कैसे आए ? इसलिए हम बहुत ही जोरदार, प्रोटेस्ट कर रहे हैं और बहुत ही जोर के साथ इस बात का विरोध कर रहे हैं कि आज तक संविधान के मुताबिक, कानून के मुताबिक अंग्रेजी के जो विधेयक और रिजोल्यूशन का हिन्दी अनुवाद मिलना चाहिए वह नहीं मिल पा रहा है और इसलिए मैं आज इस विवाद में भाग नहीं दे रहा हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The Minister.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING AND WORKS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR) : Mr. Vice-Chairman

श्री राजनारायण : इतना घोर अपमान हिन्दी का हुआ और हिन्दी का अपमान चूँकि राष्ट्र का अपमान है, राष्ट्र की जनता का अपमान है और यह सरकार बर्जित है इसलिए जब तक मंत्री इसके उत्तर में बोलते रहेंगे तब तक मैं सदन का परित्याग करता हूँ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : वे हिन्दी में बोलेंगे, आप सुनिए।

श्री राजनारायण : क्या तमाशा है ? हमें बेवकूफ बनाया जा रहा है, हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी जो दो बटा तीन जनता है उसे बेवकूफ बनाया जा रहा है।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY The ear-phones are there These Members can hear.

श्री राजनारायण : हमारा मतलब सविधान कानून से है। अगर हिंदी नहीं चलती है तो, सविधान की पोथी फाड़ दो, कानून की पोथी फाड़ दो। अब हम इस चीज को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे। राज्यसभा में ऐसा बावेल मचना चाहिए जिससे देश की जनता इस बात को समझे कि यह सरकार और राज्यसभा का सचिवालय—चूँकि राज्य सभा में मैं देखता हूँ कि चेयरमैन हिन्दी नहीं जानते, डिपुटी चेयरमैन हिन्दी नहीं जानती—हिन्दी के प्रति उदासीन है। कोई न कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए जिससे कि इस देश की जनता समझे कि 40 करोड़ जनता जो हिन्दी जानती है, उस भाषा की सविधान में गुजाइश रहते हुए भी राज्यसभा में उस हिन्दी को प्रचलित नहीं किया जाता है।

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa) . Forty crores of people do not speak Hindi

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M P BHARGAVA) Let us not get into this controversy

श्री राजनारायण : 40 करोड़ जनता हिन्दी जानती है।

SHRI PRAHMANANDA PANDA We are not bound to know it

SHRI RAJNARAIN It is a different thing

[At this stage, the honourable Member left the House]

DR S CHANDRASEKHAR Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are in sympathy with the objective of the Bill as brought forward by the honourable Member, Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye. In fact, we are largely in agreement with even the principles underlying the proposed Bill. The honourable Member who has spoken today has also expressed that the Bill should be circulated for eliciting public opinion, and it is a proposition with which I am completely in

agreement. It has also been expressed that the time required for eliciting public opinion could be cut to the end of July, 1969 as suggested by a further amendment. Even with that I am in agreement. So I would say that this could be done and when it comes back with all the criticisms and opinions in favour and against, then we can refer it to a Joint Committee and the Ministry of Law. We will also then elicit the opinion of the State Governments. Then a new Bill will be introduced which will be a more comprehensive Bill. And then we can discuss about the specific difficulties and scientific aspects. I do not want to say anything about it now.

SHRI G A APPAN (Tamil Nadu) Sir, on a point of information I think it is the opinion of this House that the Bill may be sent for eliciting public opinion. In his statement the honourable Minister says that even after eliciting public opinion, it will be referred to a Joint Committee. As I have already represented before this House, instead of referring the various issues to a Joint Committee, I would request if it is permissible within the limits of this House to refer it to public opinion and commit it to a body and affiliate some of the Members also to it so that we need not put the Bill to the long process of referring it once again to the Joint Committee.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) The question is

"That in the notice of amendment dated the 27th February, 1969, given notice of by Shri Krishan Kant, for the figures and words '31st December, 1969' the figures and words '31st July, 1969' be substituted."

The motion was adopted

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) The question is

"That the Bill to prevent the procreation of human beings of undesirable physical and mental conditions by certain types of people be circulated for eliciting opinion thereon by the 31st July, 1969."

The motion was adopted