

Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
Lai, Prof. M. B. Mani, Shri A. D. Misra,
Shri Lokanath. Narasimham, Shri K. L.
Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V. Reddy, Shri K.
V. Raghunathiha. Singh, Shri J. K. P.
Narayan. Singh, Shri Kamta. Sinha, Shri
Rajendra Pratap. Solomon, Shri P. A.
Subba Rao, Dr. A. Vajpayee, Shri A. B.

The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

THE CONSTITUTION (SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS): Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken Into consideration."

Madam, written in golden letters are the rights of freedom guaranteed to the citizens of this country and the first right is under article 19(1) that all citizens shall have the right to freedom of speech and expression. This right is guaranteed and protected by the State which came into being on the 26th of January, 1950 and at the head of the document which recorded the compact of the people of India are these words: "WE, THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC". Now, what constitutes

the base of this national entity which came into being on 26th January, 1950 is the solemn resolve which is contained in the words that the people of India constitute a sovereign democratic republic. That is the fount-head of the power of all the institutions which function in this country. All those, therefore, who enjoy the rights which this State grants and protects, must, in return, pledge themselves to respect the sovereignty and the democracy and the republican character of the State. It therefore follows that the right of freedom of speech and expression is conditioned upon the acceptance of democracy, sovereignty and integrity of this country. Whoever casts doubts upon the sovereignty of this country, whoever is prepared to surrender or barter the integrity of this country is out of the compact. Therefore, under no pretext whatsoever, any citizen of this country is entitled to contend that the right guaranteed to him under article 19(1) of freedom of speech and expression includes right to cast any kind of doubt upon the sovereignty of this country or to demand that the integrity of this country should be broken. Now, therefore, even without an amendment to clause (2) of article 19, I, speaking for myself, would have had no doubt that it would be regarded as a gross abuse of the power or the right of freedom and expression that a person would bring into doubt, bring into controversy the sovereignty of this country and also would demand a division of this country. I know there is article 368 in the Constitution which permits the structure to be changed by the will of the people but that does not permit sovereignty to be questioned, nor does it permit the integrity to be divided but in order that there should be no doubt in any one's mind, it is now being proposed that clause (2) should be amended so as to include that the right of freedom of speech and expression does not extend to questioning the integrity and sovereignty of India and Parlia-

[Shri R. M. Hajarnavis.] ment now, by law, can put reasonable restrictions upon the right guaranteed by article 19(1) in the interests of the sovereignty and integrity of the State. Speaking for myself, I have no doubt in my mind that even if these words were not there, anyone who abuses the fundamental right of freedom of expression so as to question the integrity, would certainly be, if the law is provided, come within the penal section of the law.

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

Another thing that I mentioned was that this State is a democratic State. What is the basis of this democracy? The democratic right which every citizen in this country gets is on the assumption that he accepts the sovereignty and integrity of India. He will join this democratic community only on the basis that he accepts the sovereignty of this country and integrity of this country. It is therefore implicit that whoever would hold himself out as the candidate for working this democratic institution accepts that he will uphold the Constitution of India and will protect the sovereignty and integrity of this country. It is implicit in this but what is attempted to be done is now what was implicit, what was understood, is going to be made explicit. Therefore, under article 84 we are now saying that whoever is a candidate for election for democratic institution shall also make a solemn declaration . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Is it the Home Minister's contention that what was implicit is now being made explicit?

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: What was politically true . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are talking of constitutional and legal provision.

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: The Constitution is both a political document and a legal entity.

Now what is being done is that under article 84 he will not be able to be a candidate unless he subscribes before the authorised person a declaration or an affirmation which sets out that he will uphold the sovereignty and integrity of the country. Therefore, what I said was the basis on which all of us owe allegiance to this great country and to this Constitution is formally being declared. This is a fresh solemn declaration of what is the very basis on which the national State can exercise. I am glad to say that this is a Bill which was passed unanimously by the other House. That met with unanimous approval of the House at the other place. I am quite sure it will also meet with the unanimous approval here also. This is not controversial at all. Therefore, with these words, I commend this Bill for the acceptance of the House.

The question was proposed .

5 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, this again is a Bill which has given rise to a measure of discussion in the country, at least in some sections among our people, and we shall soon be hearing the point of view which is held by our esteemed friend, Mr. Annadurai. He is anxiously waiting for his turn to speak on the subject and we shall also hear with all patience and care.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): We have heard him before.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We would like the problem to be settled through discussion and through efforts to convince each other. I was listening to the speech of the hon. Minister who was piloting this measure but he seems to be under the delusion that the Bill is making explicit what is implicit in the

Constitution. This is the first time that I have heard such an argument coming from the Treasury Benches. Such an argument was not given at the National Integration Conference nor have got this line of understanding on any other occasion when this matter was discussed. I think, therefore, we should not try to delude ourselves with the thought that we are passing something which is implied in the Constitution and when I say "Constitution" I mean it in the Constitutional and legal terms. Let us be clear that we are amending article 19 of the Constitution in a way. We are empowering legislation which otherwise would not have been *intra vires* the Constitution. Therefore, it would not be right for the Minister to say that what is implicit is now being made explicit. If it were so then the speeches of the DMK leaders under the present Constitution would have been *ultra vires*, would have been against the Constitution. That is not the position today. After this enactment, naturally it will be possible for the Governments in the States and Parliament to enact legislation to abridge certain rights given under article 19 of the Constitution. Let us do what we are doing in clear conscience because the matter is serious. We may be in general support of it but we should not try to support a thing without comprehending the scope, its implications, its meaning, its significance.

Now, hon. Ministers should be serious when they move such measures. Constitutional amendments should not be proposed and piloted in a lighthearted manner by giving this kind of arguments to which we have just been treated. As far as the fundamental right is concerned, well, this is being curtailed and I think that oath of allegiance to the Constitution in this respect is violated more by the Government than by anybody else and tomorrow I shall return to this thing when I shall show how the Constitution has been offended and violated by this

Government or rather, we have been taken to a position when we had to pass a measure which violates the provisions of the Constitution and which thereby becomes void and illegal in law. I leave it for tomorrow. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, when we discuss such subjects, we should apply our mind deeply and think over this matter in a serious mood, consider it as if from opposite angles, see the meaning from a particular angle and also to see what is the meaning from an opposite angle. Only then could we arrive at the correct conclusion.

Now, I am glad to hear that at least one Minister from the Ministry of Home Affairs has said that Indian Constitution stands for democracy. Well, I should always like to have it said away by the hon. Ministers but then I think that we have very often injured article 19 of the Constitution and thereby we have done damage on various occasions—when I say "we" I have the Government in mind—to the fundamental rights in Part III of the Constitution. Therefore, let us not try to make out as if everything will be all right if only we adopted this legislation or this constitutional amendment. Much depends on how the powers are exercised and as far as article 19 is concerned, it does not exist any more today under the emergency. It is suspended under article 358 of the Constitution, Part XVIII. Today, as we are discussing this subject, the irony of it is that article 19 is frozen, it does not exist. Of course, this state of affairs will continue for the duration of the emergency but let us remember that it does not exist today as we are discussing in this House.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the issue certainly is one which is important. Naturally, integrity of the country and its sovereignty are the cherished possessions of our people and we have to maintain them at all costs. There is complete national agreement, maybe with one or two dissenting voices or some voice here and there, over this matter and yet the fact *te-*

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] mains that we get often frightened by developments in the country and we see some time before our eyes forces of disintegration, fissiparous tendencies are unfolding themselves and they became a menacing factor and that is why it became necessary to conceive of a measure of this kind. But then, integrity and sovereignty of the country, more especially integrity which is relevant for this subject, has to be maintained not merely by legislation but by shaping the political life on democratic foundations, by removing regional disparities that exist in our country, by meeting the legitimate demands of various sections of the people who feel that they are being let down or they, are being treated somewhat discriminatingly in certain matters. This is very very important. There are very many factors which come in the way of integration of the country. It is not merely the demand of separation that comes in the way. I think, if you ask me, and I hope no hon. Member will take it amiss, casteism and communalism also do contribute to the forces of disintegration. I am not saying it in the political sense, I mean it in another sense here because these divide the people. Therefore, I think, when we have these things in mind, we should also try to locate the forces of disintegration, where they are present. Any agitation against the Government is not necessarily because of forces of disintegration but certainly certain types of agitations may become the forces of disintegration in the true sense of the term. Therefore, we must also discriminate in such cases and have a differential approach. As far as the demand for separation is concerned which, I believe, inspired this measure, it is a wrong demand. The demand for separation of any part of India from the Indian Union, whether it is in the South or in the East or in the West or in the North, is evidently a slogan of disintegration. Naturally we have to counter such a slogan but I do not think the problem is one which can be effec-

tively met by legislation. It may be necessary to have legislation and that is why the Government is getting general support to this measure but the real question is a political one.

Now, how is it that after independence large section of the people in a particular State in the South, in Madras, in Tamil Nad, felt like raising this slogan of separation? I say large sections because I have in mind the three million and odd votes the D.M.K. party got in the elections. Now, why is it that so many people rallied to the D.M.K. party which put in its banner the slogan of separation? It will not do us good merely to denounce the D.M.K. party for it. Criticise that party by all means for its political slogan but it is incumbent upon us, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that we also look inwardly and find out the factors and the causes that gave rise to the rallying of so many people to this slogan of Tamil Nad or whatever you call it. Are we to understand that people do not have any grievance or any such thing? No; we cannot accept that position. It may be that politicians have exploited those grievances in a wrong direction and sought to utilise them to build up support for this particular policy or slogan but the facts remains—and this fact we cannot escape—that there are grievances and discontentment among the people. What are we doing for this? Is it not a fact that in Tamil Nad the Congress Party is also responsible on the one hand for fighting the D.M.K. and also exploiting another party, which has an identical slogan, for its electoral purposes? If that is so, is it not the task of the leadership of the country to see that such a thing does not happen, more especially of the leadership of the party in power to see that such opportunism is not indulged in? [I should like to know from Shri Jai Bahadur Shastri where we stand in regard to this.]

Sir, we are curtailing our fundamental rights. I hope that the battle for Indian unity shall be fought and won finally and irrevocably on a political and ideological plane. I do not think this is a battle which is to be won by legislation, through the Home Ministry or under the Defence of India Rule or through preventive detention or by employing the Executive. This is a political battle which has to be fought and won politically. Therefore, I think the most important thing as far as this question is concerned is to bring about the maximum possible unity of the forces that make for the unity and integration of the country and then confront the forces that stand for disunity and disintegration or separation with logic, reason, political persuasion and political approach. The task will be, therefore, in the final analysis one of winning over those people who have gone over to the position of separation as in the case of the D.M.K. it appears to be. Therefore, I submit, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that we should approach in that manner the whole question. What I fear after an enactment of this kind is, the Executive or the Government might feel that now that they have got such a power they would be in a position to deal with the separatist slogans with executive orders and decrees. That would be a sad day for Indian unity. I say, let this measure, if it is passed, be an affirmation of our resolve to maintain, uphold and strengthen the unity of the country. At the same time let this measure and resolve be matched by our own united efforts, irrespective of political persuasions and performance, to mobilise public opinion in all parts of the country so powerfully, so strongly, so assertively, that it does not become possible for anyone who makes for separation and disintegration to hold the stage in the nation's political life. Therefore, I approach it from that angle. I do not know what Lal Bahadur Shastri has in mind but my fear is that once this measure is passed and it is not backed up by the right approaches and

policies—by which I mean political policies—there is the other danger of the party in power being complacent about its political responsibility and even shirking it by leaving matters to be dealt with bureaucratically and administratively. I hope such a situation will not develop. I do not wish to say anything more except that it is unfortunate today that we have to pass a measure of this kind to protect the integrity of the country. Let it be passed, if pass we must, but let us take also the resolve and I want a clear assurance from the Home Minister who is one of the leaders of the Congress Party, in a very high place, that this battle for Indian unity as far as the South is concerned—in Madras *vis-a-vis* the D.M.K. _____ will be fought through a political approach, by methods of persuasion, by ceaseless efforts to convince others who do not share our views in this matter and by efforts to win them over to positions of unity and integration. This is all that I have to say; I do not wish to say anything beyond that.

As far as the oath is concerned, as far as affirmation is concerned well, this does not mean much because many hon. Members opposite take oaths profusely and make affirmations in the House in the name of God but then they violate the laws. God is on their side in any case.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this Bill seeks to arm Parliament of India and the State Legislatures with powers to legislate prohibiting secessionist demands. It is in the nature of a frame-work. The picture shall be complete only when we have parliamentary and State legislations. In the present context with the demand for secession growing in many parts of the country this Bill was called for.

Implicit in our Constitution has been the faith in one citizenship, one

[Shri B. K. P. Sieha.] nationality, one country and one people. Law has a certain validity in human affairs. Law guides and controls actions and expressions of men but that validity is a limited validity, for life is more extensive than legislation. Therefore, welcome as this measure is, it must be followed by appropriate action and appropriate speeches in public life. It is only when the consciousness of one nation, of one people, becomes a part not only of our consciousness but becomes a part of the subconscious that this conception of one nation and one people will become strong and irrepensible. For that we have to make efforts on two planes, material and intellectual.

On the material plane many of these demands are occasioned by a sense of frustration. Therefore, there should be an earnest effort to build up every region of the country in harmony with each other and build them up rapidly. Moreover, those articles of the Constitution which give the right to every citizen to move about freely, to settle down, to do business, to serve in any part of the country should be made firmly effective. I am sorry to find that in the matter of Services at least, the right guaranteed to every citizen of India is affected by State boundaries, by boundaries of language and other regional considerations. New material conditions must be created, a new situation should be created. What is ordained in the Constitution should be made more effective. But *at* the same time, the intelligence of man, the consciousness of people should be worked upon. The British people proceeded on the principle of *divide et impera*. They proceeded to write history so as to create in the minds of the people inhabiting the various regions that they were culturally different, racially different, linguistically different and that the

unity of India was a British creation. This is far from the facts. From the earliest times the people of this country had the consciousness of one country from the Himalayas to the wide ocean. Therefore, these facts have to be emphasised. So far as race is concerned, I am reminded of this. When Hitler was preaching his racial theories, four eminent anthropologists from Europe came but with one book called "We, Europeans", which proved conclusively that there was no Nordic or Aryan race as such and that the people of Europe were mixed. In India there has been a greater admixture of races. In India the culture from time immemorial has been one. What the British people or the foreigners have been doing is this. They have been emphasising the differences and we have continued that trend with gusto after independence. The time has come now when history has to be re-written, a genuine history, a realistic history, emphasising that in cultural, racial and other respects the people of India have been one and are one. What should be emphasised now are the elements that unite us and not as heretofore the elements that disunite us or separate us. That is what is required.

In this connection, I would briefly refer to a certain aspect of Soviet nationality. There, in theory they have two nationalities—the State nationality and the Federal nationality. In my long tour of the Soviet Union I found that because of certain practical steps which they have taken, there is practically one nationality, that is, the Soviet nationality. In India unfortunately while our Constitution recognises only one citizenship, one nationality, because of regional considerations, almost in practice two nationalities have grown and have developed. It is time that appropriate measures are taken which will lead the people of India to have firm faith in one nationality.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the bright aspect which greatly impressed me in Soviet Russia. In every great city they have a palace of pioneers, in every great industrial enterprise, they have a palace of culture, where the children drawn from all regions of Soviet Russia, meet together, study together, dance together, play together. The result is that from their very childhood in them is ingrained the sense of one nationality. Let something comparable be introduced in our cities, at least in four or five cities in India. At least in the big nationalised industrial towns which are growing, some such experiment should be introduced. I was amazed when I went to Jamshed-pur the other day and I found there was a South Indian Club, a Bihari Club, a Gujarati Club, a Bengali Club. People drawn from the various regions were living almost in different *mohallas* of that town. I was happy to find when I went to the oil installation area in Gujarat—I made an enquiry—that they were living mixed together. And I have learnt from them and learnt with pleasure that the unhappy feature, where you have a Gujarati Club, a Madras Club, a Bihari Club, and a U.P. Club, is not going to find any place in that township. I hope proper measures will be taken. From time immemorial this country has been one. It is one and it shall remain one in spite of the doubting Thomases.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not have much to add to what I have already expressed on a previous occasion when this Bill was brought forward, but I would like to remove certain misapprehensions that have been created. The very first instance is, the mover of the Bill has stated that in the other House it was passed unanimously. Maybe after the amendment, after the voting on the amendments, at the final stage my party was not present. But when the first vote was taken, seven Members of the D.M.K. and one Member of R.S.P. Kerala, eight Mem-

bers, voted against the Bill. Perhaps in his anxiety to stress the point that there ought to be unanimity on this, he took it for granted that there was unanimity. Fortunately or unfortunately, there was no such unanimity. Eight people have actually voted against the measure in the Lok Sabha.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I would like to divide this problem into two broad aspects. One is a law and order problem. Once we abridge the Constitution and alter the fundamental rights, then it is almost an invitation to people take up the challenge. I may tell this House through you that if one feels very strongly and very sincerely about anything, he is expected to take or be cognizant of the consequences. Therefore, let us not look at this problem merely as a law and order problem, but as a problem, as my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, has put it, which ought to be solved in the political sphere to get a political solution for that. May I, with your permission, put to myself one question: What do I gain by standing alone in this House expressing an unpalatable thing, knowing full well that if only I were to give up that unpalatable 'thing, you would take, everyone of you would take me into your hearts? What do I get by standing aloof and alone? You should understand the psychology behind that stand. Please do not think that I am pressing for it for the mere novelty of it. There is frustration, a very intense and a very growing one, among a section of people of my part who definitely feel that the present political set-up, the federation, is not going to deliver them the goods. And that is why after having had the experience in this federation on or so many years, not only the members of the D.M.K. but members outside the D.M.K. too, feel that unless something radical is thought of, unless some new

[Shri C. N. Annadurai.] kind of political set-up is created, this federation is not going to stand the strain and stress of the times.

Of course, the Minister was kind enough to state that even without this amendment, the Constitution is very clear that the talk about separation is repugnant to the Constitution. I may point out that jurists are divided on that point, and I quote the opinion of one jurist of this august House, I am quoting Mr. P. N. Sapru. He has written a very persuasive, a very lucid article, not for separation, but against separation in one of our English dailies wherein he has said about the Preamble to our Constitution and has said—it may be pointed out—that it is a Sovereign Republic, since our Constitution is not rigid, since amendments are allowed, since our Constitution is purposely made to be flexible, even an amendment to the Preamble can be brought forward. And therefore it does not matter much whether, as the Minister has stated, the talk about separation is repugnant to the Constitution or, as the jurist has pointed out, it is open to question.

Apart from the Constitution, it is a matter of conscience. You should think—everyone of you in this House should think—as to why a particular section in this country feel in a way diametrically opposite to what everybody else feel. We could not have been peculiarly brought up in a different way. We could not have been unaware of the good influence that was being inculcated in this country for the past forty or fifty years. We heard Mahatma Gandhi talk about the great Bharat. We have heard with thrill, as most of you have heard, about the oneness of this country. We have read about the oneness of this country. And yet, why is it that some of us feel that the present political set-up of a federation makes the State become 'almost like a colony'? Why is it that we feel in that way? Why there is such a psychology on the one

side? There is again the other item referred to by my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the regional disparity. You cannot avoid talking about, or in fact ignore, the existing regional disparity in the economic sphere. There is the psychological sphere which has been referred to, and there is the linguistic wrangle. Add up all these things, and if you add up all these things you will come to the only conclusion to which some of us—rather most of our people—have come to in our part of the country. We feel that if we remain as a part and parcel of the Indian Union, if we remain as a component part of the Indian federation, linguistically there would be an imperialism, economically our State would be backward and psychologically we would not be having so much of solace as we would have if we were to be separate. That is the background that we will very much request everyone of the Members of this House to ponder over.

It was strengthened by the liberal dicta propounded by the present Prime Minister of India while he was not the Prime Minister but the leader of the liberation movement in the subcontinent. He has stated on many occasions that his party, the Congress Party, would try to ask or try to persuade every component unit of India to remain in the Indian Union but if for some reason or other a particular section of the people thought, if a lot of people were to think, that that particular area should secede from the Union, he would not force them to remain in the Union but he would give them the right to secede. I am quoting his famous speech at the Kapurthala Ground. I am also quoting his writings about the problem of separation. At that time the problem of separation was about Pakistan and not about other things. Therefore, when we read the liberal dicta of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, we were strengthened in our thought that if we were to present our case sincerely, you would consider that. But instead of meeting the D.M.K. and its propaganda on the

political ground, you are bent upon bringing forward a legislation. "The Congress position was that India should remain a national union but if at the same time the population of a unit specifically declares that they would not be in the common unit, then the Congress should not ask them to stay in the Union. Thus the Congress recognises the right of separation or self-determination." This is what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has stated on the 29th August, 1945. I have other quotations too but I do not want to take up the time of the House much. Therefore, it is not that we are bringing forward a theory or a thesis which is very repugnant to everybody. At one time, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru thought that it would not be so. Mr. Sapru has himself stated that. He has asked the D.M.K. and particularly me—I am glad that he has requested me—to give this up, and he has said that merely because there is a federation, that does not mean that for all time to come a component unit of the federation cannot break away from it. Please study the history of federation all over, present and past. Wherever any component part of federation feels frustrated, feels that it can get much by remaining out rather than by remaining in, then that federation is bound to break up. It may not interest you but it will interest me to know, to remind myself, that the Scandinavian Union—the union between Norway and Sweden—was in vogue for four centuries for four hundred years. Nobody questioned the validity the legality or the logicity of it. But yet, a part of it thought that by remaining in the Union they would not be getting what they would get if they remained separate. And after four hundred years, that Union was broken. I have pointed these out not in a menacing spirit but as a student of history, I am pointing this out. Please do not trot out arguments by saying that our federation is indissoluble and therefore we cannot separate. Give us more cogent reasons, give us more assurances.

By amending article 19, the Minister has stated, the freedom of speech is curtailed so as to safeguard the sovereignty and integrity of India. But our Constitution refers to fundamental rights and any restriction on the fundamental rights should be a reasonable one, and the reasonableness or otherwise is not to be decided merely by the majority in a Parliament but by the judicial mind. They should sit and say whether this restriction is reasonable and even granting for argument's sake that the restriction is reasonable . . .

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: That is the position. Even after the amendment is effect, that is the position.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Even granting that the restriction is reasonable, we should be informed whether the restriction implies prohibition also. You can restrict a particular right; say, go thus far and no farther. That was what the Home Minister stated in this House some months ago when an hon. Member put him a question about the propaganda for separation. He said, if they go beyond a certain point, we will think about it. Now, that is a most wholesome principle of fundamental right, of freedom of speech. But this is total prohibition; this is not restricting the people not to preach violence, not to preach sabotage, not to preach no-tax campaign, not to preach any other thing; a mere talk about separation is not merely restricted but completely prohibited. The hon. Minister who moved this Bill was very eloquent when he said that the two cardinal principles in our Constitution were sovereignty and democracy. This is not sovereignty; nor is it democracy. Sovereignty does not mean power to be concentrated in one place and one place alone, and the very term 'sovereignty', the definition of sovereignty is undergoing vast changes due to the impact of various political forces in this country and outside this country too. The United Nations Assembly are very busy defining what is meant by the

[Shri C. N. Annadurai.] term 'self-determination'. I understand a committee is in progress to find out what is exactly meant by the term 'self-determination'. Therefore, let us not think that sovereignty has been explained in all its implications and let us not also think that by bringing forward a measure we can put down any thought or any talk or any discontent in that regard in any part of the country by anybody.

If such a law is brought forward and it is passed, what is the situation? Though my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, supported it generally and in principle, he has also asked the Congress Party, the ruling party, to take up the political aspect, to fight us on the political ground—I do not even want to use an offensive word as *fight—meet us on the political ground. Why do you fight shy of meeting us? Did the National Integration Committee care to enquire about our point of view? Did the persuasive Home Minister create a machinery whereby he can get an insight into our sentiments, our feelings? Simply because you have got a majority, simply because the D.M.K. is in a minority, it is very easy for you to pass a legislation, and it is easier for me to go back to my people and say, "Well, I fought for you singly and all alone, and yet the Bill was passed. What shall I do?" And my people, naturally, will say, "All right; let us resist it." Therefore, you are creating an atmosphere of lawlessness, the breaking of laws. That is why, whenever a new legislation is contemplated, you should think—to borrow a phrase from my friend, the Home Minister—you should think a hundred times before you bring in any new legislation, see whether there is any necessity for it, whether there is any urgency for it, whether there is any cogency for it. Here there is neither urgency nor necessity nor cogency. Therefore it is that I oppose this Bill, and in opposing this Bill I am really sorry that I have run counter to the various sentiments of everyone of the Members

of the House, for whom I have the greatest respect. I would request everyone of them to ponder over the problem carefully, considerately and in a compromising spirit. I can even go so far as to tell the Home Minister, "All right, pass this legislation, but it will only remain in your archives or in your armoury. The people know how to meet the situation." Instead of that, after this Bill as passed, I would still request the Home Minister to constitute a parliamentary committee. Let it not be an official committee. Let it be a non-official committee composed of Members of different political parties. Ask Mr. Sapru to be there; ask Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to be there. I would very much like my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, to be there. Let them tour our part of the country, stay there for a fortnight, meet all people, understand the cross-currents of political thought there, and then let them submit a report. I accept such a committee and I say that we would present materials enough for them to ponder over this problem, and when they go through those materials, they will come to me any say, "Well, if these are the things, it is not unjustifiable for you to ask for separation, and yet we would very much like you to be with us." Now there is a German saying which says, "If you would not be my brother, I would break your head and make you one." Please do not break the heads if you want concord, if you want a sort of calm political atmosphere and if you want to solve political problems on the political plane.

Thank you.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras):
Madam Deputy Chairman, in this House we have had the very pleasant opportunity of hearing Mr. Annadurai, leader of the D.M.K. in Madras State. While I should like to give him the credit of leading a party, I must very respectfully say that he alone does not represent the people of the whole South. When he

said, "my people" I hope he meant his own followers, and his Dravida Nad demand has perhaps been further extended to comprise the four States of South India. Now, it will be very interesting for you to learn that so far Mr. Annadurai or any respectable or important member of the D.M.K. has never defined what is Dravida Nad and what are its boundaries. So, when he speaks about the people of the South, they should not have the feeling of being insulted by this Bill. I would like to repudiate his claim to speak on behalf of the people of the South, of Madras. He represents only 1/18 of the people of Madras in this House. And what is the opinion of the remaining people who are represented by 17 other Members in this House? They have decidedly held that they do not favour Dravida Nad. After all, he has been fighting very shy of the federation. He has been criticising that the federation will never give economic satisfaction and political stability to Madras State. But his own conception of Dravida Nad is that it will consist of the present Madras State, Mysore State, Kerala State and Andhra State. Can he ever hope to get even one single representative in a municipality elected in the other State from here? No. Then it will be absolutely illogical. I must very respectfully say, for him to claim that he represents the feelings of all the people for Dravida Nad. If at all he represents in Madras State, he represents only 25-30 per cent, of the electorate there.

He was very kind to quote the Prime Minister and said that the Prime Minister had even assured much earlier, about 15 or 20 years back, that there would be an opportunity to the people for self-determination. Yes, I do not think the Prime Minister, our beloved Jawahar-lal Nehru, will go back on his word. Elections have been held more than once, and Mr. Annadurai will remember that during the three elections, the people of Tamil Nad and

Dravida Nad and all the components of the electorate, of which he is aware, have definitely voted against Dravida Nad and have opted for remaining in the Indian Union. So, if three elections cannot satisfy my friend about the opinion of the people in Tamil Nad, I would like to know what is the ground for his speaking on behalf of all people claiming them as "my people"? Sovereignty can be very well defined as the will of the people, and the will of the people has been expressed in the last three elections and it is against Dravida Nad. After all, Mr. Annadurai was a member of the D.K. which is not in existence now. The idea has been there for a long time and certainly he was not the author or the father of the idea of Dravida Nad. It was left to one Ramaswamy Naicker (Periyar) to start the Dravi-dasthan movement a long time ago and to agitate for it for about 30 or 40 years. And today what does he say? He himself says that Dravidas-than is a mirage, it is impossible to achieve it, "I like a united India and I want it." He has said so.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Madam, it is true that Periyar Ramaswamy Naicker has given up the Dravida Nad demand. But he has not given up the demand for separation. He wants separation of Tamil Nad alone.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I wish Mr. Annadurai also reiterates that he wants the separation of Tamil Nad alone. But he wants separation of Dravida Nad. His party has been fighting for the separation of Dravida Nad. So, what I suggest to say is that when he says that he has a right to represent the whole of Dravida Nad. I must humbly point out to him that he does not represent even 1/20th or 1/40th of the population of the entire Dravida Nad. So, the will of the people has been expressed. What I want to say is that the very founder of the Dravidasthan movement, who wanted a separate Dravida Nad, has out of wisdom, come to the conclusion that it is not

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.] in the interest of the people to have Dravida Nad and that we must have one nation. I know that he wants to have a sovereign Southern State, but he does not want to have the right of secession. He may say many things. He does not want it. He says he will not launch the movement because he is not in favour of it. He knows that it is not in the good of the people. So, what I want to impress on this House is that the very founder of the movement has given it up, and Mr. Annadurai could have given it up much earlier. He had earlier opportunities.

I would like to know why he did not choose the opportunity after the advent of freedom to ask for all these things. When we were all fighting the British, when we were engaged in our fight against the British, when the British were leaving India, he should have asked for Dravidasthan. And at that time he was the first to join the celebrations of the Independence Day in 1947, if I remember aright. He came out openly and said, "India is one. India is united. We must have joint celebrations", and he supported the Independence Day celebrations.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I have been much amused to learn that even compliment turns into condemnation. I joined the 1947 celebrations not stating that India is one but stating that the British imperialism was driven out.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I am very happy that my learned friend gave his expression. If he had kept quiet, it would have been different. To join in the Indian freedom day celebrations means he subscribed to the Indian freedom. There is no other explanation possible. Of course, now it is too late for him to give explanation. Madam, the very fact that he joined the Independence Day celebrations shows that India was free. He must know that in 1947

Dravidasthan was not free; it was not created. But India became free and he joined the celebrations and I am happy about it. I may really compliment him and I want him to stick to it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; Tamil Nad was also free.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I do not understand what he says.

SHRI C. N. ANNADURAI: I may point out in passing that as one who joined the celebrations of 1947, I am considered to be the inveterate enemy of the Congress and Periyar who said 'it is a day for mourning is now your election agent.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: That is why I am surprised why such a progressive Annadurai should have become so much bad now, rather reactionary, when he was so very magnanimous on that day. I would have been happy if he too had given up the demand. For Mr. Annadurai also, I know that he does not very seriously believe in Dravida Nad. I will quote him, with your permission, Madam—I will not take much time of the House.

In 1952 elections he did not contest the elections—I mean, his party did not contest. But there was some agreement between the various political parties and they put up a united front. Even his people were also signatories to it. But Dravida Nad. was not in it.

In 1957 when the elections came, the D.M.K. contested the elections, but still it was out of sheer necessity, it was out of political necessity that they did not include Dravidasthan demand in the election manifesto in 1957.

Again, when other questions came up in 1962 elections in certain areas; when there had been alliances between the D.M.K., the Communists and other parties, out of practical

considerations, he did not insist on the Dravidasthan demand.

So, when on previous occasions, for political reasons, he has given up the Dravidasthan demand, Shri Lai Bahadur Shastri has been kind enough to give him a legal opportunity to give up the separation demand. Why does he not do it and say that he has given up the demand? I know whatever he speaks he speaks it only as a political slogan; I quite agree he has got a political platform. Beyond that there has been nothing because you know that without this slogan of Dravida Nad it will be difficult for him to go and face the electorate. It is good that he has done it. But I can assure the House that one party which has profited by this Dravida Nad slogan is the Annadurai D.M.K. Party, and I am sure in his heart of hearts he will not oppose it. Even now the indication given in the other House is that the D.M.K. did not vote against the resolution which finally made this Bill into law. That is because it helps them, because now the people of Madras and the South have given their verdict against separation. He wants an opportunity to get rid of it so that his party may not become unpopular. Now, if he gives up the demand he will say that he did not give it up voluntarily lest his party should become unpopular. Therefore, I am sure Mr. Annadurai will like to welcome this Bill. That is why his party did not oppose it and I am sure he will not also vote against this Bill. Once again I appeal to Mr. Annadurai to get rid of the muddle and please take this opportunity and support the Bill.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVARGIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Madam, I had given my name to speak on this Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): Madam Deputy Chairman, in the annals of the parliamentary history of India this day will go down as a red letter day. The historians can record that on this day Parliament enacted the Fifteenth (Amendment) Bill which injured the Constitution of India and gave a death blow to the independent judiciary in this country. But they will also record that on this day Parliament enacted the Sixteenth (Amendment) Bill providing for the lacuna that was left in the Constitution by the Constitution-framers in giving, as the Home Minister said, an explicit expression to the implicit that was enshrined in the Constitution.

Madam, I whole-heartedly support this Bill. What this Bill provides is that every Member, whether of Parliament or of the State Legislature, will affirm or take an oath that he/ she will protect the integrity of this country. There is nothing wrong in it and we should all support it. Then, Madam, this Bill also places a restriction on the fundamental rights . . .

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): Possible restrictions.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: . . . reasonable restrictions which may be passed into law under article 19 of the Constitution.

6 P.M.

We all know why this measure has to be brought on the Statute Book We have just heard two eminent Members from the South, of the Madras State. I have great respect for not only Mr. Annadurai but also for the other Members representing his party in the Parliament. I know them individually and I can vouchsafe that they are no less patriotic than any one of us. It is only—that is my reading of the situation—because of political considerations that they have been advocating separation or the formation of Dravidas-

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha] than and I am sure that it is merely a political slogan. It was very correctly pointed out by Mr. Annadurai that not only constitutional and legal restrictions should be placed but we have got to meet the D.M.K. propaganda on the political plane. They may have certain grievances, political or economic, and it is our duty to see that whatever the grievances may be of any part of the country, they are removed by consultation and by a spirit of 'give and take'. I humbly submit that there are ways open to him and to his party to ventilate their grievances, to discuss with the Government and the other political parties, both their grievances and the remedies that they seek to remove those grievances. It is not necessary that any political party should propagate and seek the secession of any part of the country in order to highlight the grievances that they may be harbouring.

We all agree that there should be no regional disparities so far as economic development is concerned and it will not be very proper to say that Madras or any other State in the South has been neglected so far as economic development is concerned. There may be other regions also in this country which have not advanced economically. There are regions and pockets in this country which are far less advanced than Madras or some other State in the South. We cannot give any right to any section of the population of any State to propagate for secession more or less on this ground that they are not economically advanced or they are not meeting the same treatment as some other State may be meeting from the Centre. Therefore, I think that the D.M.K. will gain in stature if they give up this slogan of separatism. I am sure as my friend Mr. Pattabi-raman pointed out, they will make use of this measure to give up their demand for separatism. I also agree with Mr. Pattabiraman that the **D.M.K.** does not represent any other part of the so-called Dravidasthan other

than Tamil Nad. They have their hold only in Tamil Nad, however small they may be. Therefore, the claim that the other States in the South favour this idea of separatism is nothing but a monstrosity. The D.M.K. has fought several elections and they have secured no doubt some votes but their total votes as compared to that polled by other parties are very small. It was only at the last general elections that they had formulated the idea of Dravidasthan in a clear-cut form. In the two previous elections to the best of my knowledge that was not there. Therefore, to contend that this idea of Dravidasthan or of separatism is backed by a large majority of the people in the South is not correct.

I, therefore, support this Bill because I would like that we should not allow any party or any person to propagate for the secession of any part of our country. There must be a constitutional bar, a legal bar against the propagation of such an idea because it may lead to dangerous situations. We have all suffered by the partition of our country into India and Pakistan and we cannot take any risks or any chance; and if we remember the role of the Muslim League in pre-independence days, we will all support this measure that we should not allow any germ to grow which pleads for separation of any part of our country. Of course, to that extent I agree with Mr. Annadurai that we should always try to understand them politically, should always try to meet their grievances and opportunities have always been provided to listen to all grievances from any part of the country in so many forums. Parliament is one of the biggest forums and we are very happy that in this Parliament we have Members of the D.M.K. and the leader of the **D.M.K.** is in our midst and he can always put forward his point of view, his grievances and I can assure him that the whole House will listen to him, will try to understand his point of view to the best of its ability, and

we would certainly like to remove any legitimate grievances. We will support him in the removal of any legitimate grievances which any part of the South may have and with this assurance, not only from my party but I am sure this assurance will be forthcoming from all parties, I hope he will support this measure.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदया, जो संविधान में संशोधन विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया गया है इसका मैं हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ। वैसे देखा जाये तो जैसा कि माननीय मंत्री जी ने कहा यह इम्प्लाइट था कि हमारे भारत की सार्वभौमिकता, अखंडता, अक्षुण्ण रहे और उसको एकसप्लिसिट करने के लिये इसमें इस तरह का संशोधन लाना आवश्यक है।

जब देश पर विपत्ति आई थी, उस समय कुछ लोगों को छोड़ कर बाकी सब लोगों ने इस सार्वभौमिकता को, इस अखंडता को कायम रखने के लिए सरकार को पूर्ण सहयोग दिया। फिर भी देश में एक सेक्शन ऐसा था, जो धमकी दे रहा था, जिसके मन में ऐसी भावना छिपी थी और वह चाहता था कि हमारे लिए एक अलग से देश बनाया जाये, एक अलग से राष्ट्र बनाया जाये। वह दल इस देश की सार्वभौमिकता और अखंडता से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रखना चाहता है। इसलिए उपसभापति महोदया, यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि अगर हमारे देश को आगे बढ़ना है, विकास करना है, उन्नति करना है, देश के इतिहास को कायम रखना है, देश की संस्कृति को कायम रखना है, इस देश की अखंडता व एकता को अक्षुण्ण रखना है तो उसके रास्ते में जितने भी रोड़े आते हैं उनको हटाना होगा और हर तरह का प्रयास करना होगा जिससे हमारे देश के ऊपर किसी तरह का खतरा न आने पावे।

मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हम केवल संशोधन-मात्र से ही अपने देश की सार्वभौमिकता तथा अखंडता को कायम नहीं कर सकते हैं, उसके

लिए केवल कानून बना देने से या शब्द लगा देने से हल निकलने वाला नहीं है और न इस तरह की कोई सम्भावना ही है। हमने शराब-बन्दी के लिए कानून बनाया और बम्बई सरकार द्वारा इस पर अमल भी किया गया, तो क्या कानून के द्वारा हमें उसमें सफलता मिली? जितनी सफलता हमें उसमें मिलनी चाहिये थी, वह नहीं मिली। अगर हम देश की सार्वभौमिकता को कायम रखना चाहते हैं, अखंडता को कायम रखना चाहते हैं, एकता को कायम रखना चाहते हैं, तो पूर्व से लेकर पश्चिम तक, उत्तर से लेकर दक्षिण तक एक ऐसे कामन प्वाइंट को जन-जन के सामने रखना चाहिये, जिस के प्रति सब लोगों में श्रद्धा हो, आकर्षण हो, विश्वास पैदा हो। जब तक हम इस तरह के कामन प्वाइंट को ढूँढ़ नहीं लेते हैं, तब तक हम यह अपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते हैं कि हमारा राष्ट्र एक सूत्र में बंध सकेगा, यह सम्भव नहीं है। जैसे माला में अलग अलग मनका होता है और उन्हें एक सूत्र में पिरोने के लिए धागे में एक साथ बांधा जाता है, उसी तरह से जब तक हम सब लोगों के हृदयों को एक सूत्र में नहीं पिरोते तब तक हम माला नहीं बना सकते हैं। उस एक सूत्र को पैदा करने के लिए हमारी सरकार को इतना अधिक प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि अगर उसमें व्यक्तिगत तथा दलगत या किसी तरह का भी नुकसान होता हो, तो उसकी चिन्ता नहीं करनी चाहिये। जब तक सारे राष्ट्र में इस बारे में अनवरत प्रयत्न नहीं होता, तब तक हम इस कार्य में सफलता नहीं प्राप्त कर सकते हैं।

वह कामन चीज हमारे लिए क्या हो सकती है? हमारे देश में कई प्रकार के धर्म हैं, कई प्रकार की जातियाँ हैं, कई प्रकार की भाषाएँ हैं, कई प्रकार की धारणाएँ हैं—और सब अलग अलग चलती है। इन सबको आत्मसात करने के लिए, एक सूत्र में बांधने के लिए जब तक सारे राष्ट्र के लिए एक कामन प्वाइंट नहीं होगा। जिसको हम सब लोग कामन मान कर चलें, उसके प्रति हमारी श्रद्धा

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया]
हो, विश्वास हो; उसके लिये जब तक हम अपने बड़े से बड़े हित को भी तिलीजलि देने की भावना नहीं पैदा करते; जब तक इस तरह की भावना समस्त लोगों के मन में जाग्रत नहीं होती, तब तक हम समूचे राष्ट्र की अखंडता, सार्वभौमिकता, एकता के लिए चाहे कितने कम्पलीमेंट्स या एडजक्टिव्स लगा कर संविधान सुधारें, उसमें हमें सफलता नहीं मिलेगी। आज हम देखते हैं कि हमारे राष्ट्र में सब कामों के लिए एक तरह की भावना की कमी है। उसकी जगह कांग्रेस दल सोचता है कि हमारे दल का कहीं कोई नुकसान न हो जाये और वह उसी दृष्टि को सामने रख कर काम करता है। कोई दूसरा दल ऐसा सोचता है कि अगर वह इस दृष्टि से काम करेगा तो उसे नुकसान न हो जाये। तो आज हम इस तरह की भावना हमारे दिलों से हट जानी चाहिये, छूट जानी चाहिये और हमें अलग अलग नारों में नहीं बहना चाहिये। हमें अपने देश के हित की तरफ देखना चाहिये और उसी को सिद्धान्त मान कर चलना चाहिये। जब तक हम सब लोग इस तरह की भावना जाग्रत नहीं करेंगे तब तक हम अपने लक्ष्य को प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते हैं। अगर हम सब लोगों के मन में अपने अपने लाभ की भावना रही तो हम इस देश की अखंडता तथा सार्वभौमिकता को कायम नहीं रख सकते हैं। इसलिए मेरा सब से पहले यह निवेदन है कि इस संशोधन को पास करने से पहले हमारी सरकार को इस बात का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि वह लोगों के मन में राष्ट्र के प्रति मातृ भाव, पितृ भाव जाग्रत करे। लोगों के मन में यह भावना होनी चाहिये कि यह हमारा मातृभूमि है, पितृभूमि है, पुण्य भूमि है और यह भावना केवल भाषणों द्वारा लोगों के मन में पैदा नहीं की जा सकती है। इसके लिए हमें शिवा का सहारा लेना होगा, दिनों दिन जो हमारे कार्यक्रम होते हैं जब तक उनके द्वारा हमें लोगों की विचारधारा को इन बातों से नहीं भरते

तब तक संविधान में संशोधन करने से हमें सफलता नहीं मिल सकती है।

आज हमारे देश में कई तरह की भाषा बोलो जाती हैं और लोग अपने लिये अलग स्थान चाहते हैं। लोग ऐसी ध्योरी प्रोपाउंड करते हैं। अगर एक बार उनके सामने समर्पण कर दिया—तो जैसा पहले किया जा चुका है—तो फिर आत्मसमर्पण कर दिया। जैसा अगर डी० एम० के० वालों की यह ध्योरी है और उन्हें इस बात से सन्तोष होता है कि उनका अलग राष्ट्र बन जायेगा तो फिर यहां ब्राह्मण राज्य, क्षत्रिय राज्य, जैन राज्य, न जाने क्या क्या राज्य कायम हो जायेंगे। इस मुल्क में तरह तरह के फिरके होने लगेंगे और उसका कभी भी अन्त नहीं होगा। जब चीन का संकट हमारे मुल्क के ऊपर आया, तो उस समय किसी भी ओर से उसका सामना करने के लिये विरोध नहीं किया गया, सब ने संगठित हो कर उसका मुकाबला करने का प्रयत्न किया। इसके बावजूद भी हमें बलील होना पड़ा और वह सबके लिए समान है। अगर हम यह मांग करें कि हम अलग होना चाहते हैं तो उस स्थिति में हमारी क्या हालत होने वाली है, इसकी कल्पना नहीं की जा सकती है और सब लोग स्पष्ट देख सकते हैं। इसलिये यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि अगर हम एक ध्योरी से आगे सरेंडर कर देंगे, तो वह न्याय संगत प्रतीत नहीं होगा।

इस तरह की ध्योरी क्यों पैदा हुई, इसके बारे में सरकार को जानकारी हासिल करनी चाहिये। उनके लीडर्स तो यहां कुछ एक्सप्रेस करते हैं मगर हमारी सरकार को इसके बारे में और ज्यादा जानकारी मालम करनी चाहिये और उन्हें समझना चाहिये। इतने पर भी जो लोग इस तरह अलग राष्ट्र की मांग करते हैं, राष्ट्र के हित की बात नहीं करते हैं, उनके प्रति सब्ब से सब्ब कदम उठाने,

चाहिये और इस बारे में किसी प्रकार की चिन्ता नहीं करनी चाहिये। हमें पहले मजबूत होना चाहिये और जो लोग देशद्रोह का काम करते हैं चाहे वे किसी जाति से सम्बन्ध क्यों न रखते हो चाहे किसी दल से सम्बन्ध क्यों न रखते हों, किसी समाज से सम्बन्ध क्यों न रखते हों, जो लोग राष्ट्र के टुकड़े टुकड़े करने का इरादा रखते हैं, जो हमारे राष्ट्र का एक और अलग हिस्सा बनाना चाहते हैं, वे देशभक्त नहीं हैं, देशद्रोही हैं और देशद्रोहियों के साथ सख्त से सख्त बर्ताव करना चाहिये तथा उन्हें सख्त से सख्त सजा देनी चाहिये।

हमारे देश में इस तरह की विचारधारा चलती है कि अगर पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच कोई मैच होती है, तो जब पाकिस्तान जीत जाता है, तो कुछ लोगों को खुशी होती है और जब वह हारने लगता है तो कुछ लोगों को दुःख होने लगता है। अगर रूस और हिन्दुस्तान के बीच में कोई मैच चले तो अगर रूस की जीत होने लगती है तो कुछ लोगों को आनन्द होता है और जब हिन्दुस्तान हारने लगता है, तो बड़ी खुशी होती है। ऐसी भावना जब तक हमारे देश में काम करेगी तो क्या हम अपेक्षा कर सकते हैं कि हमारे देश की अखंडता तथा सार्वभौमिकता अक्षुण्ण रह सकती है? यह संभव नहीं है। यह निर्विवाद है कि यहां कुछ चर्चा होती है, तो दूसरे दिन पेकिंग रेडियो से वह समाचार आ जाता है। इसी तरह पाकिस्तान रेडियो से वह समाचार आ जाता है। लेकिन हमारे रेडियो में बाद को यह समाचार आता है। क्या हमारी अखंडता के लिये यह लक्षण ठीक है, हमारी एकता के लिये और हमारी सार्वभौमिकता के लिये यह सब ठीक है? यह स्पष्ट है कि हमारे देश में इस तरह के एलिमेंट व्यापक रूप में सक्रिय हैं, जो हमारे देश की अखंडता को समाप्त करने पर तुले हुए हैं, नष्ट करने पर तुले हुए हैं। इसलिए मैं इस विधेयक का स्वागत करते हुए प्रार्थना करूंगा कि माननीय

गृह मंत्री जी को खास तौर से अगर इस विधेयक को कार्यान्वित करना है तो उन्हें दो कार्य करने होंगे। एक तो ऐसे एलिमेंट के खिलाफ सख्त से सख्त कार्यवाही करनी होगी—जो देशद्रोह का काम करते हैं, अगर उन्हें फांसी की भी सजा दी जायेगी तो वह कम होगी। दूसरे हमें अनवरत इस बात का प्रयत्न करना होगा कि किस तरह से देश को एक सूत्र में बांधा जाये। हमें प्रत्येक कार्य द्वारा, चाहे शिक्षा के माध्यम से हो या कोई भी माध्यम हो, इस देश को एक सूत्र में बांधने के लिये, एक धागे में पिरोने के लिए, भारत के जन-जन को एक धागे में पिरोने के लिए हर तरह का प्रयास करना होगा, ताकि भविष्य में किसी के लिए यह सम्भव न हो सके कि वह हमारी अखंडता, सार्वभौमिकता को किसी प्रकार से चुनौती दे सके।

इस बिल में शपथ लेने के बारे में कहा गया है, तो क्या इस तरह की शपथ लेना संविधान के अन्तर्गत आवश्यक है? उपसभापति महोदया, कानून की दृष्टि से मैं गृह मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या वह इस चीज की व्यवस्था Representation of the People Act में नहीं कर सकते हैं? अगर हम उस एक्ट में इस तरह की व्यवस्था कर सकते हैं, तो फिर संविधान में संशोधन करने की क्या आवश्यकता रह जाती है? संविधान के अनुच्छेद १०२(१) (ई) के द्वारा और १६१ (१) (ई) द्वारा हम Representation of the People Act में इस तरह का कानून बना सकते हैं, इस तरह का प्रतिबन्ध उसमें लगा सकते हैं कि इस तरह की भावना रखने वाला आदमी चुनाव में खड़े होने के लिए अयोग्य साबित होगा। जब हम इस तरह की व्यवस्था उस कानून में कर सकते हैं, तो संविधान में संशोधन करने की क्या विशेष आवश्यकता रह जाती है? इसलिये इसके बारे में भी स्पष्टीकरण हो सके तो अच्छा होगा। वैसे मेरा इसमें कोई

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौड़िया] विरोध नहीं है, ये शब्द जो उपयोग में लाये गये हैं बहुत अच्छे हैं और शपथ लेने के बाद भी इसी भावना के अन्तर्गत काम करना चाहिये। अगर आप यह कानून १९६० के पहले बना देते तो मुझे बड़ी खुशी होती क्योंकि तब जो हमें अपने देश का हिस्सा बेरुबारी का पाकिस्तान को देना पड़ा है वह देना नहीं पड़ता, मगर यह आज भी आया है तो भी मैं आशा करता हूँ कि भविष्य में हमारे देश का कोई हिस्सा पाकिस्तान को नहीं दिया जायेगा और न चीन को कोई हिस्सा सौदेबाजी में दिया जायेगा और न किसी भी प्रोपोजल से साँठ-गाँठ करके अपने देश के किसी भी हिस्से को किसी को देना पड़ेगा। मैं इसी विश्वास से इसका समर्थन करता हूँ। जो शपथ हमारे मंत्रिगण और सदस्यगण लेने वाले हैं उनको वे केवल शब्दों में ही नहीं रहने देंगे। जैसा कि एक शेर है कि मयखाने में गये तो शराब पी ली ताकि शैतान नाराज न हो और अगर मस्जिद में गये तो वहाँ भी जाकर नमाज पढ़ ली ताकि खुदा भी नाराज न हो, वह भी खुश रहे और वह भी खुश रहे— तो ऐसी बात नहीं होनी चाहिये कि शपथ ले ली और ऐसा कार्य भी कर दिया जो कि सार्वभौमिकता को नुकसान पहुंचाने वाला हो, यह न्यायसंगत नहीं होगा। वैसे बहुमत के आधार पर हम पब्लिक को भी कुछ समय तक भुलावे में डाल सकते हैं, गलत कामों को सही बता सकते हैं लेकिन वह चीज सत्य नहीं हो सकती है, तो और बातों को छोड़ कर कम से कम हमें अपनी आत्मा से पूछ कर के देखना है कि क्या अपने भारत के हिस्से को किसी को देना सार्वभौमिकता को नुकसान पहुंचाना है अथवा नहीं? मुझे आना है कि इन बातों पर विचार करके इसको कार्य रूप में परिणत करेंगे और सब तरह

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Madam Deputy Chairman, the reason why this is not introduced in an ordinary jaw

like the Representation of the People-Act but sought to be introduced as a part of the Constitution is the importance which all of us attach to this basic loyalty which we must owe and which we must publicly acknowledge before we enter upon our work in the structure of the State. I agree it could have been done by a mere law or by a mere amendment in the Representation of the People Act but as I submitted to the House in my opening speech, this is the basic compact in which people come together to form a Sovereign Democratic Republic and therefore in order that we may remind ourselves we make a public affirmation of this loyalty, of this faith, when we seek election to the various Legislatures.

Mr. Annadurai thought that this measure somehow or other was aimed at his people and aimed at his party. I always listen with deep interest to the speeches he makes. I am sorry I have only heard two of his speeches but I must confess that I am deeply impressed and I would certainly like to know what is the pain in his heart. For, I am quite sure if Mr. Annadurai goes to a foreign country and there he is woken up from his sleep and asked who he was, without hesitation his answer would be that he is an Indian. I have also no doubt that his colleagues feel the same way and, therefore, they could not bring themselves to vote against it. They have probably certain dissatisfaction but may I remind him that individual frustrations ought not to induce anyone to attack the political structure, the political institutions? It may be that under the present set-up they have differences with those who administer the State; it may be that they think that they should have a greater voice but I might remind him and also Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that the part that they should play in the State is a political issue between them and the party which I represent. Mr. Pattabi-raman has made out an unassailable case that the people have not backed Mr. Annadurai's view but have backed the views of the party which I represent.

Mr. Annadurai said that he was a student of history and, if he had not said so probably I would have guessed it. He probably must have read the History of the Bourbon who said, 'Who is the State?' and the French sovereign said, 'I am the State'. Mr. Annadurai also says, 'People? Who are the people? I am the people.' That may be a very self-satisfying illusion but that is not arithmetic. I would, therefore, beseech Mr. Annadurai to search his own heart and find out whether the interest of his own people lies in continuing with the rest of us, whether it is not a blessing that all of us are working together instead of working separately. Mr. Annadurai referred to the dissolution between Norway and Sweden after 400 years. He ought to complete the argument. He must further contend that both Norway and Sweden prospered much more when they acted on their own than when they acted together. When I went to the United States, when I saw the astounding prosperity of the most powerful and the richest nation in the world, one thought that came to my mind was how this great nation was saved by Abraham Lincoln. I am somewhat of an interested student of American institutions and I used to read with some satisfaction Lincoln's claim that he did not make war upon the South, that civil war did not arise out of an attempt to abolish slavery but he took up arms in order to save the Union. When I went to the U.S.A. I found that this was absolutely true. I would point out that just as there was a Union in North America there was a Confederation in South America also but there was no Lincoln in South America. Let him look at the United States of America. Madam, I repeat, let him look at the United States of America. They remained united. There was the Confederation of South America which did not survive. What do we find today? At the pinnacle of prosperity wealth international prestige and strength is the United States of America whereas we are grieved to find that the countries in South America whom Nature has endowed much more generously than the United

States are applicants for aid before-the same United States of America.

I will remind him of another historical instance which is taking shape before us. Does he not realise that today in Europe itself there is an attempt to found an European Common Market and there is further attempt to create political institutions in order to support the European Common Market? Which country has more intense nationalism, more virulent nationalism, than Germany and France which compelled them during a period of the last 50 or 60 years to go to war three times and what did they find? Ultimately, they found that economic collaboration between the two States was much more important than political domination of one linguistic group over another. And whom does Mr. Annadurai represent but a linguistic group? Does he represent an economic interest? Then there is something common between him and me. It was realised that coal on the one side and iron on the other side had to marry in order that they may prosper. Therefore there was an European steel community and the European steel community led to the European Common Market. Madam Deputy Chairman, it is for all of us to see that that economic combination is leading to accelerated prosperity of all parts of Europe. It is an accepted fact that the rate of growth of those which have entered the European Common Market, has gone up from 8 to 10 per cent, to 15 to 16 per cent. Even England which intended to keep out, which intended to maintain its insular position politically as well as economically insular position, is applying and applying in vain for entry into the European Common Market. Therefore, we are finding that nations which are the originators of the concept of nationalism, which are the repositories of the concept of nationalism, are surrendering a part of their nationalism, to create a wider-economic base. Does Mr. Annadurai think that it is in the interests of the people to break away from this country, which has maintained unity-

[Shri R. M. Hajarnavis.] throughout the centuries? And united it will remain however much Mr. Annadurai insists as it has persisted, throughout the centuries. I want to ask him a question: When India was under the Moghuls, that part of India which was under the Moghuls was India and was not part of it which was outside their rule also India? When it was under the British, that part which was under the British was called British India and the rest was Indian India. India has always remained one. It has always remained united and it will so remain.

Madam, today the problem before us is to keep all the parts of the country together united so that we may build up an integrated, industrial organisation, which will bring prosperity to all the people, to the people who live in my part of India and to people who live in Mr. Annadurai's part of India. Does Mr. Annadurai think that people in his part of the country without the aid, without the co-operation, from the rest of India are going to prosper? Does he not require coal from Andhra? Does he not require electricity from other parts of the country? How are his people to industrialise themselves? Therefore, in order to do so, it is necessary that the integrity of this country has to be maintained at all costs. If we do not do so, we shall be guilty of a crime to the unborn generation and we shall not plead guilty to posterity. We are, therefore, proceeding with this Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The House *divided*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes— 137; Noes—1.

AYES—137

Abid Ali, Shri.

Agrawal, Shri J. P.

Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.

Anig Kidwai, Shrimati.

Anwar, Shri N. M.

Arora, Shri Arjun.

Asthana, Shri L. D.

Ransi Lai, Shri.

Barooah, Shri Lila Dhar.

Basu, Shri Santosh Kumar.

Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati.

Bharathi, Shrimati K.

Bhargava, Shri M. P.

Chakradhar, Shri A.

Chatterji, Shri J. C.

Chaturvedi, Shri B. D.

Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh.

Chavda, Shri K. S.

Chordia, Shri V. M.

Dasgupta, Shri T. M.

Dass, Shri Mahabir.

Dave, Shri Rohit M.

Deb, Shri S. C.

Desai, Shri Suresh J.

Devaki Gopidas, Shrimati.

Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.

Doogar, Shri R. S.

Dutt, Shri Krishan.

Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.

Gilbert, Shri A. C.

Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.

Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.

Gupta, Shri Gurudev.

Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.

Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.

Kakati, Shri R. N.

Karayalar, Shri S. C.

Karmarkar, Shri D. P.

Kasliwal, Shri N. C.

Kathju, Shri P. N.

Kaushal, Shri J. N.

Keshvanand, Swami.

Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.

; Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.

Khandekar, Shri R. S.

Khobaragade, Shri B. D.	Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
Krishna Chandra, Shri.	Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
Kulkarni, Shri B. T.	Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
Kumbha Ram, Shri.	Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.	Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
Lai, Prof. M. B.	Sadiq Ali, Shri.
Lingam, Shri N. M.	Sahai, Shri Ram.
Lohani, Shri I. T.	Saksena, Shri Mohan Lai.
Mahesh Saran, Shri	Samuel, Shri M. H.
Mallik, Shri D. C.	Santhanam, Shri K.
Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.	Sapru, Shri P. N.
Mathen, Shri Joseph.	Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.	Sarwate, Shri V. V.
Mehta, Shri M. M.	Satyacharan, Shri.
Mishra, Shri S.	Satyanarayana, Shri M.
Mishra, Shri S. N.	Savenkar, Shri Baba Saheb.
Misra, Shri M.	Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
Mitra, Shri P. C.	Shah, Shri K. K.
Mohammad, Chaudhary A.	Shah, Shri M. C.
Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.	Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.	Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
Nafsul Hasan, Shri.	Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.	Shukla, Shri M. P.
Nanjundaiya, Shri B. C.	Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.	Singh, Sardar Budh.
Neki Ram, Shri.	Singh, Dr. Gopal.
Pande, Shri C. D.	Singh, Shri Mohan.
Pande, Shri T.	Singh, Shri Santokh.
Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.	Singh, Shri Vijay.
Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.	Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.	Sinha, Shri R. B.
Pathiak, Shri G. S.	Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.	Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
Pattabairaman, Shri T. S.	Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
Pillai, Shri J. S.	Solomon, Shri P. A.
Punnaiah, Shri Kota.	Subba Rao, Dr. A.
Rajagopalan, Shri G.	Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.	Tapase, Shri G. D.
Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.	Tara Ramaehandra Sathe, Shrimati,
Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.	Tariq, Shri A. M.
Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.	Tayyebulla, Maulana M.
Reddy, Shri K. V.	Thanglura, Shri A.

Tripathi, Shri H. V. Uma Nehru,
Shrimati. Vajpayee, Shri A. B. Varma,
Shri B. B. Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
Vijaivargiya, Shri Gopikrishna. Wadia,
Prof. A. R. Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES — 1

Annadurai, Shri C. N.

The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 2—Amendment of article 19

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments.

The question is:

"That clause 2 stands part of the Bill."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes— 135;
Noes—1.

AYES—135

Abid Ali, Shri.
Agrawal, Shri J. P.
Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.
Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.
Anwar, Shri N. M.
Arora, Shri Arjun.
Asthana, Shri L. D.
Bansi. Lalj Shri.
Barooah, Shri Lila Dhar.
Basu, Shri Santosh Kumar.
Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati.

I

Bharathi, Shrimati K. Bhargava,
Shri M. P. Chakradhar, Shri A
Chatterji, Shri J. C. Chaturvedi,
Shri B. D. Chauhan, Shri Nawab
Singh Chavda, Shri K. S. Chordia,
Shri V. M. Dasgupta, Shri T. M.
Dass, Shri Mahabir. Dave, Shri
Rohit M. Deb, Shri S. C. Desai,
Shri Suresti J. Devaki Gopidas,
Shrimati. Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
Doogar, Shri R. S. Dutt, Shri
Krishan. Ghose, Shri Surendra
Mohan. Gilbert, Shri A. C.
Gopalakrishnan, Shri R. Gupta, Shri
Gurudev. Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri. Kakati,
Shri R. N. Karayalar, Shri S. C.
Karmarkar, Shri D. P. Kasliwal, Shri
N. C. Kathju, Shri P. N. Kaushal,
Shri J. N. Keshvanand, Swami.
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali. Khan, Shri
Pir Mohammed. Khandekar, Shri R.
S. Khobaragade, Shri B. D. Krishna
Chandra, Shri Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
Kumbha Ram, Shri. Kurre,
Shri Dayaldas. Lai, Prof.
M. B. Lingam, Shri N. M.
Lohani, Shri I. T. Mahesh
Saran, Shri.

Mallik, Shri D. C.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Shri M.
 "Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 TVTohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
 Muhammad Ishaque^ Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan. Shri.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Nanjundaiya, Shri B. C.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Panj hazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S. Pillai, Shri J.
 S. Punnaiah, Shri Kota. Rajagopalan,
 Shri G. Raman], Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan. Ray, Shri
 Ramprasanna. Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Raghunatha. Reddy, Shri N.
 Narotham. Reddy. Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa. Rohatgi, Dr.
 Jawaharlal. SadJq Ali, Shri. Sahai,
 Shri Ram. Saksena, Shri Mohan Lai.
 Samuel, Shri M. H. Sanfhanam, Shri
 K.

Sapru, Shri P. N.
 Saraogi, Shri Parmalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Satyanarayana, Shri M.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Shetty, Shri B. p. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 \
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Si.nha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Solomon, Shri P. A.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Tapase, Shri G. D.
 Tara Ramachandra Sathe, Shrimati.
 Tariq, Shri A. M.
 Tayebulia, Maulana M.
 Thringlura, Shri A.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Uma Nehru, Shrimati.
 Vajpayee, Shri A. B.
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri' N.
 Vijaivargiya. Shri Gopikrishna.
 Wadia, Prof. A. R.

NOES—1

Annadurai, Shri C. N

The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3—Amendment of article 84

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes— 137; Noes—1.

AYES—137

Abid AH, Shri. Agrawal, Shri J. P.
Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C. Anis Kidwai,
Shrimati. Anwar, Shri N. M. Arora, Shri
Arjun. I Asthana, Shri L. D. Bansi Lai,
Shri. Barooah, Shri Lila Dhar. Basu, Shri
Santosh Kumar. Bedavati Buragohain,
Shrimati. Bharathi, Shrimati K. Bhargava,
Shri M. P. Chakradhar, Shri A. Chatterjee,
Shri J. C. Chaturvedi, Shri B. D. Chauhan,
Shri Nawab Singh. Chavda, Shri K. S.
Chordia, Shri V. M. Dasgupta, Shri T. "M.
Dass, Shri Mahatir. Dave, Shri Rohit M.
Deb, Shri S. C. Desai, Shri Suresh J.
Devaki Gopidas, Shrimati. Dikshit, Shri
Umashankar. Doogar, Shri R. S.

Dutt, Shri Krishan.
Ghose, Shri Surendra "Mohan.
Gilbert, Shri A. C.
Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
Gupta, Shri Gurudev.
Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
Kakati, Shri R. N.
Karayalar, Shri S. C.
Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
Kathju, Shri P. N.
Kaushal, Shri J. N.
Keshvanand, Swami.
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
Khandekar, Shri R. S.
Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
Krishna Chandra, Shri.
Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
Kumbha Ram, Shri.
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
Lai, Prof. M. B.
Lingam, Shri N. M.
Lohani, Shri I. T.
Mahesh Saran, Shri.
Mallik, Shri D. C.
Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
Mathen, Shri Joseph.
Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
Mehta, Shri M. M.
Mishra, Shri S.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Misra, Shri M.
Mitra, Shri P. C.
Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy,
Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati,
Nanjundaiya, Shri B. C.
Narasimha Rao, Dr. K.
Neki Ram, Shri.

Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Panj hazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lai.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 San than am, Shri K.
 Sapru, Shri P. N.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Satyanarayana, Shri M.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh.

blng, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Solomon, Shri P. A.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Tankha, pandit S. S. N.
 Tapase, Shri G. D.
 Tara Ramachandra Sathe, Shrimati.
 Tariq, Shri A. M.
 Tayyebulla, Maulana M.
 Thanglura, Shri A.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Uma Nehru, Shrimati.
 Vajpayee, Shri A. B. «
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
 Vijaivargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
 Wadia, Prof. A. R.
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—1

Annadurai, Shri C. N.

The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of «« House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 3 too, added to the Bill.

Clause ^-Amendment of article 173

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes--137;
Noes—1.

AYES—1S7

Abid Ali, Shri. Agrawal, Shri J. P.
Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C. Anis
Kidwai, Shrimati. Anwar, Shri
N. M.
Arora, Shri Arjun. Asthana, Shri L. D.
Bansi Lai Shri. Barooah, Shri Lila
Dhar. Basu, Shri Santosh Kumar.
Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati.
Bharathi, Shrimati K. Bhargava, Shri
M. P. Chakradhar, Shri A. Chatterji,
Shri J. C. Chaturvedi, Shri B. D.
Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh. Chavda,
Shri K. S. Chordia, Shri V. M.
Dasgupta, Shri T. M. Dass, Shri
Mahab'ir. Dave Shri Rohit M. Deb,
Shri S. C. Desai, Shri Suresh J. Devaki
Gopidas, Shrimati. Dikshit, Shri
Umashankar. Doogar, Shri R. S. Dutt,
Shri Krishan. Ghose, Shri Surendra
Mohan. Gilbert, Shri A. C.
•Gopalakrishnan, Shri R. Gupta, Shri
Bhupesh. Gupta, Shri Gurudev. Hathi,
Shri Jaisukhlal. Jairamdas Daulatram,
Shri. Kakati, Shri R. N. Karayalar, Shri
S. C. Karmarkar, Shri D. P. JCasliwal,
Shri N. C.

Kathju, Shri P. N. Kaushal, Shri J. N.
Keshvanand, Swami. Khan, Shri
Akbar Ali. Khan, Shri Pir
Mohammed. Khandekar, Shri R. S.
Khubaragade, Shri B. D. Krishna
Chandra, Shri. Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
Kumbha Ram, Shri.
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
Lai, Prof. M. B.
Lingam, Shri N. M.
Lohani, Shri I. T.
Mahesh Saran, Shri.
Mallik, Shri D. C.
Malviya, Shri Pattanial Kishorilal.
Mathen, Shri Joseph.
Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati.
Mehta, Shri M. M.
Mishra, Shri S.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Misra, Shri M.
Mitra Shri P. C.
Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy
Muhammad Ishaque Shri.
Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
Nanjundaiya, Shri B. C.
Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
Neki Ram, Shri.
Pande, Shri C. D.
Pande, Shri T.
Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
Pathak, Shri G. S.
Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
Pillai, Shri J. S.
Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
Rajagopalan, Shri G.
Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.

Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Saksena, Shri Mohan La).
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Sapru, Shri P. N.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Satyanarayana, Shri M.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvsr, Shrimati.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Shetty, Shri B. p. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh_ Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri R^jendra Pratap.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Solomon, Shri P. A.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Tankha, pandit S. S. N. Tapase,
 Shri G. D.
 Tara Ramachandra Sathe, Shrimati. Tariq,
 Shri A M.

Tavebulla, Maulana M. Thanglura, Shri
 A. Tripathi, Shri H. V. Uma Nehru,
 Shrimati. Vajpayee, Shri A. B.
 Varma, Shri B. B. Venkate&wara Rao,
 Shri' N. Vijarvargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
 Wadia, Prof. A. R. Yajee, Shri Sheel
 Bhadra.

NOES—1

Annadurai, Shri C. N.

The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 4 u>as added to the Bill.

Clause 5—Amendment of Third Schedule.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:
 "That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The House divided

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes— 136;
 Noes—1.

AYES—136

Abid Ali, Shri. Agrawal, Shri J. P.
 Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C. Anis
 Kidwai, Shrimati Anwar, Shri N.
 M. Arora, Shri Arjun. Asthana, Shri
 L. D. Bansi Lai, Shri. Barooah, Shri
 Lila Dhar. Basu, Shri Santosh
 Kurow.

Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati.	Lohani, Shri T. T.
Bharathi, Shrimati K.	Mahesh Saran, Shri.
Bhargava, Shri M. P.	Mallik. Shri D. C.
Chakradhar, Shri A.	Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
Chatterji, Shri J. C.	Mathen, Shri Joseph.
Chaturvedi, Shri B. D.	Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh.	Mehta, Shri M. M.
Chavda, Shri K. S.	Mishra, Shri S.
Chordia, Shri V. M.	Mishra, Shri S. N.
Dasgupta, Shri T. M.	Misra, Shri M.
Dass, Shri Mahabir.	Mohammad, Chaudhary A
Dave, Shri Rohit M.	Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
Deb, Shri S. C.	Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
Desai, Shri Suresh J.	Naftsul Hasar.. Shri.
Devaki Gopidas, Shrimati.	Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.	Nanjundaiya, Shri B. C. 1
Doogar, Shri R. S. Dutt, Shri	Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
Krishan. Ghose, Shri Surendra	Neki Ram, Shri.
Mohan. Gilbert, Shri A. C.	Pande, Shri C. D.
Gopalakrishnan, Shri R. Gupta,	Pande, Shri T.
Shri Bhupesh. Gupta, Shri	Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
Gurudev. Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.	Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta. Patel,
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri. Kakati,	Shri Maganbhai S. Pathak, Shri G. S.
Shri R. N. Karayalar, Shri S. C.	Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
Karmarkar, Shri D. P. Kasliwal,	Pattabiraman, Shri T. S. J. Filial, Shri J.
Shri N. C. Kathju, Shri P. N.	S. I. Punnaiah, Shri Kota. Rajagopalan,
Kaushal, Shri J. N. Keshvanand,	Shri G. Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand. Ray,
Swami. Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.	Dr. Nihar Ranjan. Ray, Shri
Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.	Ramprasanna. Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
Khandekar, Shri R. S.	Reddy, Shri K. V. Reddy, Shri K. V.
Khobaragade.. Shri B. D.	Raghunatha. Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
Krishna Chandra, Shri.	Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama. Reddy, Shri S.
Kulkarni, Shri B. T.	Channa. Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
Kumbha Ram, Shri.	Sadiq Ali, Shri.
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas Lai,	Sahai, Shri Ram.
Prof. M B. Lingam, Shri	Saksena, Shri Mohan Lai.
N. M.	Samuel, Shri M. H.

1963

NOES—1

Santhanam, Shri K.
 Sapru, Shri P. N.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Satyanarayana, Shri M.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvir. Shrimati.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Shetty, Shri B. p. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Solomon, Shri P. A.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Tankha, pandit S. S. N.
 Tapase, Shri G. D.
 Tara Ramachandra Sathe, Shrimati.
 Tariq, Shri A. M. Tayyebulla,
 Maulana M. Thanglura, Shri A.:
 Tripathi, Shri H. V. Uraa Nehru,
 Shrimati. Vajpayee, Shri A. B. ,
 Varma, Shri B. B. Venkateswara
 Rao, Shri N. Vijaiargiya, Shri
 Gopikrishna. Wadia, Prof. A. R.
 Yajee. Shri Sheel Bhadra.

Annadurai, Shri C. N.

The motion was adopted by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—137; Noes—1.

AYES—187

Abid Ali, Shri. Agrawal, Shri J. P.
 Ammannaraja, Shrimati C. Anis
 Kidwai, Shrimati. Anwar, Shri N.
 M Arora, Shri Arjun. Asthana, Shri
 L. D. Bansi Lai, Shri. Barooah, Shri
 Lila Dhar. Basu, Shri Santosh
 Kumar. Bedavati Buragohain,
 Shrimati. Bharathi, Shrimati K.
 Bhargava, Shri M P. Chakradhar,
 Shri A. Chatterji, Shri J. C.
 Chaturvedi, Shri B. D. Chauhan,
 Shri Nawab Singh. Chavda, Shri K.
 S. Chordia, Shri V M. Dasgupta,
 Shri T. M. Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Dave, Shri Rohit M.

Deb, Shri S. C.
Desai, Shri Suresh J.
Devaki Gopidas, Shrimati.
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
Doogar, Shri R. S.
Dutt, Shri Krishan.
Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
Gilbert, Shri A. C.
Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
Gupta, Shri Gurudev.
Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
Kakati, Shri R. N.
Karayalar, Shri S. C.
Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
Kathju, Shri P. N.
Kaushal, Shri J. N.
Keshvanand, Swami.
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
Khandekar, Shri R. S.
Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
Krishna Chandra, Shri.
Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
Kumbha Ram, Shri.
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
Lai, Prof. M B.
Lingam, Shri N. M.
Lohani, Shri I. T.
Mahesh Saran, Shri.
Mallik, Shri D. C.
Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
Mathen, Shri Joseph.
Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
Mehta, Shri M. M.
Mishra, Shri S.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Misra, Shri M.
Mitra, Shri P. C.
Mohammad, Chaudhary A
Mphanty, Shri Dhananjoy,

Muhammad Ishaque Shri.
Naflsul Hasan, Shri. Nandini
Satpathy, Shrimati.
Nanjundaiya, Shri B. C.
Narasimha Rao. Dr. K. L.
Neki Ram, Shri.
Pande, Shri C. D.
Pande, Shri T.
Panjhzari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
Patel, Shri Maganfohai S.
Pathak, Shri G. S.
Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
Pillas, Shri J. S.
Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
Rajagopalan, Shri G.
Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
Reddy, Shri K. V.
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
Sadiq Ali, Shri.
Sahai, Shri Ram.
Saksena, Shri Mohan Lai.
Samusl, Shri M. H.
Santhanam, Shri K.
Sapru, Shri P. N.
Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
Sarwate, Shri V. V.
Satyacharan, Shri.
Satyanarayana, Shri M.
Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
Shah, Shri K. K.
Shah, Shri M. C.
Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
Shetty, Shri B. p. Basappa

Shukla, Shri M. P.
Sirdhu, Dr. M. M. S.
Singh, Sardar Budh.
Singh, Dr. Gopal.
Singh, Shri Mohan.
Singh, Shri Santokh.
Singh, Shri Vijay.
Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
Sinha, Shri R. B.
Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
Solomon, Shri P. A.
Subba Rao, Dr. A.
Tankha, pandit S. S. N.
Tapase, Shri G. D.
Tara Ramachandra Sathe, Shrimati.
Tariq, Shri A. M.
Tayyebulla, Maulana M.
Thanglura, Shri A.
Tripathi, Shri H. V.
Uir.a Nehru, Shrimati.
Vajpayee, Shri A. B.
Varma, Shri B. B.
Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
Vijaivargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
Wadia, Prof. A. R.
Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—]

Annadurai, Shri C. N.

The motion was adovied by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill

SHRI R. M. HAJARNAVIS: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be passed." *The question was proposed*

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra) : Will you allow me to say ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should hive stood up.

SHRI B. D. LCHOBARAGADE- I stood up, Madam. Only I would like to say one or two things.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The House divided

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN; Ayes— 137; Noes—1.

AYES—137

Abid Ali, Shri. Agrawal, Shri J. P.
Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C. Anis
Kidwai, Shrimati. Anwar, Shri N. M.
Arora, Shri Arjun. Asthana, Shri L. D.
Bansi Lai, Shri. Barooah, Shri Lila
Dhar. Basu, Shri Santosh Kumar.
Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati.
Bharathi, Shrimati K. Bhargava, Shri
M. P. Chakradhar, Shri A. Chatterji,
Shri J. C. Chaturvedi, Shri B. D.
Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh. Chavda,
Shri K. S. Chordia, Shri V. M.
Dasgupta, Shri T. M. Dass, Shri
Mahabir.

Dave Shri Rohit M.
 Deb, Shri S. C.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Devaki Gopidas, Shrimati.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dutt, Shri Krishan.
 Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gupta, Shri Gurudev.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Kakati, Shri R. N.
 Karayalar, Shri S. C.
 Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
 Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
 Kathju, Shri P. N.
 Kaushal, Shri J. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
 Khandekar, Shri R. S.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Krishna Chandra, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kumbha Ram, Shri.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lai, Prof. M. B.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahesh Saran, Shri.
 Mallik, Shri D. C.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Shri M.
 Mitra, Shri P. C. Mohammad,
 Chaudhary A.

Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
 Muhammad Ishaque Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Nanjundaiya, Shri B. C.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Panjhzari, Sardar Ragbbir Singh.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Magawbhai S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ran Jan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Charma.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lai.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Sapru, Shri P. N.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Satyanarayana, Shri M.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Sharma, Shri, L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.

Shetty, Shri B. p. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 S.mha, Shri Rajendra Prat'ap.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 S'nha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Solomon, Shri P. A.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Tapase, Shri G. D.
 Tara Ramachandra Sathe, Shrimati.
 Tariq, Shri A. M.
 Tayyebulla, Maulana M.
 Thanglura, Shri A.
 Tripathi, Shri H. V.
 Uina Nehru, Shrimati.
 Vajpayee, Shri A. B.

Varma, Shri B. B. Venkateswara Rao,
 Shri N. Vijavargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
 vVadia, Prof. A. R. Yajee, Shri Sheel
 Bhadra.

NOES—1

Annadurai, Shri C. N.

The motion was adopted by a niaju -rity of the total members .ip of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The Hous"e then adjourned at forty-seven minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 10th May 1963.