

[Shri P. C. Sethi.]

The Government have also considered the other general recommendations of the Commission regarding regular supply of raw materials (particularly coal), improvement of sintering and ore handling facilities, more regular transport arrangements for both raw materials and finished products, adoption of latest technological advance, etc. They have accepted these and will also commend them to the steel plants for implementation.

The recommendations of the Commission related only to the period 1st April 1960 to 31st March 1962. We are already in September 1962. A view has, therefore, to be taken of the prices to be fixed after the 1st of April 1962. Government have decided that the prices to be fixed for the period 1960-62 should also be applicable provisionally beyond the period 1st April 1962 subject to certain changes which are necessary on account of (a) the recent increase in the statutory price of coal and (b) the increase in the railway freight from July 1, 1962. The effect of these changes will be announced shortly. The final prices to be fixed for the period after 1st April, 1962, will be decided after further consideration.

Government regret the delay in the announcement of their decisions on the reports of the Tariff Commission which was mainly due to the complexities of the problems involved. A Government resolution on the subject announcing these prices is being issued today.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras):
Madam . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time to ask questions because we shall be eating up the time allotted to the Constitution (Amendment) Bill.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: It is a very important statement that has been made.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): And that too on the last day of the Session.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: I am not likely to take any length of time. I want to know whether the price now fixed is likely to be made permanent for the rest of the Third Five Year Plan?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Madam, it has been pointed out in the statement that the prices which have been fixed for the period 1960-62 are likely to continue provisionally for some time till a final decision is taken. Temporarily that is the arrangement but this can be reviewed from time to time.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, may I make one submission? I want to raise an important point about yesterday's proceedings. I would request you to send for the Law Minister.

THE CONSTITUTION (FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962—
continued

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Madam Deputy Chairman, while generally giving my support to this Bill, I would like to make a few observations. Reference is being made to a certain statement made by the Prime Minister. He said that this Bill has been brought forward in order to honour the agreement between the Government of India and the French Government. What I object to, Madam, is that the Prime Minister who is known all the world over as the greatest democrat, should not have put forward such an argument. He ought to have said that the will of the people would come first. While making that statement, the Prime Minister ought to have said that only the will of the people will determine which parts are to be merged in the

adjoining parts and which parts are to be kept separately. When we got rid of the British, we did so, in the case of, a greater imperialist power, without any pre-condition. We got rid of the Portuguese without any conditions and if we say in this case that we entered into a pre-condition and we must stick to it, it looks ridiculous really. That is why I would like the hon. Home Minister not to refer to that statement while putting forth his argument.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): What was the condition?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You know it. He said that we had entered into an agreement—though not a written agreement but an oral understanding—with the French Government that we will not merge those territories with the adjoining States. I say that the will of the people should be the only criterion to judge whether they should be merged or kept apart.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: I think that was the agreement, that was the understanding.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Then you have not understood the proceedings at all.

Madam, since the time allotted is limited, I would just refer to the points only. The second point which I would like to refer to is, as we discussed this morning, this House is being neglected by the Government always. Of course, they have been good enough to provide for representation of Pondicherry in this House, but so far as Goa is concerned, the Lower House is given two representatives but we do not have even a single one. One of the previous speakers referred to it and I would submit to the Government that they should reconsider the matter and make provision for a representative from Goa in this House.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Provisions are being made.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Thank you very much. There is provision in the Bill itself for partial elections and partial nominations. It will be very advantageous to the ruling party to have this provision because all those who get defeated in the elections might then be nominated for the remaining seats.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Every legislature in India has got nomination.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: What I want to impress on the Government is that there should at least be an assurance in this House that no defeated candidate will be nominated. We must be given an assurance.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are speaking on the Constitution (Amendment) Bill?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Where is the question of defeated candidates?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He must give an assurance even at this stage.

I now come to the Centrally administered area of Delhi. There has, of course, been a great clamour in Delhi for a legislature even in the ruling party itself and I would be one with them in asking for a legislature, if possible. But the Government is not conceding that demand. Since the Government is not conceding that demand, I would give an alternative solution. I do not know how far that would be acceptable to the Government but for the people to have the satisfaction of being represented in the Ministry, I would say that at least, one of the members elected from Delhi should be put in charge of the Delhi area, whether as a Deputy Minister or Minister of State—that is the look-out of the Government—so that the electorate would have the right to determine at the next election whether he has done his job well or not. A gentleman who remains in charge of this particular

[Shri Lokanath Misra.]

department or so many gentlemen in the Ministry who remain in charge of the administration of Delhi scarcely pay any heed to the administration. There are malpractices going on which I would like to place before the House. I had asked a question on the 7th August and the hon. Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs gave me a reply in the negative. The question was whether it was a fact that there were some records missing from the office of the Collector of Delhi and also whether there were any illegal detentions of individuals under the Land Revenue Act between 1951 and 1959 by the Collector of Delhi which were brought to the notice of the Chief Commissioner of Delhi or the 20th February to which the hon. Shri B. N. Datar said that no case had come to the knowledge of the Delhi Administration. I will not read out the entire portion but only relevant extracts

SHRI A. D. MANI: Half of it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Not half but only the relevant portions.

The orders of the Chief Commissioner were dated the 20th February, the same date I had referred to in my question. The appellant was arrested and detained under the Punjab Land Revenue Act for failure to repay two amounts, namely, Rs. 2,556/4/- inclusive of interest up to 26th August, 1951 and Rs. 1,700 odd inclusive of interest up to 30th June. There has been an Act called the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, and section 30 exempts certain persons from being arrested.

Section 30 says:

"No person shall be liable to arrest or imprisonment in pursuance of any process issued for the recovery of any sum due under this Act which is recoverable as an arrear of land revenue."

The Collector has detained him. The Collector has detained many persons;

not one. This is only one instance; he has detained many people. The Commissioner has heard them and delivered judgment and while I ask a question on the floor of Parliament, the hon. Minister replies that there has been no such instance. That only shows how deep their knowledge about Delhi Administration is. Because they do not belong to this area, because they do not represent this area, they have always been ignoring it. If they had represented this area, they could never afford to ignore it because next time, when they go to the electorate they would be paid in their own coin. That is why, Madam, I stress this point that the Minister should particularly take note of this that there should be somebody elected from and representing Delhi who should be in complete charge of the Delhi Administration.

Thank you.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT
(Delhi): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am very happy that the Union territories are going to get representative governments and that they will have the opportunity to manage their own affairs. I would like to state a few facts as far as Delhi is concerned. In view of what the Home Minister has said, I may point out here why feelings came up in Delhi recently. Once a statement was made by the hon. Home Minister about Delhi that some change was contemplated and later on a contradictory statement came out that no such change was going to be made. After that in two debates in this House as far as I remember, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs did not give any encouraging reply. Then the Corporation (Amendment) Bill and some other issues concerning more powers to be given to them came up in the last Session but the statement of Shri Datar was very discouraging. He said that there was going to be no change as far as Delhi was concerned. After the discouraging statements

of Shri Datar this Bill came up from which Delhi was excluded and we wondered what was going to happen to Delhi and why there was no mention about it. We were under the impression that nothing was going to be done for Delhi and hence there was a good deal of worry among the people of Delhi. But, Madam, the hon. Minister is not listening.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: My eyes may not be there but my ears are there. She represents Delhi and, therefore, I am listening to every word of what she is saying.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Therefore, we became concerned and worried that there was nothing in the Bill because there was the statement saying that there was going to be no change in status and also the statement of Shri Datar which said that there was going to be no change even in the Corporation Act. Somehow, our stars, mine and Shri Datar's do not seem to agree in the House though outside we find each other very agreeable. All these gave us a lot of apprehension and we were worried as to what would happen. Now I am very happy that the hon. Home Minister is seriously considering that there should be some improvement in the Corporation Act as it is and that some modification would be there or there may be a complete overhaul or a radical change. We are glad about that statement. The hon. Home Minister said that so far he has not had time to get a clear picture, a concrete picture, as to what that form should be. Unless we have some idea of what the form is to be, we cannot say how workable that would be. Since we are interested in this matter, the hon. Home Minister should not look upon this as if it is our personal problem or the problem of the M.Ps. of Delhi. It is the problem of the people of Delhi and it is our duty to point out to the Home Ministry and to the Government of India as

to what the public opinion is and how the people are feeling, where the ill lies and convey to them and acquaint them with the actual state of affairs. It is a warning signal that we can give and it is for them to see what solution there can be and how improvement can be effected.

Madam, my submission is this that Delhi is a very sick child and it is for the Government of India who are the guardians to see to it now that this child does not die. If the state of affairs is neglected as it is, then I think the whole situation will continue to deteriorate with very disastrous consequences which we all wish very seriously and strongly to avoid, because if the present state of affairs is not prevented from deterioration, there will be very many things going wrong here. And the fear of the Home Ministry that the capital should be well protected may become definite because of the deteriorating conditions. So if the Government of India does not take care of this sick child now, things will be bad and it is for us to give a warning signal and give all the information and facts that we can place before them. Things are such that they warrant a very radical and very extraordinary change and in that change contemplated or to come about I hope, that the representatives of the people will be duly consulted, that discussions will take place, so that the final picture may emerge. Or a Committee may be appointed of all the people concerned in this, so that some scheme can be worked out. It is very important that there should be one unified control for the whole of Delhi. There are so many independent statutory bodies like the Water and Sewage Board, the Transport Authority, the Electricity Board, the Delhi Development Authority, the Corporation, the Delhi Administration, the Public Relations Committee, the Labour Advisory Board, etc. All these different authorities and bodies function independently. Sometimes their functions overlap and sometimes

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht.]

they are contradictory. This has created a tremendous amount of confusion and wastage of time and energy. Sometimes even to construct one fire station or one electric power station or a bus depot or a school building or a dispensary, about half a dozen Ministries of the Central Government have to be approached to get a piece of land for the purpose and to get the necessary sanction and then there is the matter of works. All this involves a tremendous amount of waste and takes back the work very much in terms of time and implementation. This running round to half a dozen Ministries by the Delhi Administration creates a lot of difficulty. So there has to be one unified control which has to be given executive authority and powers whereby they can work properly. If possible there may be one Minister or a Deputy Minister in the Centre exclusively to look after the affairs of Delhi. The hon. Minister asked: 'Why have two legislatures, the Parliament and the other body? But this Parliament hardly gives any time to the affairs of Delhi. They should allot three, four or five days per session to look after only the affairs of Delhi, so that all the matters concerning Delhi can be thrashed out. I was rather pained to hear—as I have heard it said very many times—that the state of affairs in Delhi was very bad when the State was there. Well, unfortunately my own evaluation is very different and I am sorry to say that many facts are not known to a large number of people which will show why things went wrong. There was a tremendous amount of interference by the officials of the Government of India, by certain Ministers, by certain press people, by certain industrialists, whereby the administration was very badly damaged and hindered. If you don't oblige all these people who wanted things to be done, they all turned against you and they were not interested that the State should function. If the record of the Delhi State Assembly and the Delhi State

Government is compared with the record of any other State, when they got their first Ministry in 1936 or later on or even after partition in 1947, I can say that our record would be as good as theirs, if not better. I would like them to examine this case and satisfy themselves as to what it was, with so much interference from the Government of India and their officials. One Land Reforms Bill had to be sent back to the Delhi State Assembly twice because the land of a certain official of the Government of India was affected by the ceiling. Though the prior sanction of the Government was there to our draft Land Reforms Bill and it was passed by the Assembly, after the approval of the Government of India, the President's assent was held back. They did not want the ceiling. So, a second time the Bill was passed removing the ceiling clause. Then, it was given assent by the President of India, after having gone through the Legislature twice. And a third time it came to Parliament two years ago, here in this House, when we passed the Land Reforms Bill, including the ceiling in it. There has also been a certain amount of interference by the press. They were not happy because of various things which could not be done for them, sometimes for certain individuals. Now, the Government realise that the capitalist press is not happy about our socialist pattern of society. There is a very studied sort of approach to our public sector by this capitalist press and there is a campaign against various public projects, and so on. Now, we realise what is the policy and underlying philosophy behind the campaign in the series of articles against this programme or that programme. Now, the Government recognise what was the motive of this criticism. Unfortunately, when the Assembly was there, the same forces were playing and the same philosophy was acting behind this. Then, this criticism was very much frowned upon by the Government and by our hon. Ministers, because they were thinking that things must be

really as bad as they were depicted. Now, they realise that the same philosophy, the same motivation is there. They are criticising and condemning the Government because the capitalist press cannot see eye to eye with the socialist policy of the Government of India and of the ruling party.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: These things may be looked into and a satisfactory solution found for them.

श्री ए० बी० धाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदया, सब से पहले मैं आदरणीय शास्त्री जी को इस बात के लिये बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने अनेक प्रभाव और दबाव के बावजूद दिल्ली को इस विधेयक की परिधि में लाने में इन्कार कर दिया। प्रश्न लोकतंत्र का नहीं है। प्रश्न इस बात का है कि दिल्ली के नागरिक अगर भारत की राजधानी के नागरिक होने के गौरव की अनुभूति करते हैं तो उनके लिये उन्हें कुछ त्याग करने को भी तैयार रहना चाहिये। बड़े बड़े देशों की राजधानियों में वहाँ के केन्द्रीय शासन के समानान्तर सरकारें नहीं चलती। किन्तु इसका यह अर्थ नहीं है कि वाशिंगटन की जनता को या टोकियो के निवासियों को अपना शासन आप चलाने की छूट नहीं है। दिल्ली की जनता पर एक विधान सभा लादी जाये, एक मंत्रिमंडल थोपा जाये और उसका खर्चा निकालने के लिये लोगों पर टैक्स लादे जाये, इसका दिल्ली की जनता समर्थन नहीं करेगी।

हा, यह ठीक है कि दिल्ली की जो आज की व्यवस्था है, वह सन्तोषजनक नहीं है और गृह-मंत्री जी ने कहा भी है कि वे आतंकारी परिवर्तन करेंगे। अच्छा होता, यदि वे उसका थोड़ा सा संकेत दे देते। दिल्ली की व्यवस्था के लिये अनेक संस्थाएँ हैं और

उनमें समन्वय नहीं है, तारतम्य नहीं है। अभी बिजली का संकट हुआ। उसके लिये कौन उत्तरदायी है, इसका भी ठीक तरह से निर्णय नहीं किया जा सका। मेरा निवेदन है कि दिल्ली म्युनिसिपल कारपोरेशन को और भी अधिकार सम्पन्न बनाया जाय और टोकियो के ढाँचे के आधार पर कानून और व्यवस्था भी कारपोरेशन के हाथ में सौंप दी जाय। जहाँ तक नागरिक सुविधाओं का प्रश्न है, वह एक स्वायत्त संस्था के रूप में काम करे, उसके अधिकार व्यापक हों और दिल्ली को भारत की राजधानी के अनुरूप वह एक व्यवस्था दे सके, इस प्रकार की कोई व्यवस्था करने की आवश्यकता है। लेकिन दिल्ली को विधान सभा नहीं मिली, इसलिये दिल्ली में लोकतंत्र की हत्या हो गई, यह मानने के लिये मैं तैयार नहीं हूँ। दुनिया में ऐसे देश हैं, जहाँ केन्द्र में बैठी हुई एक संस्था सारे देश का शासन चलाती है और वह संस्था यदि जनता के मत से लोकतन्त्रात्मक ढंग से चुनी जाती है, तो यह कहने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है कि उस देश में लोकतंत्र नहीं है। जैसे फेडरल फार्म ऑफ गवर्नमेंट होती है वैसे ही यूनिटरी फार्म ऑफ गवर्नमेंट भी होती है और एकात्मक शासन के अंतर्गत हम राजनैतिक और आर्थिक सत्ता का विकेन्द्रीकरण कर सकते हैं।

मेरा निवेदन है कि अभी तक जो केन्द्र प्रशासित क्षेत्र है, उनके सम्बन्ध में सरकार कोई दृढ़ता से समान नीति नहीं अपना सकी। पहले केन्द्र प्रशासित क्षेत्रों का निर्माण किया गया। बाद में स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन की सिफारिशों के अनुसार उनके ढाँचे में परिवर्तन किया गया, अब फिर उन्हें नये प्रशासनिक ढाँचे से युक्त किया जा रहा है। मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि जो भी क्षेत्र अपने निकटवर्ती प्रान्तों से मिलाया जा सकता है, उसको मिला दिया जाना चाहिये, चाहे फिर वह गोवा हो, या पांडिचेरी हो या हिमाचल प्रदेश। अगर उनको पृथक्

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

रखने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, तो हमे प्रांतों में उनको मिला देना चाहिये; क्योंकि हम जितनी देर पृथक् रखेंगे, उनको प्रांतों में मिलाने का काम कठिन होता जायेगा। पृथक्ता के साथ एक स्वार्थ का विकास होता है, कुछ राजनैतिक अधिकार मिलते हैं, कुछ पदलिप्सा की पूर्ति होती है और इसलिये एक वर्ग ऐसा उत्पन्न होता है जो जनहित के नाम पर उस स्वार्थ को, उन सुविधाओं को और उन विशेषाधिकारों को बनाये रखना चाहता है।

मैं नहीं समझ सका कि हमने पांडिचेरी को भद्रास में मिलाने का निर्णय क्यों नहीं लिया। यदि फ्रांस के साथ हुई संधि में ऐसी कोई धारा है, लिखित या अलिखित, तो गृह मंत्री जी को उसका स्पष्टीकरण देना चाहिये, यद्यपि मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसी कोई धारा हो नहीं सकती। एक बार फ्रांसीसी बस्तिया हमारे हाथ में आ गईं, तो वे कहा मिले, किसके साथ उनको समाविष्ट किया जाय, यह हमारी सार्वभौमिक सत्ता से सम्बन्धित प्रश्न है, जिसके ऊपर हम किसी विदेशी शक्ति का हस्तक्षेप बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन यदि कोई बात हो तो हमें विश्वास में लिया जाना चाहिये। अगर पांडिचेरी को छोड़ भी दिया जाय तो जैसा कि कहा गया, कराइकाल, माहे और एनाम को अलग रखने का कोई औचित्य नहीं। जिस जनता की सुविधा के लिये हम इन टापुओं को अलग रखना चाहते हैं, वे चारों ओर पानी से घिरे हुये नहीं हैं, बल्कि दूसरे प्रांतों से घिरे हुए हैं, उस जनता को सुविधा नहीं मिलेगी—प्रशासन की सुविधा, न्याय की सुविधा, केन्द्र के साथ सम्बन्ध रख कर अपने विकास के कार्यों में सहयोग देने की सुविधा। साढ़े चार सौ मील में बसे हुये ये छोटे छोटे गांव न अपना विकास कर सकते हैं और न उन्हें पृथक् रखने की आवश्यकता है। मुझे ताज्जुब है कि दादरा

और नगरहवेली भी अलग रखे जा रहे हैं। दमन और दीव को भी पृथक् रखने की बात हो रही है। मैं तो यहां तक कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि हमें गोवा को भी किसी प्रांत में मिलाने का फैसला करना चाहिये। हम इस समस्या को कब तक लटकाये रखेंगे।

श्री बी० डी० खोबरागड़े : किस प्रांत में ?

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मेरा निवेदन है कि उसको महाराष्ट्र में मिलाना चाहिये।

SHRI B. D. KOBARAGADE: Thank you.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : लेकिन अगर हम उसे अलग रखेंगे तो उसमें आगे जा कर सरलता उत्पन्न नहीं होगी। यह विवाद बढ़ेगा। आज सम्भव है, थोड़ा सा तनाव पैदा हो जाय, खिचाव पैदा हो जाय—नदियों के पानी के बटवारे पर खिचाव पैदा हो रहा है—लेकिन आज जो परिस्थिति है उसका सामना कर के हमें गोवा को मिलाने का फैसला कर लेना चाहिये। अगर हम उसे पृथक् रखेंगे तो यह पृथक्ता बढ़मूल होती जायेगी और इसके साथ ही केवल निहित स्वार्थों का विकास होगा और फिर इन बस्तियों का मिलाना और भी मुश्किल हो जायगा। एक दिन ऐसा था, जब कि हिमाचल प्रदेश अलग नहीं रहना चाहता था, इसके बारे में देश में व्यापक समर्थन था, लेकिन आज हिमाचल प्रदेश वालों से बात करिये, क्या वे पंजाब के साथ मिलना स्वीकार करेंगे ? वे कभी स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे। स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन के दो सदस्यों ने सिफारिश की थी—वे किसी राजनैतिक दल से सम्बन्धित नहीं थे, निष्पक्ष व्यक्ति थे—उनकी सिफारिश थी कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को पंजाब में मिला देना चाहिये और प्रशासन की दृष्टि से यह उपयुक्त

होता, लेकिन कुछ कारण आ गये, राजनैतिक और साम्प्रदायिक, जिनके कारण हिमाचल प्रदेश को उस समय पंजाब में मिलाया नहीं गया और आज तो उसको मिलाने की कोई सम्भावना नहीं है। यद्यपि पंजाब के मुख्य मंत्री राजस्थान को मिलाने की बात करते हैं; मगर हिमाचल प्रदेश को मिला कर एक बड़ा प्रान्त बनाये, इसके लिये शायद वह भी केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रेरित नहीं कर सकते।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : उन्होंने दिल्ली का भी नाम लिया है।

श्री ए० बी० बालपेयी : मेरा निवेदन है कि इन क्षेत्रों को निकटवर्ती प्रान्तों के साथ मिलाना चाहिये, लेकिन अगर सरकार इस बात को स्वीकार करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है, तो मैं यह चाहूंगा कि इन क्षेत्रों को—दिल्ली को छोड़ कर—अपना प्रशासन आप चलाने की पूरी छूट होनी चाहिये। नौकरशाही के हाथों में इन क्षेत्रों की जनता के भाग्य को हम रख दें, यह ठीक नहीं होगा। इससे अनेक कठिनाइयाँ पैदा होंगी। इसलिये मेरी यह समझ में नहीं आता कि इस विधेयक के अन्तर्गत इन क्षेत्रों में जो विधान सभायें बनेंगी, उन विधान सभाओं के सदस्य क्यों आंशिक रूप से चुने जायें। गृह मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि वे आंशिक रूप से चुने जायेंगे, आंशिक रूप से सदस्यों का नामांकन किया जायेगा और उन्होंने उदाहरण दिया लोक सभा का, राज्य सभा का। यह तो मैं मानने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि कुछ विशेष हित हैं जिनको इन क्षेत्रों की विधान सभाओं में प्रतिनिधित्व देने की आवश्यकता हो लेकिन मुझे डर है कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि पार्श्वली एलेक्टेड और पार्श्वली नामिनेटेड के आधार पर आधे से ज्यादा सदस्य मनोनीत कर दिये जायें और आधे से कम चुने जायें। यह तो उपहासास्पद होगा और इसलिये अगर हमें कुछ क्षेत्रों की विधान सभाओं में कुछ सदस्यों को मनोनीत करना है, तो जैसा कि विधान में स्पष्ट है—

राष्ट्रपति को अधिकार दिया गया है, ऐंग्लो-इंडियस के बारे में या कुछ और हितों के बारे में—उनकी सख्या निश्चित है कि कितने सदस्य मनोनीत किये जायेंगे, उसी तरह से यहाँ भी वह सख्या स्पष्ट की जाय। अगर इस सविधान (सशोधन) विधेयक में यह स्पष्ट नहीं हो सकता, तो इसके अन्तर्गत जो नियम बनेगा, जो कानून कानून बनेगा, उस में यह सख्या स्पष्ट की जाय। इस सम्बन्ध में कोई दुविधा नहीं रहनी चाहिये कि मनोनीत सदस्य कहीं बहुमत में न हो जायें। एक-दो सदस्य अगर नामांकित किये जायें तो उसमें कोई विशेष आपत्ति कि बात नहीं है किन्तु प्रमुखतया जैसी हमारी लोक सभा है या राज्य सभा है, उसी तरह वह चुनी हुई होनी चाहिये। जनता के प्रतिनिधियों को वहाँ भी जनता के प्रति उत्तरदायी होना चाहिये और शासन में जनसहयोग तथा समर्थन प्राप्त करने में वे सशक्त और सक्षम होने चाहिये।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहूंगा कि इस विधेयक के सम्बन्ध में जो सशोधन दिये गये हैं, वे विधेयक के विरोध की भावना में नहीं दिये गये हैं और हम यहाँ आलोचना करने के लिये खड़े हैं तो गृह-मंत्री जी ऐसा न समझें कि विधेयक की मूल भावना से हममें से किसी को विरोध है लेकिन आलोचना प्रत्यालोचना चलेगी ही और मुझे विश्वास है कि उत्तर देते समय जो प्रश्न, जो शकायें, इस पक्ष की ओर से उठाई गई हैं, उनका गृह-मंत्री जी स्पष्टीकरण करेंगे। धन्यवाद।

SHRI T S PATTABIRAMAN
(Madras): Madam, the Government of India deserve our warmest congratulations on two counts now. For liberating these areas which have been under foreign domination for a long time, and also, without any time-lag, setting up popular Assemblies where popular sentiments can be expressed through the elected representatives of the people. Without

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.]

any bitter struggle the French possessions in India were liberated with the goodwill of the French Government. But Portugal could not see the writing on the wall, and we had to go through a process which has been approved by the people of the country in full.

Madam, the question of set-up had created a little controversy, and but for a few dissenting voices the formation of these States has been widely welcomed. Some people, especially with regard to Pondicherry, went on to show that Madras was eager to have Pondicherry assimilated in its territory and wanted to wipe out the French Settlement without any trace of it. I can assure you, Madam, on behalf of the people of Madras that Madras is not very eager to have Pondicherry and Karikal assimilated in the State of Madras unless the wish and desire come from the people of those respective areas. Even when the Bill was before the Madras Legislature, no Member of the Madras Legislature expressed any desire that these territories should be comprised in the State of Madras. On the other hand the popular feelings in those areas have been respected, and now they will be having a separate State. Similarly, even the Congress organisation has not been very eager to have the Pondicherry Congress merged in the Tamilnad State Congress. That itself is a clear indication that there is no anxiety or rather over-anxiety on the part of Madras to get these areas merged in the State of Madras. But the whole question has been left and will be left to the people of those respective areas, and whenever they desire voluntarily to become a part of Madras, perhaps that might be taken into consideration by the Madras Legislature.

Madam, Pondicherry, Goa and other States have come into existence, and they deserve our fullest consideration with regard to their economic development. Pondicherry area

has been one of the most neglected areas, and during the long years of foreign rule no industry worth the name has been built up, and the economic condition of the people is very bad. It is necessary that even at the cost of reappraisal of the Plan the great ports of Pondicherry and Goa should be fully developed. Pondicherry had started a large export trade prior to the securing of independence, but now Pondicherry gives a desolate appearance. One complaint of the people of Pondicherry is that it has lost its commercial importance due to the abolition of many things, and they want the revival of commerce and industry through the port of Pondicherry. Even with regard to Goa, I am told that Goa is one of the finest natural harbours in the country and that it can be fully utilised for developmental purposes. I would like the Government of India to examine, irrespective of past commitments, whether any reappraisal of the Plan is necessary and to try to improve these ports and give prominence to them as they have become part of the Indian Union. That will be able to give the people an assurance that the ports, the commerce and industry and economic development of those areas will be well protected after coming into the Indian Union.

When the question of parliamentary legislation is going to come up for the formation of Legislative Assemblies, Ministries and other set-up, I am sure there will be one criticism that should be looked into by the Government and properly attended to when the legislation is framed. There is a general feeling that these small units cannot have a top-heavy administration which will eat away most of the incomes that will be accruing to those States. So, it is necessary that the legislation should provide for small Assemblies and even smaller Cabinets, so that they shall not eat away the resources of the area for which they are primarily intended. If too large a Cabinet is set up, the whole money will not be

available for developmental expenditure but will, on the other hand, go towards the expenditure of the administration only. So, when this legislation is brought forward, I am sure that this point will be taken into consideration. The people of Pondicherry and the people of Goa will be very happy to be one with us, and I am sure that this development of having a popular set-up in those areas will be fully appreciated by all and will be welcome.

SHRI MAHESH SARAN (Bihar): Madam, I am very happy that this Bill after all has been introduced. It was long overdue and the people, especially of Tripura, Manipur and Himachal Pradesh, were clamouring for it for a very long time. I have been associated for very many years with Tripura and Manipur and I can say about the feelings of the people there. In 1952, when the Advisory Council was appointed, the people felt that the powers were not enough and they clamoured for more powers. And when in 1957 the Territorial Council came into being, they felt very sad. They felt that instead of going forward, they were going backward, and they were clamouring all the time for more powers and for greater opportunities of serving their country. They had been clamouring for it and when our Home Minister went there, he saw the feelings of the people. But in his own winning way, he always tried to soothe the people by promising nothing very definite but saying that something would come. When the Territorial Council was again elected, the people got disappointed, they thought that nothing was coming. And it is a red letter day today that in spite of the fact that they had no hopes of a Legislative Assembly and a Council of Ministers, they are now having them. So, the Home Minister gave a surprise to the people, because they never expected that this big change would come soon.

It is necessary for me to say something about the nominated and elected members of the Assemblies. In places like Manipur and Tripura, it is necessary that there should be some nominations because there are many classes of people who cannot win in straight elections and come to the Assemblies. There are the hill tribes, there are the Scheduled Castes and in Tripura, there are a large number of refugees and they also require representation. Therefore, I think it is very essential that in addition to elections, there should be nominations to the Assemblies. Of course, an absolutely nominated Assembly would have been a bad thing, but now that we have the provision of there being partly nominated and partly elected members of the Assembly, I think that things will go on better.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARAGAVA) in the Chair.]

So far as Pondicherry, Goa and others are concerned, I feel that we have no right to force them to attach themselves to any State. It is their right. Let them breathe free air. Let them decide for themselves, carry on things for a little while and when they feel that they want to join with any neighbouring State, they can do so. But we here in Parliament should not force their hands. It would be most improper, and not the right thing to do. So far as Delhi is concerned, we have already heard speeches about it and we know that things are not going on very smoothly there, and a lot of change is necessary. Of course, an Assembly may not be there, but I feel that the people should have a voice in the management of Delhi itself and unless that right is given to them and unless the officials' rights are curtailed, things cannot go on very well. So, I am happy and I congratulate the Home Minister for bringing forward this Bill.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Sir, we believe in a political philosophy which lays down that there should be a government of the people, for the people, by the people. We also believe that this political philosophy can find expression, or it has found expression, in a system of elected legislatures and a Council of Ministers responsible to the elected representatives of the people. I am glad that the Union territories which so far had been denied democratic representation or democratic Assemblies are now going to have them. It is now contemplated that a Bill will be brought forward here after the amendment of the Constitution and these territories will have elected legislatures. However, I must sound a note of warning, for I agree with the hon. Member from Uttar Pradesh, the distinguished representative of the Jan Sangh, that the ultimate and final solution, the only proper solution, of the problems of these territories would be their amalgamation with the bordering or neighbouring States. When the legislatures are established, when a democratic Council of Ministers is established, a sort of vested interest grows, a vested interest which demands or desires the continuation of these territories as separate units and which would oppose the amalgamation of these territories with the neighbouring or bordering States ultimately. Therefore, this experiment has to be watched carefully for vested interests are dangerous but democratic vested interests are more dangerous since they are more powerful because somehow or other they manage to get people behind them. Therefore, while establishing these democratic legislatures, it should be the concern of the Government of India to watch the experiment carefully and they should take care that in any future legislation, they should keep the controlling reins in their hands, so that the ultimate amalgamation or the final solution is not thwarted.

What should be the character of these democratic institutions, it is too early to say and, therefore, comment has to be withheld.

Sir, I have said that the ultimate solution would be amalgamation with the bordering States or the States in which these territories are enclaves. If we look to the map of Himachal Pradesh, we will find that Himachal Pradesh is split into two parts—Chamba and the other three or four districts. Chamba is a sort of enclave, it is not contiguous to the other areas of Himachal Pradesh. It is a sort of enclave between Jammu and Kashmir on the one side and Punjab on the other. Therefore, the retention of this territory as a distinct unit is, in my opinion, unnatural. Same is the case with Goa, Diu and Daman. They are separated from each other by long distances.

SHRI SHIVA NAND RAMAUL (Himachal Pradesh): What about Simla?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Then, Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe and Yanam, these four territories are separated by long distances. While Pondicherry and Karikal are in Madras, Mahe is in Kerala and Yanam is in Andhra Pradesh. Therefore, it would be unreasonable or improper to retain these territories as distinct units for long. But the question is: Should there be amalgamation here and now? I think there the proposals in the Bill are right. They are very reasonable. In the case of Pondicherry, I do not know what are the terms of the treaty. But when Pondicherry was transferred to India *de facto*, an assurance was given by the leaders of Government that every effort would be made to retain the special characteristics of the people of Pondicherry and that the least disturbance would be done to the special features of Pondicherry.

In view of this assurance it is too early at this stage to urge for their amalgamation with Madras or any other neighbouring territory. More-

over, the laws, the systems of administration, the systems of justice, and the land laws of these territories are different from the laws of the neighbouring territories. Therefore, while for the present they should be retained as separate and distinct entities, an effort should be made to see that these systems are so transformed that in course of time—and that course of time should not be the very distant future; it should be the near future—they approximate to our own laws, to our own systems of administration and to our own systems of justice, so that these territories are amalgamated with the territories round about. But that is a solution which, as I have said, must await some period.

Take the case of Goa. Now my friend says, "Here and now amalgamate it with the neighbouring territories." Diu is a small tiny dot on the coast of Gujarat. Daman is an enclave on the borders of Gujarat and Maharashtra. Goa borders on Mysore and Maharashtra. We know what feelings small talukas have aroused in this country. We know what sentiments are attached to them, and now, when we propose to amalgamate either Goa or Daman at this stage, we have to consider as to with which State these territories are to be amalgamated. There will be pulls from Mysore on the one side and Maharashtra on the other. There will be pulls from Gujarat on the one side and from Maharashtra on the other, and these may create complications, which may better be avoided for the present, because we are concerned with more important tasks for the present.

Take the case of Himachal Pradesh. I have already said that the ultimate solution is amalgamation, but then I know the feelings and sentiments of the people of Himachal Pradesh. At least at this stage they would not like to be amalgamated, and there is reason behind it. It was a Princely area, an area secluded from the rest of India

by mountains and forests. Therefore, it is in a less advanced stage than the neighbouring Punjab. The people of Punjab are more advanced, they are cleverer, and naturally the simple people of Himachal Pradesh have a complex of fear. They have apprehensions that if they are amalgamated with Punjab, their interests will suffer, and these apprehensions, in my opinion, are justified. Therefore, though the ultimate solution, as I have already said, is amalgamation, that solution has to await a more favourable opportunity.

Lastly, Sir, I come to the case of Delhi. Delhi is a special case. I agree there is some force in what the hon. Member of the Jana Sangh from U.P.—Mr. Vajpayee—said, that in no country in the world the capital city forms a distinct and separate State. In every country of the world—take Australia, Canada, U.S.A.—the capital city is always directly governed by the Federal or Union or Central Government. That is one reason which may be urged in favour of denying a democratic Assembly to Delhi. Moreover, here you have a Corporation with wide powers. The division of functions between the deliberative wing and the executive wing of the Corporation may not be very satisfactory, but taken as a whole, the Corporation enjoys larger powers than any other Corporation in this country. They very much fall short of the powers that an Assembly does possess, but then it has wider powers than any other Corporation normally possesses. And then, if an Assembly is established, naturally the Corporation's powers have to be curbed, or the Corporation has to be abolished. So these are the only two arguments which can be advanced in favour of denying a democratic Assembly to Delhi. But then let us not forget that Delhi has had for five years a democratic Assembly, and that Assembly and that Administration were doing well though my hon. friend opposite has different views about the achievements of the day, of that Assembly and that Government.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Even the Home Minister . . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: They had a Legislature for five years and, therefore, the sentiment of the people of Delhi is that they should not be denied an Assembly while the people in other Union territories have an Assembly, and in politics, in political evolution, reason sometimes is a faulty guide; a surer guide is sentiment; a surer guide is history. Therefore, I feel that the question should be considered deeply and coolly whether Delhi should have a Legislature or not, because while reason is against it, sentiment and history are in favour of it. I feel that this Bill is weighed in golden balance. It is an excellent Bill. Nobody can possibly take exception to this measure at this stage of political development of our country. I heartily support it.

SHRI T. M. DASGUPTA (Tripura): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I support the Constitution (Fourteenth) Amendment Bill which has been passed by the Lok Sabha. The Bill is giving shape to the wishes and the aspirations of the peoples of the Union territories. The peoples of the Union territories, especially those of Tripura, Manipur and Himachal Pradesh, which were previously Part C States under the Constitution had a long-standing desire for full-fledged democratic rights, and with this end in view these peoples have always expressed their views in that respect, but we found that, when the States Reorganisation Commission came into existence for the reorganisation of States, for various reasons they recommended the merger of Tripura and Manipur with the neighbouring States, but thanks to the then Home Minister Pandit Pant, who appreciated the feelings and the wishes of the people of Manipur and Tripura, had rightly kept Tripura and Manipur separate, as Union Territories, and gave Territorial Councils to those areas along with the other Union territories.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Are these Territories economically viable?

SHRI T. M. DASGUPTA: That is a separate question. There are many States in India which are not in the full sense economically viable, but still they are allowed to fulfil their democratic aspirations and hopes.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Here is the new State of Nagaland.

SHRI T. M. DASGUPTA: Yes, there is the case of Nagaland also.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: But it has come into existence only recently.

SHRI T. M. DASGUPTA: Though these Territorial Councils were given to the people, they had bifurcated the departments of the Government in such a way that it was found that the development departments were not working in the true spirit of the aspirations of the people. So a review of the whole situation came before the Home Ministry, and in pursuance of the statement of the Home Minister the hon. the Law Minister toured the different places of the Union territories and after that he made some recommendations and as a result of his recommendations this Bill has come into being. I welcome this Bill, and the people of all these Union territories will fully appreciate and realize the significance of this Bill, and they also will welcome it, and on the floor of this House the hon. Home Minister has given the assurance that the next Bill is coming soon and that it will be coming in the next Session.

2 P.M.

Sir, the objection raised to the scope of nomination has no meaning because most of the Union territories are inhabited by a major portion of tribal people and usually in democracy some sections of the weaker community should deserve special consideration. For the safeguard of their

rights and interests it is desirable that there must be scope for nomination. Therefore, the scope for nominations, I think, is in conformity with safeguarding the rights of the weaker sections of the community which are living in these territories.

I would, in this connection, mention one thing. In the next session of the Council will be coming a Bill for making provision for new elections in these territories. Instead of making a provision for new elections there, I think it would be better if the present representatives who have been elected under the Territorial Council rules are allowed to continue in the next session which will be coming in due course because that will simplify many of the complications.

Sir, much sentiment has been expressed in regard to the Union Territory of Delhi. When the Union territories got their Territorial Councils, practically at the same time Delhi got the Delhi Municipal Corporation. And at that time it was told that this Corporation was a much progressive one and it would be able to satisfy the wishes of the people. But, unfortunately, it could not satisfy the wishes of the people. Now, on the floor of this House, the hon. Home Minister has expressed that some drastic change will be made in this respect also. While hearing the hon. Minister a suggestion came to my mind which I would like to express here.

Sir, it may be considered whether one or more Ministers could be associated with the Union Home Ministry whose special responsibility would be the Delhi administration. As a convention they may be taken in from amongst the Members of Parliament from the Delhi area. The Delhi Municipal Corporation Act may also be amended by virtue of which one of the Ministers may be allowed to preside over the meetings of the Corporation. If he becomes the President or the Chairman of the Corporation, he will be able to find out the wishes and the reactions of the Cor-

poration. Thus it will be possible for him to apprise the Government of the whole situation and do justice to the aspirations of the people. I do not like to go into details of the thing, but I think this system will help and will also be in conformity with the wishes of the people. The Chairman may not have the right to vote except in the case of a tie but he should be able to take part in the deliberations and also give the viewpoints of the Government, if and when necessary. I think the hon. Minister may consider this point while changing the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act.

श्री शिवानन्द रमौल : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस कांस्टिट्यूशन (फोरटीन्थ अमेंडमेंट) बिल का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। सबसे पूर्व मुझे धन्यवाद करना है, गृह मंत्री जी का और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी का, जो आज की दुनिया में एक बड़े उच्च कोटि के डेमोक्रेट हैं।

यूनियन टेरिटरीज के ऊपर काफी दिनों से बहस-मुबाहिसा होता चला आ रहा था। स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन की स्थापना से इस देश में काफी हलचल हुई और काफी प्रदेश इधर उधर दूसरे प्रदेशों में मिल कर खत्म हो गये। यह तब्दोली आने के बाद जहाँ पहले देश में पार्ट ए, पार्ट बी, और पार्ट सी स्टेट्स थीं, वहाँ सिर्फ दो किस्म की स्टेट्स यूनियन टेरिटरीज और फुल फ्लेज्ड स्टेट्स रह गईं। वह भी एक तजुर्बा था। यहाँ यूनियन टेरिटरीज को साथ के सूबों के साथ मिला देने का खयाल भी जाहिर किया गया। हिमाचल प्रदेश के बारे में खास तौर पर मैं यह अर्ज करूँगा कि वाजपेयी जी ने जैसा यहाँ बतलाया, स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन के तीन मेम्बरों में से दो मेम्बरों ने हिमाचल प्रदेश को पंजाब में मिलाने का जिक्र किया था, लेकिन उसके मुकाबिले में कमीशन के चेयरमैन श्री फ़जल अली का जो स्ट्रांग डिसेंटिंग नोट था और जो स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन ने भी माना कि किस कैटेगरी की

[श्री शिवानन्द रमौल]

छोटी स्टेट्स को स्टेट रहने के लिये फेवरेबली कंसिडर किया जा सकता है, उसमें उन्होंने यह साबित किया था कि हिमाचल प्रदेश ही एक ऐसी यूनियन टेरिटरी है जिसको हर प्रकार से फेवरेबली एक छोटी स्टेट बनाने के हक में कंसिडर किया जा सकता है। स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन के बाद से ही या भारतवर्ष के आजाद होने के बाद से ही हिमाचल प्रदेश की यह डिमांड नहीं है कि वह एक अलग पहाड़ी स्टेट हो, बल्कि मैं हाउस की सूचना के लिए यह बतला दूँ कि सन् १९३८ में जिस वक्त आल इंडिया स्टेट्स पीपुल्स कांफ्रेंस स्टेट्स में काम करती थी, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी की अध्यक्षता में लुधियाना की कांफ्रेंस में इन पहाड़ के लोगो ने प्रस्ताव पास किया था कि चूक पहाड़ों की समस्याएँ बिल्कुल मुस्तलिफ है, वहाँ के लोगों का रहन-सहन मुस्तलिफ है, वहाँ के रस्म व रिवाज मुस्तलिफ हैं और अगर उनको मैदान के लोगों के साथ रख दिया जाय तो वे अपनी तरक्की नहीं कर सकते, इसलिए तमाम पहाड़ी इलाके की पहाड़ी स्टेट अलग से होनी चाहियें। तो यह पहाड़ी स्टेट की मांग काफी पुरानी है और उस वक्त से यह मांग चली आ रही थी। इसके परिणाम स्वरूप जिस वक्त भारतवर्ष आजाद हुआ और स्टेट मिनिस्ट्री रियासतों के मामले में काम कर रही थी, उस वक्त सरदार पटेल के इशारे के मुताबिक हिमाचल प्रदेश में सुकत में एक सत्याग्रह किया गया और उस सत्याग्रह के कारण जितनी भी शिमला की पहाड़ी रियासतें थीं, उनको यूनियन के साथ मर्ज करने में सरदार पटेल को सहायता मिली और उस के बाद हिमाचल प्रदेश कायम हुआ। उस वक्त का एक पत्र है होम मिनिस्ट्री का, जिसमें लिखा यह है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश इन-इनस्टेज में फुल प्लेज्ड स्टेट की पोझीशन अख्तियार करेगा। पहले चीफ कमिशनर का सूबा बनेगा, फिर लेफ्टिनेंट गवर्नर का सूबा बनेगा, और उसके बाद जब वह अपनी इकोनामिक

स्थिति में परिपूर्ण हो जाये, तो उसको फुल प्लेज्ड स्टेट का दर्जा मिल जायेगा। उस के बाद स्टेट्स रिआर्गनाइजेशन कमीशन के परिणामस्वरूप यह मसला हिमाचल प्रदेश के सामने रखा गया कि वह पंजाब में मर्ज हो जाय। हिमाचल प्रदेश का पार्ट सी का दर्जा था और वहाँ असेम्बली भी थी और मिनिस्ट्री भी थी; लेकिन वहाँ की लीडरशिप ने मिनिस्ट्री को भी छोड़ा, असेम्बली को भी छोड़ा और एक यूनियन टेरिटरी को हैसियत से रहना पसन्द किया। उस वक्त ऐसी हवा थी कि मुल्क में कोई छोटी यूनिट रखा जाना पसन्द नहीं किया जाता था। लेकिन हमारे जो नेता हैं, वे पूरे डेमोक्रेट हैं, गणतंत्र के हामी हैं और उनको पांच छ. साल के तजुर्बे से यह मालूम हो गया है कि छोटी छोटी यूनिट्स को भी अधिकार मिलने चाहियें ताकि वे अपने इलाके का इन्तजाम खुद करे। इस वजह से आज यह भा दिन है कि यह बिल हमारे सामने उपस्थित है और कांस्टीट्यूशन में अमेंडमेंट लाया जा रहा है कि यूनियन टेरिटरीज को भी पापुलर गवर्नमेंट और लेजिस्लेचर वगैरह का हक मिले।

यहाँ एक यह भी सुझाव दिया गया कि इन तमाम यूनियन टेरिटरीज को कुछ असे के बाद पास के प्रांतों में मिलाया जाये। इसके सिलसिले में मेरा एक निवेदन है कि जो पास के प्रांत इन छोटी टेरिटरीज को अपने में मिलाना चाहते हैं उनका यह कर्तव्य है कि जिनको वे अपने साथ में मिलाना चाहते हैं, उनकी गुड-विल पहले हासिल करें और अपने सलूक से उन्हें यह बतायें कि वे उनके हामी हैं, वे उनके दुःख-दर्द में सहायक होंगे, तब उनके दिलों में यह खमाल पैदा होगा कि बड़े प्रांत में मिलने से हमारा फायदा है। तब कोई अडचन नहीं होगी। लेकिन जैसा कि यहाँ गाँहूर किया गया है कि इनको पास के सूबों में मिला दिया जाये, उसके बारे में मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर ठीक ढंग से यहाँ डेमोक्रेसी फक्शन करे, तो फिर यह चीज इस तरह चलने वाली:

नही है। भारतवर्ष में बड़े सूबे भी हैं और छोटे छोटे सूबे भी हैं और इस किस्म के सूबे भी हैं जो कि पहाड़ों में हैं। नागालैंड को आपने अपने में मिलाया लेकिन अगर वहा के लोगों की गुड विल भारत सरकार के साथ न होती, वे अगर यह न समझते कि भारत में मिल कर हमारा फायदा है, तो उनको यहा आने की क्या जरूरत थी, वह फिजों का साथ देने और वहा बाकायदा बगावत करते रहते। यही हाल गोआ के बारे में है। वहा के लोग भारत में आना चाहते थे, वे समझते थे कि भारत में जाने से हमें सुविधा मिलेगी; और वहा की जनता ने भारत के हिमायतियों का साथ खुल कर दिया और उनका साथ-देकर उसे आजाद कराया, तो वह इस तरह से हमारे में मिला। इसलिये मैं आपकी सेवा में निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जब यहा डेमोक्रेसी फक्शन कर रही है, तो यह लाजिमी है कि हर एक लोगों के जो विचार हैं, जो खयालात हैं—चाहे वह छोटे हो या बड़े हो, चाहे वह पहाड़ में रहते हों या मैदान में रहते हों—उनकी रिस्पेक्ट आपका जरूर करनी पड़ेगी और तभी हम भारतवर्ष में डेमोक्रेसी ठीक ढंग से चला सकते हैं। सिन्हा साहब ने चम्बा की मिसाल दे कर यह जाहिर किया कि चम्बा हिमाचल प्रदेश से बिल्कुल अलग है। मैं बहुत खुश होता अगर वह शिमला और कुल् लू की भी मिसाल उनके साथ ही देने, जो कि हिमाचल प्रदेश में बिल्कुल आइलैंड की तरह है। तो जो यह एक सुझाव दिया जाता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को पंजाब में मिला दिया जाये, उस बारे में मैं समझता हू कि शास्त्री जी के बयान ने इस चीज को बिल्कुल शांत कर दिया है और अब से मर्जर का सवाल पैदा होने वाला ही नहीं है। दो दिन हुये, दूसरे हाउस में जब कि यही कास्टीट्यूशन अमेंडमेंट बिल वहां जेरबहस था, तब पंजाब के एक मेम्बर ने जां वहा के गृह मंत्री भी रह चुके हैं, यह मुझाव पेश किया था कि जब हिमाचल प्रदेश को लेजिस्लेचर दी ही जा रही है, तो क्यों नहीं जो दूसरे पहाड़ी इलाके इसके साथ

मिलते हुए हैं, उनको भी हिमाचल प्रदेश में शामिल करके इसको एक बड़ा पहाड़ी स्टेट बना दिया जाये। मैं इस खयाल का स्वागत करना हूं और जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि हिमाचल प्रदेश को पंजाब में मिला दिया जाये, उनकी सेवा में यह नम्र निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि अगर उनको हिमाचल प्रदेश के साथ प्रेम है और वे चाहते हैं कि उसकी तरक्की हो, तो उनको इस चीज को दूसरे नजरिये से सोचना चाहिये कि जो पहाड़ी इलाके इसके साथ मिलते हुए हैं, उनको इससे मिलाकर एक काटीगुअस एरिया बना दिया जाये। आप कालका से चलेगे तो शिमला पहुंचते पहुंचते जगह जगह आपको पुलिस की रंग बिरंगी पगडिया मिलेंगी, तीन चार जगह ऐसा होगा, क्योंकि कालका से चलकर तीन मील के फासले पर हिमाल प्रदेश की टेरिटरी है फिर उसके बाद पंजाब की टेरिटरी है फिर उसके बाद हिमाचल प्रदेश की टेरिटरी है तो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को इफेक्टिव तौर पर चलाने के लिये और उसको कामयाब बनाने के लिये यह निहायत जरूरी है कि इन सब इलाकों को मिला कर एक काटीगुअस एरिया बनाया जाय और जो उसमें पहाड़ी इलाके हैं—पाकेट्स हैं—उनका हिमाचल प्रदेश में मिला दिया जाय। अब, जहा तक यूनियन टेरिटरीज का पाम क सूबे में मिलाने का ताल्लुक है, उसके लिये मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि जो सूबा यूनियन टेरिटरी को अपने में मिलाना चाहता है उनका सलूक यूनियन टेरिटरी के लोगों के साथ बड़ा हमदर्दना होना चाहिये, बड़ा बिरादराना होना चाहिये और उनसे उनको यह तवक्को हो कि उनके साथ मिल कर हम अच्छी तरह से तरक्की करेंगे और उनका भविष्य उनके साथ मिलने में अच्छा होगा। जब तक यह भावना पैदा नहीं होगी तब तक महज खयाल करना कि यूनियन टेरिटरीज को—चाहे वह गोआ हो या पाडीचेरी हो—पास के सूबे में मिला दिया जाय, यह मेरी समझ में मुनासिब चीज नहीं है और न ही होनी सम्भव है।

[श्री शिवानन्द रमोल]

इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं बिल का हार्दिक समर्थन करता हूँ और शास्त्री जी, पंडित जी आदि को मैं हार्दिक बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने इतने साल के तजुर्बे के बाद यह फैसला किया कि यूनियन टेरिटोरिज को भी प्रजातांत्रिक ढांचा दिया जाये और उनको मौका दिया जाय कि वे खुद अपने इलाके को तरक्की करें और वहाँ पर अपनी जनता का तरक्की करें ।

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Madam Deputy Chairman, even though I welcome this Bill as it tends to give some democratic powers to the citizens of those Territories to manage their own affairs as they desire, still I have doubts in my mind whether we will be successful in giving them real democracy as they desire. Many Members have expressed their views in this House and they stated that the democratic powers should be extended to the citizens who are living in these Territories also. It is known to all that these Territories are Centrally-administered Territories. It means that the Central Government is responsible for the administration of these Territories. So if we are creating the Legislatures and Ministries in those Territories, even then, it will be mainly the responsibility of the Union Government to administer those Territories. Therefore, the Ministries in those Territories, will be ultimately responsible to the Union Government as the Union Government will be responsible to Parliament here and the Union Government will be liable to answer for whatever happens in these Territories. So, if the Ministries in those Territories are responsible to the Union Government and not to the Legislatures there, how the Legislatures there will be able to enjoy their full democratic rights or powers, I fail to understand.

By passing this legislation, we are creating these Territories which

are just like the old Part C States. There is only a little difference. The part C States were called States. These are called only Union Territories. The Part C States were constituent units of the Indian Union and these Centrally-administered Areas are not constituent units of the Indian Union. But there is some similarity also. The Part C States were also Centrally-administered. These are also Centrally-administered. The Part C States also had Legislatures and Ministries and we are also, by this Bill, providing for Ministries and Legislatures in these Territories. So there is little difference between the Part C States and the Union Territories. If the hon. Minister had taken the trouble to go through the pages of the States Reorganisation Commission Report and pondered over the invaluable suggestions made by the Commission, then I doubt whether he would have ignored the suggestions made. I would only quote one or two paragraphs from the report. They have stated that the experience of the Part C States administration is not encouraging. They have said that those units are not economically viable, they have not got sufficient financial resources and therefore there cannot be any development in these Territories. The administration also is not as efficient as it should be, it is slack and therefore ultimately the people suffer. Therefore the Commission had recommended that ultimately these Part C States should be merged with the adjoining States. But this invaluable suggestion has been ignored by the Government, I do not know why. Madam, even now many hon. Members have suggested that these territories should be merged with the adjoining States. I do not understand why territories like Pondicherry, Karikal or Mahe, should not be merged with the adjoining States. We are not told of any compelling reasons why they should keep these territories as Centrally administered territories. Some reference was made to some sort of an understanding or treaty

with the French Government that these territories would be Centrally administered, that they would not be merged with any adjoining States. I do not know whether there is any treaty with the French Government or any understanding, because the hon. Minister has not clarified the position. I do not think there is any such understanding. Otherwise, how could the French Government agree to the merger of Chandernagore with West Bengal? Chandernagore also was French territory, but immediately after it was transferred by the same French Government to India, it was merged with West Bengal. If the French Government did not object to the merger of Chandernagore with West Bengal, how can the same Government object to the merger of these territories with the adjoining States? That I fail to understand.

Madam, there is the problem of Goa also. Goa is mostly a Marathi-speaking area. There the majority of the people speak the Marathi language. But unnecessarily a controversy is being raised about this matter and Mysore is also trying to claim that territory as part of Mysore State. In this House, only a few days back, when a question was raised about schools there, it was mentioned that not one single Kannada school exists today in Goa. On the contrary, there are about 400 schools which are imparting education in Marathi medium in Goa.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE (Maharashtra): Voluntary schools.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Voluntary schools, says my hon. friend here. In Goa these schools are run by voluntary organisations. Therefore, there is no doubt that the people of this territory speak the Marathi language and not the Kannada language.

Another controversy is being raised and that is about the Konkani language. But it has been emphasised for many years by many learned and erudite scholars that Konkani is only a dialect of Marathi. Therefore, it is beyond all doubt that the majority of

the people in Goa speak the Marathi language and it is but a natural corollary that this territory should be merged with the State of Maharashtra.

Madam, these territories should not be independent. Neither should they remain as Centrally administered. There are a number of problems to be solved. There are economic problems to be solved. In Goa, for instance, there are a variety of minerals available and the mineral wealth of Goa has to be exploited. There is also a waterfall which can be used for having a hydro-electric project and electric energy can be supplied to Goa and Goa can be converted into another industrial area. Therefore, for the development of these territories it is essential that these territories should be merged with the adjoining States. So far as Goa is concerned, it should be merged with Maharashtra and as for the other territories, Pondicherry may be merged with Madras or Tamil Nad and Mahe with Kerala.

SHRI A. D. MANI: With the consent of the people.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Of course, with the consent of the people. Many people from Goa have sent telegrams to the Prime Minister that the schools in Goa should not be joined to the Delhi Board of Secondary Education and that they should be affiliated to the Secondary Education Board of Poona. Even then, in spite of the wishes of the people of Goa, the Government did not take action in that direction but on the basis of some committee's report, they are affiliating all the schools in Goa with the Delhi Board of Secondary Education, which is about a thousand miles away from Goa.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up in another two minutes.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Madam, I have spoken only for ten minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But there is not much time and there are many more speakers.

[Shri B. D. Khobaragade.]

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: I will try to wind up after touching on one more point. There is another reason why I oppose the creation of small territories. I have already pointed out in the beginning that we are now creating some sort of Part C States again. Only a few days back we created the tiniest State of our country, namely the State of Nagaland. By creating such small States and such small Centrally administered territories, with legislatures and ministries, we are creating in the country political imbalance. On the one hand we have these small and tiny States like Kerala and Nagaland, and on the other, we have got the huge, monstrous, monolithic States like Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. Therefore, there is some sort of apprehension in the minds of the people from the other States that Indian politics is being dominated by these two States, namely, the State of Uttar Pradesh and the State of Madhya Pradesh. There is some sort of apprehension also in the minds of the people of the South that there is this political domination. Therefore, I would suggest, if you are going to create such small tiny States and if you want to keep political balance in this country, then you should divide Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh into smaller States. Only then can you have political balance.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (My-sore): Why not Maharashtra?

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: If you divide Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, I will not oppose the bifurcation of Maharashtra. First divide Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh and then speak of other States.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No, no more division.

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: If you want to create such tiny and small States, divide such large monolithic States as U.P. and Madhya Pradesh before such tiny States are created.

Next I have to refer to this question of nomination and then I finish my speech. There is this provision for making nominations in this Bill. I remember that in the other House the hon. Minister explained that this provision is essential, and he wanted to prove it on the analogy of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha having nominated Members. He said there are nominated Members in the Lok Sabha and in the Rajya Sabha, and therefore here also you can have it. But there is a vast difference, because the Lok Sabha consists of 500 members and in the Rajya Sabha we have 250 members. By nominating some 10 or 12 members, because of their invaluable social work or because of their erudition or scholarship and so on, to the House, the position is not changed much. But the Legislature in these territories will consist only of 40 or 50 members and if you nominate one or two members, it will affect the position. A minority may even be converted into a majority. We have got that experience in Nagpur, where the opposition people got a majority in the direct elections and the Congress was routed. But then with two or three representatives from the Railways, University and the Improvement Trust and the whole minority of the Congress was converted into a majority. This is what one or two or three members can do. But why have nominated members? If you want to give a chance to those people who cannot face the hazards of an election then instead of having nominations, have selection by the elected members by the system of the single transferable vote so that good and qualified people may be sent to these Legislatures also. They should not be sent by nomination. I have got other doubts also about nomination. I doubt if we give the Government power to nominate members to these Legislatures, whether that power will be used carefully and with discretion. We have got our past experience to substantiate my argument. We nominated Dr. Colaco as the mem-

ber from Goa. He was supposed to be the man who always supported and was always in favour of autonomy for Goa with the sovereignty of Portugal over it. Even then the Government have nominated him as the representative from Goa. (*Interruption.*) But till the last moment when Goa was liberated, he had his views. And there was such an amount of huge protests and demonstrations. Also there was a fast by one Mr. Fernandez that he should not be allowed to sit in the Lok Sabha and that his membership should be cancelled, and the Prime Minister had to give an assurance that it was only a temporary measure and that elections would take place soon the people would be given the right to send their own representatives. Therefore, in view of our past experience I say, this power of nomination should not be given to the Government. Thank you

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, this discussion on the Bill to amend the Constitution is a very happy occasion; because this brings back to Mother India one of our lost children, Pondicherry. We also rejoice in the fact that the people and the Government of France had the wisdom and imagination, like our British friends, to hand back this territory to us in a peaceful manner; and we did not have to resort to force as we were compelled to do in the case of Goa, Daman and Diu which were occupied by reactionary and unimaginative Portugal. It seems to me, Madam, right and proper that we, who live in the rest of India, should do everything in our power to make these new members of the family especially welcome in our midst and, if necessary, we should even go out of our way to make them feel welcome.

It so happens, Madam, that very recently I had an occasion to spend a great deal of time in the Pondicherry area and I had an opportunity to study some of the problems of that area. I also saw some of the development activities

which the Government of India had already initiated even before the *de jure* transfer of these territories. One of the welcome development measures which are in the process of execution by the Ministry of Transport of the Government of India is the development of the Port of Pondicherry. Because of shallow waters, the ships there have to cast anchor at a distance from the seafront and the arrangement there was to carry the goods exported from that port by country boats from the seafront to the ships. In order to obviate this difficulty, Government have already built a pier which is about one and a half miles in length and this is being fitted with cranes and other equipment for quick loading and unloading of cargo ships and a new railway line has been brought right up to the top of the pier from the Pondicherry railway station and extensive godown facilities have been built up. These new facilities will make it possible for us to use the port of Pondicherry for purposes of exporting iron ore and other kinds of ore to Japan and other parts of the world. At the moment, we are exporting only very limited quantities of unfinished cotton textiles and that sort of material from the port of Pondicherry to other areas of the world.

Another very pleasant development that has taken place there is the new seafront. The Government have already built a very wide concrete pavement in the seafront. The city faces the sea and there is about two miles of this seafront which was in a very neglected condition and this newly built wide concrete road with broad pavements has become a very great blessing to the people of this very congested little town.

The other very welcome development activity that has already been started is the Medical College. The Principal and other teachers of the Medical College very proudly showed me some of the good work that they were doing in their temporary premises. The Medical College is affiliat-

[Shri Sudhir Ghosh.]

ed to the Madras University and they have already produced their first batch of graduates this year and judging by the results of the examination, this teaching hospital seems to be doing extremely well there. The new buildings for the College and the teachers and the students are nearing completion and when they move into the new premises, they will be very well off indeed.

Now, alongside these items of very pleasant development activity, you see a number of unpleasant things in this little area of Pondicherry; and these are an unusually high percentage of people infected with leprosy and the widespread prevalence of Filaria and the millions of mosquitoes which carry the filarial parasites from person to person. The number of mosquitoes is so large that if you sit down in the evening to have a talk with a few friends in an open verandah, it is very difficult to talk without inhaling live mosquitoes through your nose or through your mouth. These mosquitoes are particularly dangerous because of the wide spread existence of Filaria. There is a very convenient breeding ground for these mosquitoes. In this little town, there is a wide open drainage channel; for some curious reason the French used to call it as the Grande Canal, I do not know why. This dirty nullah divides the town into two parts which they used to call, in the French days, the White Town and the Black Town. And the most unpleasant thing of all is that this little town, 2 miles by 2 miles, literally stinks. And the solution to these problems is, of course, the building up of an underground drainage and sewage disposal system. I was happy to learn that the Government of India have already sanctioned a sum of fifty lakhs of rupees for this engineering job but the progress seems to be very slow because the administration there does not seem to have any adequate engineering organisation and they have to depend on the Central Public

Works Department in Delhi for preparing these engineering details and for the Madras Public Works Department for the execution of such a project. It may be a good idea for the Government of India to make some local arrangements there for this kind of engineering activity. This project needs a very great deal of vigorous pushing and I very much hope that the hon. Minister will make a note of it.

The rural area of Pondicherry is limited in size but it contains nearly three lakhs of people. People in the southern areas of India seem to be noticeably poorer than the people of Northern India; and it seems that it would be a very good idea if we can cover that little rural district with a Community Development project at a very early date and perhaps also organise small industries in this rich area. As regards larger industries, there is already a new and modern sugar mill in operation.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Are we discussing the Constitution Amendment Bill or the problems of Pondicherry?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up, Mr. Ghosh.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: We are talking about Pondicherry and it seems there is no particular irrelevance in saying something about the problems there. Anyhow, one more word, Madam, and I conclude my remarks on Pondicherry.

Madam, the very mention of the name Pondicherry reminds us of a great Indian who spent forty years of his life, from 1910 to 1950, in meditation and contemplation in his *ashram* there. And today's discussion, I think, would be incomplete if we did not make a brief reference to this great son of this country. On the political plane, the services of Aurobindo Ghosh in the freedom movement of India are comparable to those of his comrade and colleague, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, like whom he too was an intellectual giant. But Shri Aurobindo did for India and for the world . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Please wind up Speak on the Bill You have two minutes more

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: As far as the Bill is concerned, all there is to say is that we are in favour of the Bill; but I thought, when we were passing this Bill, it was proper and appropriate on such an occasion to remember a great man who was associated with that place and he was a very distinguished son of this country Madam, if you do not think that it is relevant to make reference to him while we are discussing the Bill, perhaps I had better stop

What I was trying to say is that this great son of India left behind him, for his country and for this world, something which is more than intellectual, which is more than political. He left behind him for mankind a message, a message of hope And we do seem to need a message of hope and a faith in the midst of all the mess that man is making of himself in the world today He said that twentieth-century man is not the last word in nature's evolution, the great force, whom we call Nature, is busy evolving a better and better man possessing more and more power over disease, decay and death. Man who calls himself Communist and non-Communist, man who calls himself black or white, eastern or western, advanced or backward, and divides himself into many other divisions; man who makes nuclear bombs and threatens to drop them on himself—and with all his other manifestations of lunacy—man is, in spite of it all, inexorably moving towards the essential oneness of mankind This was the message, Madam, of a man who achieved a consciousness and a power that was more than intellectual or mental; it was something supramental And I think, Madam, it is good that when we are saying "welcome back" to Pondicherry we should remember this great son of India and his message For a nation does not live by bread alone

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. The hon Prime Minister

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, I should have thought that the Prime Minister would speak at the end because many other points have not been made. Naturally we would like to hear the Prime Minister but if he wants to speak now, well, we are agreeable to it

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Anyway, you thought so but the Prime Minister is speaking now

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU). I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to intervene in this discussion I am not the last speaker The hon Member opposite will no doubt have his chance I am grateful to you because this is the only time I have I am rather pressed for time today as I am going away this evening.

This little Constitution (Amendment) Bill, small as it is, has a certain historic significance because it puts an end to all colonial regimes constitutionally in India Of course, Pondicherry and the other French establishments have been factually within India but now after six years of waiting they will become part of the Union of India; so also Goa

Now, there are two matters especially that I should like to speak about There are two amendments that have been proposed, one is about Pondicherry and the other French establishments, whether they should remain as a separate entity or be merged into the adjoining State, and the other is about Delhi As for the first, hon Members have been reminded, I suppose many times, of the undertaking and the assurance we gave to the French Government at that time, not only to the French Government but to the people of Pondicherry I myself have given it at public meetings,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
 at private assemblies in Pondicherry and diplomatically and otherwise to the French Government. One may say that such an assurance is not legally binding but it is more than legally binding; it is morally binding. And apart from that, for my part I think it is desirable for Pondicherry to be a separate entity. But it is not for me to determine that. As we have said in our assurance to the French Government, it is for the people of that area to decide in future what they would like to do, whether they would like to merge in the adjoining States or remain as a separate entity. The question rests not with us. That is perfectly clear. We cannot go behind that undertaking and I feel that the hon. Member who moved this amendment has done so regardless of the wishes of the majority of the people of Pondicherry.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: We said we were prepared for the referendum.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am expressing my own analysis of the situation. I have no doubt about it and I have been in touch with Pondicherry all these years. I have been there repeatedly and the one thing we have always stressed is that they should remain a separate entity. Whether they do so in future or not remains to be seen. As I said, I think it is a desirable thing. Some hon. Members may not attach importance to it but I think it is desirable for Pondicherry which has been for several hundreds of years a part of the French empire and, therefore, has imbibed a great deal of French culture, you may say, language etc. It is a beautiful language. It is a good thing that we should have a centre for French language in India. That does not mean any disrespect to the language of the great majority of the people there. It is Tamil; of course that will have its full place but it is desirable to have a centre for French language and culture there. So speaking for myself I think it is a desirable thing apart from our under-

takings. There are some smaller enclaves like Yanam and Mahe. It is not very logical to keep them under the same Administration as Pondicherry and Karikal and I think there is something in that argument. At the present moment, I would beg of the House to consider that we had better give effect to our assurance and agreement as a whole and keep them with Pondicherry and Karikal rather than separate them although administratively it might have been a little easier to deal with them in their respective States.

Now, coming to Delhi, I feel rather strongly in regard to Delhi because with all respect to the hon. Member who has moved the amendment, I have Delhi in my blood. I am a Delhi man to some extent. The hon. Member knows Delhi as the capital and the seat of this Government. But I attach a great deal of importance to Delhi. Delhi evokes images in me of 5,000 years and more, of a succession of kings, governments, empires falling and rising, great things happening, mixed cultures evolving and all that. Good and bad comes up to my mind. I rather doubt if the same images are evoked in the hon. Member's mind. Delhi as the capital is important enough and for anyone to imagine that we wish to differentiate against Delhi is completely wrong, because we attach so great an importance to Delhi, to the improvement of Delhi, to the old historical background of Delhi, that we hesitate to do anything at the present moment which would prevent us from going in, what we might consider to be, the right direction. My point is, to include Delhi in this Bill casually just like any other place, Manipur, Tripura, Pondicherry or Goa, is not paying regard to the special questions that are tied up with Delhi. I said in the other House the other day that I am not satisfied with the present arrangements for Delhi. I know to some extent from personal experience and a great deal from what I have been told that it has developed into a very complicated and complex system of Government here with

the result that responsibility hardly attaches to anybody. There is the Central Government of course with its numerous Ministries separately dealing with Delhi, Works Ministry, Health Ministry, Education Ministry and so on. There is the Chief Commissioner of Delhi; there is the Corporation of Delhi. There are numerous foreign embassies in Delhi and I could go on enumerating. There is the Master Plan Committee for Delhi. There is the Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking and other specialised agencies which in their own sphere are practically free to act as they choose of course subject to some control. But they are autonomous really. The other day we had some trouble in Delhi about the power supply question which caused a good deal of distress to many people. Well, it is not for me now to say who is responsible for that but primarily obviously the Electric Supply Department which was dealing with it. The Electric Supply Department is partly controlled by the Corporation. Many members of the Corporation say that under the existing circumstances they have no power at all, no real power. The Chief Commissioner exercises it. I am not criticising anybody but as we have grown up it has become a place where it is very difficult to fix responsibility. The Central Government is there but the Central Government obviously cannot come into the picture at every stage. The Chief Commissioner is there and he is, if I may say so, one of our best administrators and we specially chose him and we have kept him there although he is due for promotion elsewhere. We have kept him there because we feel he is probably the best man we could find and he is popular but again his powers are limited. It is extraordinary that everybody's powers are limited by somebody else and the result is unfortunate. Neither the Corporation can function with the satisfaction that it is doing things that it wants to do, nor the Chief Commissioner, nor the many other special undertakings, nor the Master Plan Committee. I have had some experience in this matter,

because for some years past I have been interested in the slums of Delhi and I have repeatedly called people together representing various organisations and consulted them. In theory everybody was agreeable, but in practice not much was done. Something has been done, I admit, and done not only by the Government and its apparatus, but also by private organisations. I admit that. But still the progress has been slow and every time we have come up against this lack of responsibility and everybody having the power to obstruct somebody else doing something. So, it is a very complicated thing. Then, there are the foreign Embassies which have to be treated specially. It is difficult to put them just as Himachal Pradesh or Tripura or some other Territory. You have to devise some method, and it has to be devised, I admit, which will simplify this administration, give it as much of popular backing as possible and so that work can go on in Delhi adequately. That is, I think, the main reason and an adequate reason why Delhi cannot be included in this Bill, whatever the views of hon. Members may be about Delhi. I have indicated rather negatively what my views are, that is, it cannot be treated in the same kind of way as various other Union territories, but that it should be treated rather specially. That as great a popular backing as possible should be given to any apparatus in Delhi is obvious to me. That is the main point I would like to raise.

About Pondicherry, Mahe and Yanam, in the present Bill no change can be made. At least I would not wish any change to be made, because to some extent it would be going against the undertaking we gave. That is enough for me. It is not good for a country like India or for any country, especially for us to go back on everything that we have said repeatedly.

Of one thing I have to remind this House. Many of us have been very impatient about the delay in the change in Pondicherry, that is, the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]
delay in the *de jure* transfer, after the *de facto* transfer had taken place. It was rather a frustrating experience, but the change has come about now and even though it has taken some years it has come about and it has come about in friendship and peace, peacefully and in a friendly way with France. It was worth while waiting a few years to get that done in a friendly way with a great country.

And finally about Delhi I would submit that Delhi cannot, whatever the views may be of any hon. Member, be included in this Bill, to be tacked on as 'a place'. It is not a place. It is 'the place' of India and has to be considered with its history stretching back, with all kinds of backgrounds that past history has left us. It is true that Delhi has changed considerably since independence and that huge migrations have taken place and displaced persons have come. They are welcome here and Delhi is their home. But the fact remains that in spite of all that, Delhi still remains Delhi of old. Five thousand years of history attaches to it and we cannot be casual about it. We have to think hard, consult the people of Delhi and others connected with Delhi as to what to do. It is a difficult matter and I cannot quite frankly suggest anything. I have no clear idea in my own head, except that all these matters should be considered separately and we should not do it in a hurry and casually put it in this Bill. Thank you

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to know from the Prime Minister why he has only told us negatively what is in his mind that something is wrong with the Delhi Administration. From his speech here and from his earlier speech in the other place, we did not get any indication of the lines along which his mind is working. Do we take it that when the matter is under consideration, he has also in mind the proposal for creating an Assembly and a responsible Government for Delhi?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I say that if we had it clearly in our mind, we would have put it in the Bill? That is what I have just said.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): May I ask the Prime Minister this? He says that French culture should be preserved. If Pondicherry is merged in Tamil Nad, why cannot there be a clause in the Bill safeguarding French culture? It is quite possible. This is one point. Another point is as regards Delhi. London is the seat of Government in the U.K., but responsible government has not been denied to it and history is associated there too. How do you make a special point of difference? That is what I want to know

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I regret I cannot reply. I have failed to understand what he said.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH. I said that the Prime Minister said that French culture should be preserved in Pondicherry. If Pondicherry is merged in Tamil Nad, why cannot there be a clause in the Bill, especially safeguarding French culture there? It is quite possible to do that. This is one point

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I will repeat what I said, because I think that the great majority of people in Pondicherry do not want that. I do not want to force it. Certainly it is no good contradicting me, because I can contradict hon. Members opposite. I cannot go about on this issue taking a plebiscite or referendum, because the other fact is there. I have given an assurance to the French Government and I am going to stick to it. I think it will be unfair for us and not befitting our honour not to do that.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: With regard to the undertaking to the French Government, unless they desire it, we do not want a change. I agree. But how is the Government going to find out their desire? Do you want an agitation or something like that? Obviously not. There must be some

method by which the desire of the people should be ascertained.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There are many ways of finding out the desire of the people. Anyhow, at this moment, the first step of bringing them into the Union of India, that cannot be done. Afterwards we can consider that question separately.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, now comrade Ramamurti has explained our position with regard to Pondicherry and what the Prime Minister has told us is this. He, unfortunately for us, did not hear what comrade Ramamurti had said. Now, all that he tells us is that he gave an undertaking or understanding to the French Government that Pondicherry would retain its entity, cultural or otherwise. I do not know exactly in what words this understanding was given. Secondly, it does not bind us in a way that we cannot make certain other arrangements provided the people want it and that can be ascertained. Nor do I think the French Government would understand it in the wrong light. Suppose we make a change here and say that Pondicherry becomes a part of Tamil Nad or the other parts go to the respective adjoining States and so on, I do not think the French people or the French Government will misunderstand our position with regard to this matter, because what, I think, at that time was uppermost in the minds of many people who were discussing it, was that certain cultural traditions and so on which had been built up should be maintained. It is possible to create sufficient safeguards to maintain them. Anyhow, as far as the French are concerned, although the agreement was signed in 1954 we had to wait and the Prime Minister did not misunderstand the French Government very much. And I think the French people will also understand our position if, after having waited for so long we have got the *de jure* transfer and now we propose to have a different type of arrangement from what was contemplated at the time

the discussions were going on for the agreement to be signed. I do not think it is a right thing for 3 P.M. the Prime Minister of the country to place an oral understanding above certain other things as if it were a treaty or agreement. I can understand it because I would not like the Prime Minister of the country to be let down; but if I say that consistent with his dignity and honour as the Prime Minister of the country it is possible to make the arrangement along the lines I have suggested, why should we not go in for that? This is what I cannot understand. Anyhow we are not very much convinced by the line of reasoning the Prime Minister has given in this matter. I think it would be drawing too heavily on his own personal popularity over this matter which is of a political nature and which has got constitutional implications. It is not always good to pit the personality against certain broad constitutional and political processes. The personality cult is nowhere good, and, therefore, here in this thing also any kind of personality cult should be avoided. (Interruption) As you know, Madam, we Communists, are overcoming personality cult.

(Interruption)

, Madam Deputy Chairman, let me proceed. Before I start saying a few things about Delhi, let me greet the people of Himachal Pradesh, Tripura and Manipur for the victories they have won in their struggle for a democratic set-up and responsible government. The credit goes to them. When I say that the credit goes to them, I do not mean it in a narrow partisan sense because the people belonging to all Parties stood for having a democratic set-up and responsible government. So, the credit goes to them. But for their struggle and unity probably this Bill would not have been possible today. Therefore, we must remember those people who fought valiantly and unitedly in this matter. It has been demonstrated once again that once the people are

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
united, what appears to be a settled fact could be easily unsettled. That is why, even though at one time in this House and in the other House it was made out that the arrangements with regard to the Centrally administered areas were final, things have changed now. As far as our Party is concerned, we feel particularly happy because consistently in this House and in the other House we have been pressing for a democratic set-up for them as we are doing now with regard to Delhi. As you know, our Party in Tripura fought the elections with this slogan as the main slogan, that is, for responsible government. and we secured 51 per cent of the votes and also the blessings and sympathies of even those who did not vote for us. It is not a question of party at all. We are glad that it has come. Personally I took part in the agitation in both Manipur and Tripura.

Therefore, Madam, the matter having gone so far, the Government is stopping on the question of Delhi. It is no use telling us the history and so on. Delhi is our great capital. Delhi has been the centre of Indian history and Indian culture. Empires have risen and fallen here. We know that, but the impact of it has been felt by all Indians, and therefore we are all concerned in the historical past of Delhi. But what we are more concerned with is about the future of this great city of ours.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, we cannot understand the argument of the Government in this matter. Frankly speaking, we are at a loss as to how intelligent people in the Government could produce so invalid arguments as they have been doing in this matter. Let us recall that Delhi had a Legislative Assembly. It is not something they are asking for for the first time. They had it and they had about 48 M.L.As. when it was a Part C State. With the reorganisation of the States this Assembly was taken away from them. Then they got a Municipal Corporation and they have got 86 members. Now if you take into account

the population growth, it is at present 27 lakhs. But on the basis of 25,000 per constituency a Legislative Assembly for Delhi, to put it on the same footing as when it was a Part C State, would have about 52 to 55 members. M.L.As. Delhi is entitled to have a Legislature of that size according to the old arrangement that was there, because the population has increased and the voters have increased. So the Assembly was taken away and we gave them the Municipality and the Corporation with certain powers or absence of power. What happened then? That is very important to review today. The law and order situation continued to deteriorate, and the Central Government had been systematically failing in ensuring law and order in Delhi. The situation is much worse than what it was even when it was a Part C State. Therefore, the Central Government administration has not made much good here. Girls are kidnapped from scooters, from airport, from houses. Murders take place at the rate of two or three in Delhi per day, almost a record in the world perhaps; but certainly I do not know whether Chicago beats Delhi or Delhi beats Chicago in this matter. Bomb explosions take place. A bomb exploded at a meeting which was addressed by the Prime Minister, and the Delhi police could not do anything. Smuggling is going on.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: On a point of order, Madam. It is all irrelevant, because it was never under the Assembly; it was not either under the Corporation. Law and order has always been under the Government of India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is why I say that the situation has worsened. I know that you will be a little touchy.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It was never with the Corporation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that. Let me develop my point. Mr. Akbar Ali Khan is very happy as if

he has discovered something new. I say that the general condition has gone down. Nobody is responsible for anything today. Even when the Assembly was there, law and order was there, but the point is that the matter was being discussed in the Assembly. There were legislators, there were constituencies, and things functioned in a different way. Now smuggling is going on. Illicit distillation is going on. Nothing happens, no arrest takes place, and complete incompetence and failure have been displayed by the local administration, the Delhi police administration, and so on. You might say that it was so before also. But the point here is that it was suggested that this arrangement would lead to an improvement. It has not led to an improvement. On the contrary, there is deterioration in the situation. Racketeering is going on here. Permits and licences are being dealt with in a racketeering manner, as everybody knows. It seems that under the new dispensation that is in force now, senior officers of the Government of India and the land racketeers have something of a kind of co-operative and are tampering with town planning and so on, in order to make profits and gains out of that. I can give you many many examples, but the time is short. Many scandals come to light in the Corporation but they have not any power to deal with them. Then again, as far as the police is concerned, things are going out of Delhi, smuggled out of Delhi, which should not go out of Delhi. Wheat is being exported out of Delhi with the connivance of the police. No step is taken. One can recite many things. Therefore, the situation has not improved. I can well understand the Prime Minister expressing dissatisfaction. It is much worse than his words would convey. Why is it so? It is said by the Government now, and it is Government's first argument, that the Corporation is there and so there need be no Assembly. These are contradictory things. We do not accept this position, because it is possible to have both. If for example, the Corporation Bill were passed when the Assembly

was there, the Bill would have been different. Certain powers would have been differently settled in this matter. Anyhow, the Corporation has not got certain functions of the State. Almost none of the important functions the Corporation has got. Police and law and order, it has not got, industrial disputes it has not got, rehabilitation is outside the scope of the Corporation. Acquisition of land for slum clearance and social housing are not within the province of the Corporation. Food and civil supplies are not within the scope of the Corporation. Therefore, it is not right to say that the Corporation has got these essential powers. Powers affecting the life of the people are outside the scope of the Corporation and they are divided between a large number of Ministries and Departments here, with the result that there is always a confusion.

Now, it is said that Delhi must have a special status because it is the Capital of India. I can understand it, but according to the Government, special status means that Delhi must always have a bureaucratic administration and unbridled bureaucracy at that patronised by the Ministry of Home Affairs. That is how it is done. Is that the special status that we want for Delhi? It is a great city and a great city with the saga of past history. This state of affairs is neither doing credit to our past traditions nor being fair to the future. The special status, according to them, is bureaucratic administration.

It is said now that something was wrong with the whole administration. When the Assembly was there, they were not happy with the Assembly or with the function of it. But an analysis of it has not been made. Now, with regard to that, there was misuse of authority and power. The authority did not properly function when it was a Part 'C' State. But the main point that is to be remembered today is that the Assembly which was in existence then was without any authority and power. It was shorn of all authority

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

and power. It did not enjoy the powers and the authority which the Assemblies of the constituent States of India enjoyed. It was bereft of all power and authority. Naturally, it became an impotent force, a degrading force, in some way. The Chief Commissioner's budget was a non-voted budget; the police budget was a non-voted budget. And there were a whole number of bodies which had been shorn of statutory powers. Various autonomous bodies were there and only one Bill was passed, the Delhi Shops and Establishments Act. They could not function. Let us be clear about it. What existed from 1948 to 1956 in Delhi was not a full-fledged Legislative Assembly with the necessary powers that they have in the States today. The failure lay there. You cannot have the facade of an institution and expect it to function in a proper way. Therefore, things went wrong. That is the crux of the problem. The lesson from this thing should be to create a properly-constituted legislative organ with the necessary powers that make it really effective, that really rouse the public and political conscience of the people and enable them to handle, within the limitations of the Constitution, the affairs of their State or their area. That was not done. Delhi has been, most unfortunately, neglected in this matter. It is the Capital of India. But we have not given to the people of Delhi what they desire. Undoubtedly we want Delhi to enjoy a special status. But that status should be expressed in a better administration of Delhi, in a more democratic set-up, with the people more and more shaping their affairs and conducting their affairs. That should be the approach in this matter. Now, we should not try to make out that things went wrong and therefore nothing should be given. That is not fair.

As far as the expenditure is concerned, another argument is given. It is better to spend money on a democratic set-up rather than spend money on a bureaucratic imposition from the

Central Government. This is what I say. I would any day spend more money on the Legislature of Delhi and on a Council of Ministers in Delhi responsible to the Assembly than I would spend money on a Chief Commissioner dictated to by the Home Ministry, not responsible to the people and only functioning at the behest of the Home Ministry. This is what I say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are more speakers.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: You are most irresponsible, I say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Am I most irresponsible? Your interruption shows that you are no better either.

I say, therefore, that this is not the right approach. These arguments do not stand at all. The hon. Members opposite do not like the home-truths to be spoken in this House. That is my trouble. I tell you that up to March, 1962 when the discussions were going on, the High Command, as it is called here, gave an undertaking to everybody concerned that Delhi would be having a democratic set-up and a responsible government. Then some trouble arose over the Rajya Sabha election; when the candidate of the High Command was not acceptable and when some other candidate was returned, the High Command got angry with the Delhi Pradesh Congress Committee and decided to abandon this idea. I say, don't handle the affairs of Delhi from the point of view of the domestic affairs of the Congress Party.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you winding up? Please do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is how I wind up. It would be a tragedy if Delhi's problems are tackled in this manner. Secondly, it should not be treated as if it is an issue between the Delhi Pradesh Congress Committee and the Congress High Command. If something is wrong with the Delhi Pradesh Congress Committee, it is the task of the High

Command to use the party constitution and set matters right, not penalise the people of Delhi for that, not punish them by denying something to which they are entitled. Therefore, Delhi has got a very strong case and I think the sooner we accede to the demand of the people of Delhi—the demand for a Legislative Assembly and a responsible Ministry—the better for the whole of India and certainly for this Capital because strengthening Delhi's public life means strengthening the institutions of democracy, strengthening the process of democracy, and that we cannot possibly do unless we do away with the present bureaucratic administration and substitute it by a full-fledged democratic organisation, namely, an Assembly and a responsible Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mohan Lal Saxena, I hope you will be brief.

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA (Nominated): Madam, I do not want to enter into any controversy about Delhi. But having been called upon to speak after Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I think I owe it to the House to say a few words about the observations that he has made. He has made certain assumptions, and then, without giving us the authority for them, he goes on waxing eloquent about the need for a democratic set up for Delhi and says that it is due to some trouble between the Delhi Pradesh Congress Committee and the High Command that the whole scheme was changed. I would like to know his authority for saying that. For aught I know, if there were a referendum the people of Delhi would not vote for the set-up which they had before the States' Reorganisation. So, it has to be considered as to what else can be done. The present Bill only provides for reverting to the type which the other Union territories had before the States reorganisation came into force. The hon. Member himself says that that scheme was not proper, that it was not given suffi-

cient thought to and that even the Assembly did not enjoy sufficient powers. If it is so, then it is all the more reason that sufficient time and attention should be given to the problem of Delhi as to what form of Government Delhi should have, so that keeping in mind the problems—the Prime Minister has already referred to it—we might be able to have a better administration, which may also satisfy the aspirations of the people.

In this connection, I would like to repeat the suggestion that I had made at the time when the States Reorganisation Bill was under consideration and I had suggested that in the Cabinet, there should be a separate Minister for Delhi Affairs. I think that if that suggestion had been accepted, there would not have been so much trouble, with so many Ministries dealing with the different problems of Delhi and without any co-ordination. That would have obviated a number of difficulties and I do still hope that the Government and the Home Minister would consider the suggestion. Six years have passed since we had the States Reorganisation Act passed, and many of those who were strong advocates of linguistic States have also since changed their minds. Instead of bringing peace to the country and greater integration, it has given a fillip to fissiparous tendencies, and I think it is time that, instead of considering bit by bit, we consider the whole question in the light of our past experience. Even at that stage I had suggested that it was difficult to resist the demand for having linguistic States, but incidentally I saw a way out to have greater coordination between the linguistic States and effective control over them. I had suggested that the whole country should be divided into five or six zones with one common Governor for each zone, a common High Court, a common Public Service Commission and a common reserve police force. Still more, I had suggested that instead of having zonal advisory councils, which were accepted at the instance of the

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena]

Prime Minister, we should have active Zonal Councils and, to begin with, the Central Government should delegate some of its powers to them, in the matter of regional planning, irrigation projects, flood control, etc, and that the members, representing the States in those Zones in Parliament, the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, should constitute the regional councils. That was my suggestion and I am referring to it today. Therefore I would like the Government to remember, that in view of our past experience and when we have accepted Nagaland as a State—a state with a population of only 3½ lakhs—for reasons with which I entirely agree, it will not be easy for us to resist such demands from other territories, like the hill areas, as has been pointed out by the Members of the Assam Legislative Assembly. They have also suggested that there should be one common Governor for the eastern zone with all these States in it, and also a common High Court, and I submit that is a move in the right direction. Also the other day the Chief Minister of Punjab pleaded for the merger of Rajasthan, Punjab, Kashmir, etc. But then the Chief Minister of Rajasthan is not agreeable to this, and I know it will not be possible, but I think it will not be difficult to persuade these States to have a Zonal Council in common, for example, for Punjab, Kashmir, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh, a common Governor, a common High Court, a common Public Service Commission and a common reserve police force. Similarly they may have an eastern zone, a central zone, a western zone and a southern zone. Now there is the demand from the D.M.K. I know there is no strength behind it but still, if we have a southern zone with a common Governor and all that, then that will lead to greater integration of the country, and that will also reduce the expenditure that is involved otherwise. I have only repeated my suggestion. I thought I must avail myself of

this opportunity to refer to this suggestion so that the Government may think over it.

Thank you.

شری مہا لال ساکسنا (اتر

پردیش) : دیپتی چیئرمین صاحبہ،
مجھے آپ نے وقت دے دیا اس کے لئے
شکریہ۔ جہاں تک ایملڈنگ بل کا
سوال ہے اور جو یہاں پیش ہے اس
پر کوئی دو رائے نہیں ہو سکتی
ہیں۔ خوشی کی بات ہے جو علاقے
ہلدوستان میں نئے شامل ہو رہے
ہیں ان کو بھی اب رائے دیئے گئے،
اسمبلی کا اور ڈیموکریسی سے فائدہ
اٹھانے کا موقع دیا جا رہا ہے اس لئے
میں اس بل کو سپورٹ کرتی ہوں
اور چند الفاظ دلی کے بارے میں
کہنا چاہتی ہوں۔

دلی کے بارے میں یہاں یہ
بہت کچھ کہا جا چکا ہے۔ خود
پلڈت جی نے بھی کہا ہے کہ وہ
اس سے بہت مطمئن نہیں ہیں۔
جو صورت حال یہاں کی ہے۔ میرا
تہوڑا سا تعلق ان کمیٹیوں سے
ہے جو یہاں اس وقت کام کر رہی
ہیں مثلاً پبلک ریلیشن کمیٹی اور
یہاں کی جو لینڈ ریفرم کمیٹی بنی
تھی اس میں بھی میں شامل ہوئی
اور وہ جو ۳۰ ایکڑ کا قاعدہ مقرر
ہوا تھا کہ اتنی لینڈ سب کے پاس
ہونی چاہیئے وہ میرے سامنے بنا

تھا۔ لیکن اس کے بعد پھر سب سے
معلوم ہوا کہ اس میں کچھ تبدیلی
کی گئی۔ پھر اس کے بعد معلوم
ہوا کہ اب چھ برس کے بعد کچھ
اور تبدیلی کی جا رہی ہے۔

چھ سال پہلے ایک اسمبلی یہاں
قائم تھی وہ دلی کا بہت سخت زمانہ
تھا جس زمانہ میں انہوں نے دلی
کی حالت کو ٹھیک کیا تھا۔ اس
اسمبلی میں پبلک ورکرس اور پبلک
کے نمائندے چن کر آئے تھے لیکن
کچھ ایسے حالات پیدا ہوئے کہ گورنمنٹ
کو اس میں تبدیلی کرنی پڑی۔
جو اختلافات ہوئے تھے وہ نئے
نہیں تھے۔ یو پی، بہار، پنجاب
اور دوسرے پراونسز میں بھی آپس
میں اختلافات ہوتے ہیں لیکن ہوم
منسٹری نے اور گورنمنٹ نے سوچا
کہ دلی راجدھانی ہے اس لئے یہاں
حکومت کو تبدیل کرنا چاہیئے۔
نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ اسمبلی ٹوٹ گئی۔
اس وقت ہم ایک تجرباتی دور
سے گزر رہے تھے اور جو تجربہ کیا
گیا آج چھ سال کے بعد اندازہ ہوتا
ہے کہ اس کا کوئی چھ نتیجہ
برآمد نہیں ہوا۔

جو حالت اس وقت یہاں
پر ہے اور دلی والے جس طرح
سے اپنے آپ کو بے بس محسوس
کر رہے ہیں اس کو دیکھ کر معلوم
ہوتا ہے کہ گورنمنٹ نے جو قدم اٹھایا
نہا اور جو حل سوچا تھا وہ بالکل
پے کار ثابت ہوا۔ آج اگر ایک

معمولی سی ڈسپینسری بھی کھولنی
ہو یا اسکول کھولنا ہو تو پتہ چلتا
ہے کہ نرسری یا پرائمری تعلیم کا
کس سے تعلق ہے اور سیکنڈری کالج
اور یونیورسٹی کا کسی اور سے تعلق ہے۔
یہاں جتنی سنگٹرل منسٹریز ہیں سب
کسی نہ کسی طرح سے دلی کے کاروبار
میں اور دلی کے معاملات میں اینٹرو
رہتی ہیں۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوتا ہے
کہ آفیسرس کا ایک ایسا ہولڈ پیدا
ہو گیا ہے اتنا اثر ہے کہ ہر منسٹری
کے آفیسرس پورے طور پر دلی کے
معاملات میں اور دلی کی ہر چیز
میں دخیل رکھتے ہیں۔ اور اس کا
نتیجہ یہ ہے کہ دلی کا امن و امان
اور اس کی جو یکجہتی تھی وہ
سب قریب قریب ختم ہو چکی ہے۔
یہاں غلط فہمی گہری بڑھ رہی ہے۔
کریشن انتہا سے زیادہ بڑھ گیا ہے
اور روزمرہ کی زندگی میں ہر چیز
میں روکاوتیں پیدا ہوتی ہیں لوگ
پریشان رہتے ہیں لیکن ان کی سوجھ
بوجھ میں نہیں آتا ہے کہ وہ کس کے پاس
جائیں کیونکہ دلی کا ایک مالک تو ہے
نہیں چھ چھ اتھارٹیٹیز ہیں جن کے
نصحت دلی ہے۔

میں انریبل ہوم منسٹر سے
درخواست کروں گی کہ وہ بہت کچھ
سنتے ہیں، بہت کچھ دیکھتے ہیں،
لیکن کبھی کبھی ان لوگوں کی بھی
سن لیا کریں جو دلی کے دل کی
ہوکن سنا کرتے ہیں، جن کی انگلیاں

[شری متی انیس قدوائی]

یہاں کی پبلک کی نبض پر دھا کرتی
ہیں اور جو پبلک ورکر ہیں - اس
افرانفری کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا ہے کہ دلی کا
جو نظام تھا وہ بجائے درست ہونے کے
اور بھی ابتر ہو گیا ہے اس لئے میں
آپ سے یہ درخواست کروں گی کہ آپ
آئندہ سیشن میں کوئی ایسا سولوشن
دھونڈیئے ایسا حل نکالئے جس سے
دلی کی پرابلم حل ہو سکے - دلی
واہوں کی خواہش ہے کہ ان کو اسمبلی
ملے - دلی والے چاہتے ہیں کہ ہمارے
چلے ہوئے نمائندے پھر یہاں کا انتظام
کریں اور یہاں انکی اپنی گورنمنٹ بلے یہ
کوئی بڑا مطالبہ نہیں ہے - پارٹ سی
اسٹیٹس سب جگہ بہتر کام کر رہی
ہیں - اس طرح یہ اسٹیٹ بھی بن
سکتی ہے اگر اس کے اوپر گورنمنٹ کا
زہادہ ہولڈ نہ ہو - کسی پروانٹس کے
چیف منسٹر کو بلا کر کے ہوم منسٹر
کچھ نہیں کہہ سکتے - لیکن یہاں جو
منسٹری تھی اس کو اتنی پاور ہی
حاصل نہیں تھی - وہ ہوم منسٹری کے
تحت تھی ہوم منسٹر اس کو بلاکر
کے کہہ سکتے تھے کہ ان کے خلاف نو
کنفیڈنس دے دیں -
یہاں کی پولیس ان کے اختیار میں
نہیں تھی ان تمام چیزوں کی وجہ سے
دلی کی حکومت کچھ نہیں کر سکتی
تھی اس لئے مجھے امید ہے کہ آئندہ
سیشن میں جو کوئی بھی حل آپ
نکالیں گے وہ اتنا بہتر ہوگا کہ اس سے

دلی کے حالات بہتر بنانے میں مدد
ملے گی -

آپ نے پانچ ہی منٹ کا وقت دیا
ہے - اس لئے میں ان چند الفاظ کے
ساتھ اپنی تقریر ختم کرتی ہوں -

†[श्रीमती अनिस किववई (उत्तर प्रदेश):

डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिबा ! मुझे आपने वक्त दे
दिया, उसके लिए शुक्रिया। जहां तक असेम्बली
बिल का सवाल है, और जो यहां पेश है उस पर
कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती हैं। ख़ुशी की बात
है, जो इलाक़े हिन्दुस्तान में नये शामिल हो रहे
हैं, उन को भी अब राय देने का, असेम्बली
का और डेमोक्रेसी से फायदा उठाने का मौका
दिया जा रहा है। इसलिए मैं इस बिल को सपोर्ट
करती हूँ और चन्द अलफ़ाज़ दिल्ली के बारे
में कहना चाहती हूँ।

दिल्ली के बारे में यहां पर बहुत कुछ
कहा जा चुका है। खुद पंडित जी ने भी कहा है
कि वह इससे बहुत मुसमयन नहीं हैं—जो
सूरतेहाल यहा की है। मेरा थोड़ा सा ताल्लुक
इन कमेटियों से है जो यहां इस वक्त काम कर
रही हैं मसलन पब्लिक रिलेशन्स कमटी
और यहा की जो लैंड रिफार्म कमटी बनी थी
उसमें भी मैं शामिल हुई। और, वह जो ३० एकड़
का क़ायदा मुकर्रर हुआ था कि इतनी लैंड सब
के पास होनी चाहिए, वह मेरे सामने बना था।
लेकिन उस के बाद फिर मुझे मालूम हुआ कि
उस में कुछ तब्दीली की गई। फिर उसके बाद
मालूम हुआ कि अब छः वर्ष के बाद कुछ और
तब्दीली की जा रही है।

छः साल पहले एक असेम्बली यहां
कायम थी। वह दिल्ली का बहुत सख्त जमाना
था जिस ज़माने में उन्होंने दिल्ली की हालत
को ठीक किया था। इस असेम्बली में पब्लिक
वर्कर्स और पब्लिक के नुमाइन्दे चुन कर आये थे।
लेकिन कुछ ऐसे हालात पैदा हुए कि गवर्न-
मेंट को उस में तब्दीली करनी पड़ी। जो इच्छता-

फ़ात हुए थे वह नये नहीं थे । यू० पी० बिहार, पंजाब, और दूसरे प्राविन्स में भी आपस में इस्लामफ़ात होते हैं, लेकिन होम मिनिस्ट्री ने और गवर्नमेंट ने सोचा कि दिल्ली राजधानी है इसलिए यहां हुकूमत को तब्दील करना चाहिए । नतीजा यह हुआ कि असेम्बली टूट गई । उस वक्त हम एक तज़रबाती दौर से गुज़र रहे थे और जो तज़रबा किया गया, आज छः साल के बाद यह अन्दाज़ा होता है कि उसका कोई अच्छा नतीजा बरामद नहीं हुआ ।

जो हालत इस वक्त यहाँपर है और दिल्ली वाल जिस तरह से अपने आपको बेबस महसूस कर रहे हैं उसको देखकर मालूम होता है कि गवर्नमेंट ने जो कदम उठाया था और जो हल सोचा था वह बिल्कुल बेकार साबित हुआ । आज अगर एक मामूली सी डिस्पेंसरी खोलनी हो या स्कूल खोलना हो तो पता चलता है कि नर्सरी या प्राइमरी तालीम का किसी से ताल्लुक है और सेकेंडरी कालेज और यूनीवर्सिटी का किसी और सेनाल्लुक है । यहाँ जितनी सेंट्रल मिनिस्ट्रीज़ हैं सब किसी न किसी तरह से दिल्ली के कारोबार और दिल्ली के मामलात में एंटर रहती हैं । इस का नतीजा यह होता है कि आफिसर्स का एक ऐसा होल्ड पैदा हो गया है, इतना असर है कि हर मिनिस्ट्री के आफिसर्स पुरे तौर पर दिल्ली के मामलात में और दिल्ली की हर चीज़ में दखील रहते हैं और उसका नतीजा यह है कि दिल्ली का अमन-अमान और उसकी जो यकजहती थी वह सब करीब करीब ख़त्म हो चुकी है । यहाँ गुंडागर्दी बढ़ रही है, करप्शन इन्तहा से ज्यादा बढ़ गया है और रोजमर्रा की जिन्दगी में हर चीज़ में रुकावटें पैदा होती हैं, लोग परेशान रहते हैं, लेकिन उन की समझ में नहीं आता है कि वह किस के पास जायें क्योंकि दिल्ली का एक मालिक तो हैं नहीं छः छः अथारिटीज़ हैं जिन के तहत दिल्ली है ।

मैं आनरेबल होम मिनिस्टर से दरखास्त करूंगी कि वह बहुत कुछ सुनते हैं, बहुत कुछ देखते हैं, लेकिन कभी-कभी उन लोगों की भी सुन लिया करे जो दिल्ली के दिल की धड़कन

सुना करते हैं । जिनकी उंगलियाँ यहाँकी पब्लिक की नब्ज़ पर रहा करती हैं । और जो पब्लिक वर्कर हैं । इस अफ़रातफ़री का नतीजा यह हुआ है कि दिल्ली का जो निज़ाम था वह बजाय दुरुस्त होने के और भी अबतर हो गया है । इसलिए मैं आप से यह दरखास्त करूंगी कि आप आइन्दा सेशन में कोई ऐसा सोल्यूशन ढूँढिये, ऐसा हल निकालिये जिस से दिल्ली की प्रॉब्लम हल हो सके । दिल्ली वालों की ख्वाहिश है कि उनको असेम्बली मिले । दिल्ली वाले चाहते हैं कि हमारे चुने हुए नुमाइन्दे फिर यहाँ का इन्तज़ाम करें और यहाँ उनकी अपनी गवर्नमेंट बने । यह कोई बड़ा मतलब नहीं है । पार्ट सी स्टेट्स सब जगह बेहतर काम कर रही हैं । इस तरह ये स्टेट भी बन सकती हैं अगर इस के ऊपर गवर्नमेंट का ज्यादा होल्ड न हो । किसी प्राविन्स के चीफ मिनिस्टर को बुला करके होम मिनिस्टर कुछ नहीं कह सकते लेकिन यहाँ जो मिनिस्ट्री थी उसको इतनी पावर ही हासिल नहीं थी, वह होम मिनिस्ट्री के तहत थी, और होम मिनिस्टर उस को बुला करके कह सकते थे कि उनके खिलाफ़ नो कान्फ़िडेंस है या वह इस्तीफा दे दें । यहाँ की पुलिस उनके अख़्तियार में नहीं थी । इन तमाम चीज़ों की वजह से दिल्ली की हुकूमत कुछ नहीं कर सकती थी । इसलिए मुझे उम्मीद है कि आइन्दा सेशन में जो कोई भी हल आप निकालेंगे वह इतना बेहतर होगा कि उस से दिल्ली के हालात बेहतर बनाने में मदद मिलेगी ।

आपने पांच ही मिनट का वक्त दिया है । इसलिए मैं इन चन्द अल्फ़ाज़ के साथ अपनी तक्रार ख़त्म करती हूँ ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pillai. Five Minutes, please.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI (Madras): Madam Deputy Chairman, originally Pondicherry was called 'Puducherry'. The French were not able to pronounce the word 'Puducherry'. So

[Shri J. S. Pillai]
they changed it into 'Pondicherry'. 'Puducherry' is, as you know, a Tamil word, meaning a 'new settlement'. 'Pudu' means 'new' and 'Cherry' means 'settlement'. The Adidravidas, who formed the bulk of the French Army, were the original settlers of that place. So it came to be known as 'Cherry'. We are glad it is going to be a part of our Republic.

Madam, I suggest that we change the name of 'Pondicherry' to 'Puducherry'. By changing the name we would not be making any innovation. We have already changed the anglicised name of Bezvada to Vijaya-wada, Benaras to Varanasi. So also 'Pondicherry' has no meaning. 'Puducherry' has a meaning. With the exception of a few educated people, the rest of the people there even now call that place 'Puducherry' and not 'Pondicherry'. Even now in the railway station on the board you will find 'Pondicherry' in English and 'Puducherry' in Tamil. On the buses also you will find 'Puducherry'. Time has come, though not today but in the near future, that the name must be changed.

Madam, during the French regime the people living there were very happy because everything was cheap there. Will you believe me, if I tell you that for two annas in those days we could purchase a yard of silk cloth?

AN HON. MEMBER: In which year?

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: In 1935. For Rs. 2 in those days we could get a silk saree. For Rs. 2/8/- I bought there a piece of 'Mull' measuring 20 yards. As for alcoholic drinks, they would cost two pence a peg.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Did you find out why it was so cheap?

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: Because they had a free port. That is the answer. Now prices have gone up very high and I hope the Government will notice it and do something to remedy it.

Madam, when the place was under the French Government, there was no unemployment. The young men of that place, especially Harijans, recruited themselves in the French Army, and after serving in France or in Algeria or in Saigon or in Madagascar they got very good pension. Now there is unemployment. I would like the Government to remedy these two defects.

Then, Madam, the language of that place is Tamil. I want the Government not to dump officers who are ignorant of Tamil. The young men of the place studied French and are ignorant of English, this ignorance of English should not stand in the way of their getting jobs in the Government. I want the Government to change the rules so that those people who are living in Pondicherry, and who are ignorant of English but who know Tamil, may be absorbed in Government services.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): What about Mahe? Pondicherry includes Mahe also.

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: I married in Pondicherry. So I am interested in Pondicherry.

Madam, it is Pondicherry which gave asylum to two great sons of India. One of them was from Bengal and the other was Subramania Bharathi of Tamilnad. It not only gave political asylum but it gave asylum to all sorts of burglars, thieves and smugglers. Now that situation will be over.

Another thing that I want to tell the House is this. Five Parliamentary seats are reserved for Pondicherry. I want the Government to reserve at least one seat for Harijans. I think on the population basis they form about 40 per cent.

SHRI M. R. SHERVANI (Uttar Pradesh): Why not two?

SHRI J. S. PILLAI: I have said "at least one". (Interruption.) Let the Government calculate it. It is not my business.

(Time bell rings.)

Just one minute. I will recapitulate what I have said:

- (1) Change the name from Pondicherry to Puducherry;
- (2) Harijans there should be given at least one reserved seat;
- (3) Those young men who have studied French and Tamil should be absorbed in the Government services.

Thank you, Madam, for giving me time.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Madam, much has been said about Pondicherry and Delhi. I do not think any other point has generally been touched except for some references here and there to minor matters. In so far as Pondicherry and Delhi are concerned, the Prime Minister has already spoken and made the stand of the Government on these matters quite clear. I do not want to take much time of the House in repeating more or less the same argument. But I might inform the House, as Shri Vajpayee specially referred to article 2 of the Treaty of Cession of the French Establishments of Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe and Yanam, which was signed on the 28th May, 1956 and which has been ratified by the Government of India and France, that it provides:

"These establishments will keep the benefit of the special administrative status which was in force prior to the 1st November, 1954. Any constitutional changes in this status which may be made subsequently shall be made after ascertaining the wishes of the people."

This is article 2 of the Treaty signed between the Government of France and the Indian Government. In this context, as the Prime Minister said, there is no alternative for us at present to make any changes and since, I think, 1st November, 1954, the territories of Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe and Yanam have been administered as a separate entity. I think this will have to continue when the new pattern of reform is given to them.

I would only say, Madam, that both on account of the Treaty obligation and other assurances given by the Prime Minister, the Government of India have decided to retain the separate individuality of these territories in the administrative set-up. In regard to smaller places or villages like Mahe, Yanam, etc., well, these are matters which could be considered later. As to whether any change should be made, naturally the wishes of the people will have to be ascertained. Many devices could be provided or could be thought of. What it should be, well, it is all a matter which, I think, the new Pondicherry Legislative Assembly when it is formed would itself consider and make its own suggestion. I do not know why we should be in such a great hurry at present.

As regards the jurisdiction of Madras High Court over Pondicherry, article 230 empowers Parliament to extend the jurisdiction of the High Court to any Union Territory, and I might inform the House that a proposal for the extension of the jurisdiction of the Madras High Court is under our consideration. In regard to Goa, Daman and Diu administration, the Goa, Daman and Diu Act makes provision for the extension of the jurisdiction of the Bombay High Court to this Union Territory. The particular provision is yet to be enforced but the law is already there.

I do not want to deal with Dadra and Nagar Haveli except to say that it has also been administered as a

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

separate territory, first as a free administration and thereafter as a Union Administration. It has functioned as a separate unit since long before the liberation of Goa and it is not, therefore, desirable at this stage to merge Dadra and Nagar Haveli into Goa. I need not refer to the question of the Panchayats. They have a Varsh Panchayat, as it is called, which is an advisory body for the Administration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. It was this Varsh Panchayat which passed a resolution for the integration of Dadra and Nagar Haveli before the Government of India passed the Dadra and Nagar Haveli Act in 1962. This Varsh Panchayat consists of about 20 members. Representative bodies at the district and village levels on the pattern of similar organisations in the rest of India are also being set up.

All these territories or areas have their own specialities and the background of their administration and other matters have been so much different that we have to tackle each area or each territory in a separate manner. Basically, of course, the things remain one, they are Union Territories and they have to function within the Union Government and they have to adopt the common pattern of our administration and the democratic set-up but minor changes or small changes here and there have to be agreed to and adopted.

As regards Delhi, I am sorry that Mr. Gupta started referring to the crime situation in Delhi. I thought generally, formerly he used to be relevant, but today, unfortunately, he has been irrelevant throughout and perhaps he tried to somehow find an opportunity to condemn the Delhi Administration. I do not want to defend the shortcomings and the weaknesses of the Delhi Administration. I know that they lack in many things on account of which the people have to suffer but I do not know if there is any administration in any place, either in this country or in other

countries, which is perfect and which is giving complete satisfaction to the people. So, Delhi has its own problems. It is not like other cities. There is no city in this country at present which is expanding so rapidly in area, in population and in relation to different other matters and problems. So, it has to be realised what are the special difficulties that the Administration has to face. I must also admit that the recruitment of staff was done at a time when even the recruitment was not done properly in order to accommodate large numbers of people who had come from outside. There was on the one hand the human problem, the absorption of people, giving them employment, giving them shelter and in that connection it was not possible entirely to fix a very strict or hard and fast criterion of the efficiency and standard of the staff. So, all these factors have to be taken into consideration. I am not prepared to admit that the Delhi administration has failed or has not functioned well at all. The previous Assembly, of course, as Kumari Shanta Vasisht said, was not in charge of law and order and police and law and order was a reserved subject but in other matters the Delhi Ministry functioned very well. They did many things which gave satisfaction to the people in the matter of education, health and other social activities. They did quite a lot of work and very good work indeed but the abolition of the Legislature and the Ministry, of course, as I said came in the wake of the report of the S.R.C. and when Legislatures etc. were abolished in other Union Territories, they were abolished in Delhi also.

However, at present it is true that there are stories or incidents appearing in the papers almost, as Mr. Gupta said, daily. I do not think it is something which is new in a big city like this. Go to any other city. I think in every newspaper which appears in that city, you will find headlines or prominent place given to different

kinds of crimes etc. There is nothing uncommon but I do not want to defend it for a moment that these things are not to be counteracted or not to be overcome but then, regarding the many abductions—he talked for abductions—I do not really want to deal with that. I am sorry but because he made a reference to three cases of abduction, I say that I have read the report. I cannot state to the House as to what really those incidents are and what for and why for and how did they happen. I went into the details and all the impression created on the people as well as on you, I can definitely say, is not at all correct. Regarding the last case of abduction, some people went towards Meerut in a car and I am not aware as to what people generally drink, cold or hot. I am almost a fool in that matter. I do not know what it is but I am told they had a few bottles also. When they covered some distance, after that, perhaps, I do not know what they did but the bottle was empty. Of course, there was a girl also sitting with them. While returning, at some place, I do not know, whether it was due to the hot drink or the liquid they had taken from the bottle, the girl started shrieking and shouting and some passers-by wanted to know what was the matter. They stopped the car they would not allow these people to go and they said: 'This is a case of abduction, these people are taking away the girl without consent.' But then what happened? These people came and the girl made a statement. This was the story. There was no case of abduction at all and when the contradiction was given in the press, it was published in a corner. The first story was in headlines but when it had to be contradicted, it was just placed in a corner. I do not know how many of you have even seen this contradiction. This is how things are put and exaggerated and wrong impression is created but then my other difficulty is that Shri Gupta and his friends, unfortunately, do not help in maintaining peace and law and order in the city.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What am I to do, tell me. Should I be a Head Constable under you?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I mean the Members of the Communist Party. They take interest in creating a spirit of defiance. A spirit of defiance may be good sometimes, but if things are done in such a manner, as to lead to violence or to violent activities and even mentally if there is created an atmosphere of violence, these things are really bad. On the one hand the hon. Member desires that there should be peace and that law and order should be there in the city. Of course, these minor incidents or major incidents when they are committed we must take action against them and we must act against those who are responsible for them. If the officers are at fault, they should be taken to task. But the kind of atmosphere or climate that the hon. Members and political parties create in the city is also an important matter. We take up one or two or three, four cases and dilate upon them. But we do not realise our own responsibility and see how far it could help in creating a better atmosphere.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is why we want an Assembly here where the political leaders can discuss things.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Well, for that I do not think you want an Assembly in Delhi. Madam, as I said, when the Congress Government was here in Delhi, I mean when the Congress Party was in power in the Delhi Legislature, although some difficulties were there which cropped up, we worked very well and in full co-operation and coordination, and there was smooth working. I know what will happen if Mr. Gupta's party were to come to power in the Legislature of Delhi. I have no doubt what will happen. We have experience of it in Kerala.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, you are a good man. Please do not bring in that topic.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I have no doubt what will happen.

AN HON. MEMBER: What happened when there was direct action in Kerala?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I do not think the Communist Party will ever come into power here. I am merely taking it as a hypothetical case. Let us consider objectively, what will happen. My friend, Mr. Gupta, need not get excited. He is not going to come into power here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are pressing for an Assembly here knowing full well that the Congress will be there. That shows our generosity and our non-partisan approach in this matter.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I am merely saying that if the Communist party were in power in the Centre, they also would have to consider this aspect of the problem that I want to pose. I say in the capital of the country in the capital city you cannot work at cross purposes, because the seat of authority, the real authority of the whole country is the capital, and if there are two governments functioning at cross purposes in the capital city, it would create a very awkward situation. Therefore, I say in case Shri Ramamurti and his followers come into power here in the Delhi Legislature . . .

THE MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI A. K. SEN): That will never happen.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Mr. Asoke Sen here says that that will never happen. I do not want to repeat it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You repeat it. Have the pleasure of repeating it.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: We do not want to deprive you of the pleasure of repeating it.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Well, then they will really work at cross purposes and then I do not know how a government can really function properly. It will set up such a bad example for the other States also. I have no doubt in my mind that any kind of a Legislature or Cabinet in the city of Delhi would not be desirable in the larger interests.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: You are going to have your own party in the Government here. If you cannot control your own party, why do you say that they will work at cross purposes?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Ours is a democratic party.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: And, therefore, all these quarrels?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have so many factions, I know, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. I know your problems. I sympathise with you. We want to help you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you know his problem, please listen to him.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Factions etc. are there, I don't deny it. But as we have to function in a democratic way, we must give adequate freedom to whatever party comes into power. The same freedom was given to the Communist Party in Kerala. We could have easily managed to get a majority in Kerala.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Never, never.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: You could not have got it. We challenged you at the time of direct action and you did not accept that challenge. There is now your coalition with the Muslim League.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: With all your persuasive powers and ability you went there but you could not do it.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I am talking about the previous election in which the Communist Party came into power. I am not talking of the future or subsequent general election in which we came into power. The League and the P. S. P. are also there. But previously, if the Congress had desired, with the help of Independents, it could have formed a government, in Kerala. We could have done it. But we did not do it and that too deliberately. Even here, at the Centre, the Prime Minister said: "No, let the other party do it." (*Interruptions.*) Please let me continue. I do not want to take a long time. I would like to finish in another two or three minutes because there is other work. There are two other Bills to be considered. I am only stating that the Prime Minister himself said that as the Congress was not in a clear majority, he did not want the Congress to take power into its hands. He said, "If the Communist Party can form a government, let them do so." So, we did it deliberately. The hon. Member accused us saying that we did something in Kerala and we did not want other parties to come into power. That, I say, is far from the truth.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why not have elections now? We can have a trial of strength.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: At present, in Kerala, we are in power and as far as I know, the Communist Party, in spite of its efforts has not been able to weaken that Government, and may I add . . .

(*Interruptions*)

AN. HON. MEMBER: Have another election.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Kerala seems to be a sore point with the hon. Members of the Communist Party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is the obsession with the hon. Home Minister.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Then **Shri Gurupada Swamy** referred to something being partly nominated and partly elected and so on. I have already stated what I had to say on this question and I have nothing more to add. I would like to make it clear that there is not the least desire to have two kinds of Legislatures. It is like this. For example, if in the Rajya Sabha there are four or five nominated Members and the others are elected, it does not become a nominated body. After all, what is this nomination meant for? It gives representation to such interests as need it. Especially in places like Manipur, Tripura and also Himachal Pradesh, there are tribals in large numbers. If they are not elected, we should give them representation. Also if you like, you can give representation to educationists, scientists and others. The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and others are not represented in the Legislatures, but it is only desirable that they should be brought in and so one at least of their representatives has to be nominated. There can be no two opinions on that. (*Interruptions.*) Please do not disturb me. Let me now proceed. It is not the intention at all to have a nominated 4 P.M. Legislature and then later on have an elected Legislature. That is not the idea at all and I do not think there should be any kind of confusion over this matter. I might also add that Government is not taking the power to form these Legislatures, partly nominated and partly elected. The Constitution merely gives this power to the Parliament. It is an enabling measure, an enabling provision and so it is entirely for the Parliament, if it ever desires, to suggest a law, or the Government can bring forward a law, and it is for the Parliament to accept it or not to accept. So, the Government is not taking any powers at all.

Well, Madam, the last point is about the Zonal Councils to which reference was made by **Shri Mohanlalji Saksena**. He has written to me also and, as he said, he has been pressing for it

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]

for some time past, that the Zonal Councils should be further strengthened and that they should be given statutory power. Well, it is a subject on which, of course, I cannot express any opinion just at present. I am glad to say that these Zonal Councils are undoubtedly useful. They have got no statutory power. I have attended a number of meetings of the Zonal Councils, the Southern Zonal Council, the Western Council and in a few days we are going to have a meeting of the Eastern Zonal Council in Calcutta; and I have found that these Councils are really helpful in discussing jointly matters of common interest and we have been able to solve a number of things on which there have been differences. The States have been discussing amongst themselves and yet they could not come to any conclusion. When we sit round a table and discuss, the Chief Ministers discuss, this has undoubtedly been fruitful. So, the idea of the Zonal Councils is good. Whether we should clothe them with legal authority and legal power is a different matter but sometimes it is also better if without legal authority we can discuss matters amongst ourselves and come to decisions—there is no sense of imposition in it. The State Governments also sometimes feel that we want to impose everything. There is no sense of imposition in this kind of voluntary organisation.

I do not know whether I should say it or not but I think I shall place before the House what is coming up in my mind. I think it might be desirable to consider whether we can have some kind of joint councils or joint bodies where the representatives of these small areas could meet those of neighbouring areas. For example, there could be a joint council consisting of Madras or the neighbouring States and Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe, etc., and we can sit down, discuss common problems and arrive at decisions in matters of general interest like trade, commerce, and also matters relating to the provision of

necessary facilities in regard to transport. These are matters in which if there is some common agency for discussion, it would definitely help. Of course, it is just an idea that has occurred to me. I might say that I have not given thought to it nor has this matter ever been considered in the Ministry. When Shri Mohanlalji Saksena was speaking, this occurred to me and I said that this proposal was worth considering. I have no doubt that if we agree, the smaller States will be benefited definitely by the discussion with the neighbouring bigger States. These could be considered and I would very much like the hon. Members also to give thought to it. If they have any other suggestions to make, I shall welcome them.

I have nothing more to add. I do hope that this Bill will receive the unanimous consent of the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have only one point to ask. The hon. Minister, in the course of his speech, more or less said that he was not in favour of giving a Legislative Assembly to Delhi and so on. You will remember the Prime Minister saying that everything was under consideration. He also said in the other House that the matter was under consideration. Do I take it that the statement of the Minister means that the matter has been closed and it is decided that Delhi will not have a Legislature and responsible government? Has it been closed? Has the last word been uttered? The speech of the Minister was rather disturbing as far as we are concerned, may be many Members opposite also.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I am sorry the hon. Member does not remember what I said while introducing the Bill. I had made it clear that we were considering various proposals in regard to Delhi both as regards the Corporation as well as the administration of Delhi. I had also said that we had definitely drawn up certain proposals but were also waiting for the report of the sub-committee which has been

appointed by the Corporation. I did not want to repeat those things. These matters are under our consideration and we will, when we get time, of course, consult the members of the Congress Party if he has no objection and come to a final decision.

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—183; Noes—Nil.

AYES—183

Abid Ali, Shri.
Agrawal, Shri J. P.
Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin.
Ahmad, Shri Syed.
Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.
Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.
Annapurna Devi Thimmarreddy, Shrimati.
Anwar, Shri N. M.
Arora, Shri Arjun.
Asthana, Shri L. D.
Atwal, Shri Surjit Singh.
Baharul Islam, Shri.
Bansi Lal, 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.
Chinai, Shri Babubhai.

Das, Shri L. N.
Das, Shri N. K.
Dasgupta, Shri T. M.
Dass, Shri Mahabir.
Dave, Shri Rohit M.
Deb, Shri S. C.
Deokinandan Narayan, Shri.
Desai, Shri Khandubhai K.
Desai, Shri Suresh J.
Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
Devaki (Gopidas), Shrimati.
Dharam Prakash, Dr.
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
Doogar, Shri R. S.
Dutt, Shri Krishan.
Dwibedy, Shri Bairagi.
Gaikwad, Shri B. K.
Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
Ghosh, Shri Niren.
Ghosh, Shri Sudhir.
Gilbert, Shri A. C.
Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
Gupta, Shri Maithilisharan.
Gurudev, Shri.
Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.
Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
Joshi, Shri J. H.
Kakati, Shri R. N.
Kalelkar, Kakasaheb.
Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
Kathju, Shri P. N.
Keshvanand, Swami.
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
Khandekar, Shri R. S.
Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
Koya, Shri Muhamed.
Krishna Chandra, Shri.
Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
Kumaran, Shri P. K.
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.

Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Lal, Prof. M. B.
 Limaye, Shri S. K.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahesh Saran, Shri.
 Maiti, Shri N. B.
 Mallik, Shri D. C.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri M.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
 Moideen, Shri M. J. J.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naicker, Shri M. A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Patel, Shri S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.
 Pehdse, Shri Lalji.
 Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.

Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri.
 Rao, Shri B. Ramakrishna.
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
 Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Sahab.
 Seeta Yudhvair, Shrimati.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhub.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sherkhan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Shri Anup.
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.

Singh, Shri D. P.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Syed Mahmud, Shri.
 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.
 Vyas, Shri Jai Narain.
 Warekar, Shri B. V. (Mama).
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—Nil

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 DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2.—Amendment of article 81

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—182; Noes—Nil.

AYES—182

Abid Ali, Shri.
 Agrawal, Shri J. P.
 Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin.
 Ahmad, Shri Syed.
 Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.
 Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati.
 Anwar, Shri N. M.
 Arora, Shri Arjun.
 Asthana, Shri L. D.
 Atwal, Shri Surjit Singh.
 Baharul Islam, Shri.
 Bansi Lal, 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.
 Chinai, Shri Babubhai.
 Das, Shri L. N.
 Das, Shri N. K.
 Dasgupta, Shri T. M.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Dave, Shri Rohit M.
 Deb, Shri S. C.
 Deokinandan Narayan, Shri.
 Desai, Shri Khandubhai K.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri R. M.

Devaki (Gopidas), Shrimati.
 Dharam Prakash, Dr.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dutt, Shri Krishan.
 Dwibedy, Shri Bairagi.
 Gaikwad, Shri B. K.
 Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
 Ghosh, Shri Niren.
 Ghosh, Shri Sudhir.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gupta, Shri Maithilisharan.
 Gurudev, Shri.
 Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Joshi, Shri J. H.
 Kakati, Shri R. N.
 Kalelkar, Kakasaheb,
 Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
 Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
 Kathju, Shri P. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
 Khandekar, Shri R. S.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Koya, Shri Muhamed.
 Krishna Chandra, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kumaran, Shri P. K.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Lal, Prof. M. B.
 Limaye, Shri S. K.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahesh Saran, Shri.
 Maiti, Shri N. B.
 Mallik, Shri D. C.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.

Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri M.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
 Moideen, Shri M. J. J.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naicker, Shri M. A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Patel, Shri S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.
 Pendse, Shri Lalji.
 Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri.
 Rao, Shri B. Ramakrishna.
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.

Reddy, Shri K. V.
Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
Reddy, Shri S Channa.
Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
Sadiq Ali, Shri.
Sahai, Shri Ram
Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
Samuel, Shri M. H.
Santhanam, Shri K.
Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
Sarwate, Shri V. V.
Savnekar, Shri Baba Sahob.
Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
Sethi, Shri P. C.
Shah, Shri K. K.
Shah, Shri M. C.
Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
Sherkhan, Shri.
Shervani, Shri M. R.
Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
Shukla, Shri M. P.
Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
Singh, Shri Anup.
Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
Singh, Sardar Budh.
Singh, Shri D. P.
Singh, Dr. Gopal.
Singh, Shri Mohan.
Singh, Shri Santokh.
Singh, Shri Vijay.
Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan.
Sinha, Shri R. B.
Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
Subba Rao, Dr. A.

Sur, Shri M. M
Syed Mahmud, Shri.
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.
Vyas, Shri Jai Narain.
Warerkar, Shri B. V. (Mama).
Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—Nil

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 the First Schedule

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I move:

1. That at page 1, for clause 3, the following be substituted, namely:—

“3. In the First Schedule to the Constitution, under the heading ‘I. The States’,—

Amendment of the First Schedule.—(a) in the paragraph relating to the territories of the State of Andhra Pradesh, the following shall be added at the end, namely:—

‘and the territories which immediately before the sixteenth day of August, 1962,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

were comprised in the French Establishment in India known as Yanam';

(b) in the paragraph relating to the territories of the State of Kerala, the following shall be added at the end, namely —

'and the territories which immediately before the sixteenth day of August, 1962, were comprised in the French Establishment in India known as Mahe', and

(c) in the paragraph relating to the territories of the State of Madras, the following shall be added at the end namely:—

'and the territories which immediately before the sixteenth day of August, 1962, were comprised in the French Establishments in India known as Pondicherry and Karikal.'".

I have only one thing to say in this connection and the rest will be said by my colleague, Mr P Ramamurti. Now, much has been said about the understanding that was given by the Prime Minister to the French when the matter was under discussion. We cannot accept that position for the simple reason that this understanding was given to the French colonialists and with regard to matters concerning the sovereignty of our country. If a Prime Minister or a Foreign Minister gives an undertaking which impinges on the sovereignty of the country, then, of course, the Parliament has . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: He represented the people of India

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It may be true but there has to be written understanding. I do not know whether you want to treat Parliament

as the AICC. If you do not treat it like that then the constitutional issue should be discussed.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You continue.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has to demonstrate his loyalty to the Prime Minister. It is understandable. But you consider it in all seriousness. Suppose you have given this, why should we accept it? It is a question of internal arrangement, the administration of a part of the country which has been liberated from the French authorities, from the French colonisers at that time. I could have understood if the Prime Minister had said that he had given an undertaking to the people of Pondicherry and so on. That would have some validity.

HON. MEMBERS: He said so.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He did say that, that he has told the people of that area (Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, will you allow me? If all the voices start speaking, my voice will be drowned, I know that. Hon. Members today are trying to drown my voice. I know; I am conscious of my weakness but the point is this. You consider it from a serious angle. If the position was only a kind of an understanding given by the Prime Minister or this Government to the people of Pondicherry that certain things will not be done, then it will stand on an entirely different footing because there will be scope for testing the opinion of the people of Goa within the internal framework of our sovereignty, but this assurance is given to a foreign Power with regard to a question as to how we manage our internal affairs. Now, this is an internal affair and I do not think in international law it is acceptable to any democratic Parliament that an undertaking given to a foreign Power with regard to how one should settle

the internal affairs, administrative or constitutional affairs, of a country should be valid. Therefore, I say with all respect to the Prime Minister—as I said before we would like to uphold his honour in every such matter—that if such an understanding was given at that time it was misconceived; it prejudged the functions of the sovereign body, it prejudged the functions of Parliament. So such an understanding would not be admissible within the framework of our sovereignty. We are, therefore, suggesting that we need not be bothered about what we told the French. After all, they were in the wrong when they were occupying this part of the country as colonial rulers.

The question was proposed.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I just want to make some observations. I do not want to go into the question of this undertaking but our Prime Minister had stated that it is a question of these people having imbibed what he called the French culture. It is only that point that I want to touch upon because what type of French culture these people have imbibed I do not know. There is French culture and French culture. There is the French culture of the French Revolution when people fought for freedom and liberty. There is also the French culture of the colonial regime. As far as I know during the 150 years of French colonial regime there the French Government did not inculcate in those people the culture of the French Revolution. Therefore, it is not that culture that we want to preserve. And as far as I know hardly about one per cent of the people of Pondicherry have been educated in the French language and during the last 150 years this territory has not produced a single French scholar. That is the position. Therefore what is the French culture that these people are supposed to have imbibed and which we are supposed to be interested in preserving? As far as the French language and literature are concerned, there is a

French institute which is being run by the French Government. It is a very good institute; there is research work going on there on Indology. I am all for the Government giving some subsidy, financing it and preserving that institution. We have absolutely no objection to that. Therefore, bringing this question of French culture for the purpose of continuing the arrangement which has been made by the French Government is something which I do not understand.

The only other point I would like to emphasise is this. The Prime Minister was saying that he knows the opinion of the people. As far as I know, it is not the opinion of the people. If what they get from Mr Gubeir and the present set of Ministers is the opinion of the people . . .

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: In the recent elections the people of Pondicherry went to the polls on this issue and they were all defeated.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: On the question whether Pondicherry should form part of Tamil Nad or otherwise let us have a referendum. In the other election this was not the issue. And I would like to tell my friend that 12 out of the 21 elected members from the Pondicherry area have sent telegrams to the Prime Minister that they want to join Tamil Nad. Similarly, the Karikal municipality has passed a resolution. The Mahe Congress Committee has passed a resolution. If these things are not indicative of public opinion I do not know where it is indicated on this specific question. Twelve out of 21 elected members from the Pondicherry area have sent telegrams. I want to know if it is not the people's opinion there. If you want some other method of finding their opinion, tell us what that method is. So, do not push us to the necessity of having an agitation over this matter. This is a matter on which there will be an agitation. That is all what I am saying.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: I do not know why there should be so much excitement about this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No excitement on this side.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Shri Bhupesh Gupta raised the question of the Prime Minister conceding certain matters, something which was, from his point of view, not correct.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: To the French.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: There is nothing like that in the agreement I was just looking into the agreement and I find there is nothing like what Shri Bhupesh Gupta has said. What the Prime Minister has said in this very House on the 6th September, 1955, was entirely different. The difficulty is, Shri Bhupesh Gupta completely forgets what has happened in the past. The House agreed with what the Prime Minister said . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We were not informed at that time.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: . . and after that he wants to completely ignore it. Here is an extract from the speech made by the Prime Minister on 6th September, 1955. He said it was far more important that India and France should come to a peaceful agreement not only because of Pondicherry but because of our future relations and everything. And we gave them, as the House knows, all assurances about the future, about the French culture, about the French language and other things in Pondicherry. Ultimately, we came to an agreement (*Interruptions*). This is a statement made by the Prime Minister in this House and after his speech was made the motion was agreed to or accepted. Now, it is a good thing and it means that his general desire was that this transfer should be as peaceful as possible. Nothing else. We did not want to resort to violence in this matter. In coming to some agreement, he has had to create the proper

atmosphere and it is in that context the Prime Minister said that he would like or the Government of India would like to preserve, for example, the French language.

I say in the agreement itself there is a provision, article 28, in which it is said that the French language shall remain the official language of the Establishments so long as the elected representatives of the people shall not decide otherwise. You may call it French culture or whatever it is, I do not know what the word is. But I am merely referring to one matter, about the language. Two basic things are provided here. These are article 1 and article 2. Article 1 says France cedes to India in full sovereignty the territory and the Establishments of Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe and Yanam. It is the basic thing, complete cession to India of the full sovereignty over these territories. So, there is no question of France coming again into the picture. It is entirely for us and for the people of Pondicherry to make any change as we desire. That follows. Then in article 2, it says that these Establishments will keep the benefit of the special administrative status which was in force prior to 1st November, 1954. Any constitutional changes in this respect, which may be made subsequently, shall be made after ascertaining the wishes of the people.

That is the main point—wishes of the people. So, it is entirely for the people of Pondicherry, Mahe, etc—now becoming a Union Territory—to express their wishes in regard to any change in the set-up in that territory. I do not think that there should be any kind of haste in these matters. We have solved many problems. Given the time and given the necessary consideration, of course, many of these intricate problems could be solved without any conflict or clash. And I personally think, let

Pondicherry develop itself. Let the Centre help them. They will now be getting fresh, new, additional powers and new authority. As and when they develop economically and gather strength, I have no doubt that they will consider later on at what stage they will find it useful to merge with others or a part of it to merge with others. I do not think they will have any special difficulty and it should be left entirely to their wishes. We should give them every opportunity to work in their territory and try to develop it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I put Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's amendment No. 1 to vote.

The question is:

1. That at page 1, for clause 3, the following be substituted, namely:—

"3. In the First Schedule to the Constitution, under the heading 'I. The States',—

Amendment of the First Schedule.—(a) in the paragraph relating to the territories of the State of Andhra Pradesh, the following shall be added at the end, namely:—

'and the territories which immediately before the sixteenth day of August, 1962, were comprised in the French Establishment in India known as Yanam';

(b) in the paragraph relating to the territories of the State of Kerala, the following shall be added at the end, namely:—

'and the territories which immediately before the sixteenth day of August, 1962, were comprised in the French Establishment in India known as Mahe'; and

(c) in the paragraph relating to the territories of the State of Madras, the following shall be added at the end, namely:—

'and the territories which immediately before the sixteenth day of August, 1962, were comprised in the French Establishments in India known as Pondicherry and Karikal.'"

The House was divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—10; Noes—161.

AYES—10

Gaikwad, Shri B. K.
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
Kumaran, Shri P. K.
Limaye, Shri S. K.
Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
Pendse, Shri Lalji.
Ramamurti, Shri P.
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
Subba Rao, Dr. A.

NOES—161

Abid Ali, Shri.
Agrawal, Shri J. P.
Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin.
Ahmad, Shri Syed.
Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.
Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.
Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shri
mati.
Anwar, Shri N. M.
Arora, Shri Arjun.
Asthana, Shri L. D.
Atwal, Shri Surjit Singh.
Baharul Islam, Shri.
Bansi Lal, Shri.
Barooah, Shri Lila Dhar.
Basu, Shri Santosh Kumar.
Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati.
Bharathi, Shrimati K.
Bhargava, Shri M. P.
Chakradhar, Shri A.
Chaturvedi, Shri B. D.
Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh.

Chavda, Shri K. S.
 Chinai, Shri Babubhai.
 Das, Shri L. N.
 Das, Shri N. K.
 Dasgupta, Shri T. M.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Deb, Shri S. C.
 Deokinandan Narayan, Shri.
 Desai, Shri Khandubhai K.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
 Devaki (Gopidas), Shrimati.
 Dharam Prakash, Dr.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dutt, Shri Krishan.
 Dwivedy, Shri Bairagi.
 Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
 Ghosh, Shri Sudhir.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
 Gupta, Shri Maithilisharan.
 Gurudev, Shri.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jaramdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Joshi, Shri J. H.
 Kakati, Shri R. N.
 Kalelkar, Kakasaheb.
 Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
 Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
 Kathju, Shri P. N.
 Keshvapand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
 Koya, Shri Muhamed.
 Krishna Chandra, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahesh Saran, Shri.
 Maiti, Shri N. B.

Mallik, Shri D. C.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Misra, Shri M.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjay.
 Moideen, Shri M. J. J.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naicker, Shri M. A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Patel, Shri S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhanasing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.
 Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri.
 Rao, Shri B. Ramakrishna.
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.

Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvair, Shrimati.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sherkhan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Shri Anup.
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Syed Mahmud, Shri.
 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.
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
 Vijaivargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
 Vyas, Shri Jai Narain.
 Warkerkar, Shri B. V. (Mama).
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—185; Noes—Nil.

AYES—185

Abid Ali, Shri.
 Agrawal, Shri J. P.
 Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin.
 Ahmad, Shri Syed.
 Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.
 Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati.
 Anwar, Shri N. M.
 Arora, Shri Arjun.
 Asthana, Shri L. D.
 Atwal, Shri Surjit Singh.
 Baharul Islam, Shri.
 Bansi Lal, 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.
 Chinai, Shri Babubhai.
 Das, Shri L. N.
 Das, Shri N. K.
 Dasgupta, Shri T. M.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Dave, Shri Rohit M.
 Deb, Shri S. C.
 Deokinandan Narayan, Shri.
 Desai, Shri Khandubhai K.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
 Devaki (Gopidas), Shrimati.
 Dharam Prakash, Dr.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dutt, Shri Krishan.
 Dwibedy, Shri Bairagi.
 Gaikwad, Shri B. K.
 Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
 Ghosh, Shri Niren.
 Ghosh, Shri Sudhir.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gupta, Shri Maithilisharan.
 Gurudev, Shri.
 Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Joshi, Shri J. H.
 Kakati, Shri R. N.
 Kalelkar, Kakasaheb.
 Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
 Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
 Kathju, Shri P. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
 Khandekar, Shri R. S.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Koya, Shri Muhamed.
 Krishna Chandra, Shri

Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kumaran, Shri P. K.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Lal, Prof. M. B.
 Limaye, Shri S. K.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahesh Saran, Shri.
 Maiti, Shri N. B.
 Mallik, Shri D. C.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri M.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
 Moideen, Shri M. J. J.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naicker, Shri M. A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Patel, Shri S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.

Pendse, Shri Lalji.
Pillai, Shri J. S.
Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
Rajagopalan, Shri G.
Ramamurti, Shri P.
Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
Ramesh Chandra, Shri.
Rao, Shri B. Ramakrishna.
Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
Reddy, Shri K. V.
Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
Sadiq Ali, Shri.
Sahai, Shri Ram
Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
Samuel, Shri M. H.
Santhanam, Shri K.
Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
Sarwate, Shri V. V.
Satyacharan, Shri
Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
Sethi, Shri P. C.
Shah, Shri K. K.
Shah, Shri M. C.
Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
Sherkhan, Shri.
Shervani, Shri M. R.
Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
Shukla, Shri M. P.
Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
Singh, Shri Anup.

Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
Singh, Sardar Budh.
Singh, Shri D. P.
Singh, Dr. Gopal.
Singh, Shri Mohan.
Singh, Shri Santokh.
Singh, Shri Vijay.
Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan.
Sinha, Shri R. B.
Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
Subba Rao, Dr. A.
Sur, Shri M. M.
Syed Mahmud, Shri.
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.
Vyas, Shri Jai Narain.
Warerkar, Shri B. V. (Mama).
Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—Nil

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 3 was added to the Bill.

*Clause 4—Insertion of new article
239A*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam,
I move:

2. "That at page 1, line 19, after the words 'Union territories of' the word 'Delhi' be inserted."

3. "That at page 1, line 20, the words 'and Pondicherry' be deleted"

4. "That at page 1,—

(i) in line 21, after the words 'a body', the words 'fully elected' be inserted;

(ii) in lines 21-22, the words 'whether elected or partly nominated and partly elected' be deleted; and

(iii) in line 23, for the word 'or' the word 'and' be substituted."

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:
Madam, I move;

6. "That at page 1, for lines 21 to 23, the following be substituted, namely:—

'(a) a body elected to function as a Legislature for the Union territory, and'."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam,
I move:

7. "That at page 2, line 2, the words 'or both' be deleted."

[This amendment also stood in the name of Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.]

The questions were proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I do not wish to say much because the subject has been dealt with, but only again I shall stress here the supreme need and urgency for granting a Legislative Assembly and responsible government to the people of Delhi. I press it not in any partisan interest or with my eyes on something. I do so because the people of Delhi are entitled to have all the *opportunities of self-government as others have*. I think that if we give

them the opportunities, the morale of the Delhi public and their political life will be improved and heightened, because the Legislature will be functioning in which the representatives of the people will be functioning, responsible to the people, and the people will have a direct share in the administration of the affairs of Delhi. It is only when we are in a position to bring about the integration of the popular efforts on the one hand and the functions of the State on the other can we have the proper development of the political and social life of this great city.

Madam, I do maintain here in all solemnity that I would not have been pressing for it had I thought that this would make things difficult for the capital city of India which is now the focus of the entire world. I press this amendment precisely because I believe that, should the people of Delhi be given the opportunity to handle their affairs in this manner, there will be all round improvement, at least scope for improvement. Now, I would not like to punish the people of Delhi. Parliament is no substitute. We do not have time to discuss the problems of Delhi; even to deal with them in the Question hour. We know that little time is given to discuss matters concerning Delhi. We have only four or five representatives from Delhi, whereas in an Assembly they will have nearly 55 representatives. These are very important matters.

Here I would just draw your attention to the statement made by the President of the Delhi Congress, Mr. Brij Mohan. He is a Congressman whom Mr. Lal Bahadur consults on very many matters. Summing up his reaction he says:

"I need hardly say that we feel a little disappointed over the exclusion of Delhi from the scope of the Constitution Amendment Bill. The Prime Minister made it

clear that Delhi would not be discriminated against."

He went on to say:

"It is for us now to convince the Prime Minister and the Home Minister that the needs of Delhi can be adequately met only if a fully representative administration is set up on the lines of the Union territories."

I do not know what the lines of the Union territories will be but I do stand for a full-fledged Legislative Assembly and responsible government within the framework of the constitutional provisions that obtain or guide the affairs of the States of the Indian Union. That is what I say.

I am extremely sorry that Mr. Lal Bahadur brought in other things. He advised us to co-operate with him in improving the situation in Delhi. I entirely agree with the sentiments expressed, but how to do so is the crux of the matter. One of the best ways to do so is to bring the Assembly into existence and let the democratic process start working with which we can co-operate and which will also help the Central Government. Such an arrangement here will take away nothing from the stature of the metropolitan city, the capital city of India. On the contrary I can tell you that once you have this arrangement the prestige and the stature of this great city of Delhi would be simply enhanced. This is what I say. We would like the Ambassadors and others who come here to see how in a federal or quasifederal structure we have a Parliament functioning side by side with the local authorities organised in a Legislature and a government. We want to demonstrate to the world here in this city that it is possible to combine the local administration and responsible government with the broader administration. Such things are happening in other countries. Why cannot we do so? There will be no parallel, there will be no conflict if we keep the functions clear in our

mind and delimit them in the constitutional and other provisions. There will be no conflict. On the contrary they will be functioning as if with the Constitution working towards building up of the life of Delhi. I do not know why the Home Minister accepts those arguments or gives weight to those arguments. I beseech him that the sooner he grants Delhi the much needed and long awaited Legislative Assembly and responsible government the more it will bring credit to him, to the Central Government, to the people of Delhi, to the whole country, and this will also open new vistas for arranging the affairs of Delhi in the best possible way to the satisfaction of all.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY. Madam, I raised two points in the debate. The hon. Minister gave clarification, but I am afraid the clarification was not very clear to me. The first point I raised was that the nominated elements were not necessary in the Assembly. He said that they were necessary because certain tribal elements or interests might require special consideration. In this connection may I point out that the election law contains radical provisions to deal with such special interest? There is reservation provided for the Scheduled Castes and Tribes. So, in view of this provision or safeguard provided in the election law, this provision in the Bill is not necessary. If you retain this provision, it would only mean that the Assembly would not only consist of elected members but also nominated members. And it will take away the element of election, the element of representation and the element of self-rule. Therefore, I raise this objection while speaking on this Bill.

Secondly, my point is that the Bill envisages the setting up of a Council of Ministers without even a Legislature or, in the alternative, a Legislature without a Council of Ministers. This anachronism, this anomaly, has to be removed. Therefore, I propose in my amendments that certain words 'partly nominated' be omitted or deleted and that the

Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy] s 'or both' also be deleted, by making the whole provision rational and consistent.

want the hon. Minister to clarify the two points sufficiently so that if I think it proper, I may withdraw my amendments.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nausher Ali. You may speak now.

SHRI SYED NAUSHER ALI (West Bengal): Madam there is an amendment to the effect that the words "whether elected or partly nominated and partly elected" be deleted. I have been throughout my political life a supporter of election, never a supporter of nomination. I do not understand what object can there possibly be for nomination where there is scope for election. In a democratic set-up you bring in certain nominated elements. These nominated elements represent not the people, they represent a particular group or a particular class. In a democratic set-up, it is inconsistent, in my humble opinion. I, therefore, support the amendment and I say that all the elements should be elected and not a single member should be nominated. That is all that I have to say.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Well, Madam, I have nothing much to say about Delhi. I have had my say and I can once again tell the House that we will have the necessary consultation among ourselves and see what is best or what could be the set-up or pattern for Delhi both in regard to the Corporation and with regard to other matters. It cannot be denied that even the Corporation and local bodies are democratic institutions. They are elected by the people. And in fact, it is from the local bodies that really the democratic or parliamentary system begins. They have been a training ground. Some of us who had been in the local boards realised the benefits we got while we were in the local bodies. I have also had the

occasion of being a member of the Allahabad Municipal Corporation for about seven years and it is from that that I learnt something about the administration and about the working of the democratic institutions. So, it should not be felt otherwise. If a picture is drawn up of a Corporation or a Board—as of no consequence, we are not doing a service to the whole institution. It is, as I have said, the first step towards democratic organisation.

As regards the other matters, of course, we will definitely give opportunities to the representatives of the people in Delhi to associate themselves, and give them a sense of feeling that they are in a position to participate in the development work and other activities of the Delhi State.

As regards nominated members, I am afraid Shri Gurupada Swamy has not fully caught my point. So far as this provision is concerned, as I said at the beginning, this exactly follows the provision of the old article 240. And it was discussed threadbare during the Constituent Assembly days. And after a good deal of deliberation, this finds a place, this old article 240 finds a place, in the Constitution. As it was repealed, we have just copied it out and incorporated it in this Bill.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: You had that article in the Lok Sabha.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: As I said in the beginning, it was in deference to the wishes of the Members of that House, and I also felt somewhat convinced. I thought that the idea of having a totally nominated body or a Legislature might be given up. But in so far as partly nominated and partly elected body is concerned, I do not see why there should be any objection. As regards a Legislature without a Council of Ministers or a Council of Ministers without a Legislature, we are not going to do it. I mean nothing of that kind is going to

happen. I do not think that Parliament will ever pass such a law. If Parliament does it—it is supreme—the Government can do nothing. If in a particular State the administration is suspended or if there is President's rule or any other kind of change occurs, and in that case, if Parliament desires that there may be a special kind of set-up, it will be entirely for Parliament to consider and decide it and we will act according to the wishes of Parliament. But for the time being, just at the present moment, not in the immediate future, if everything functions well, we have not the slightest desire that there should be any Legislature without a Council of Ministers or that there will be a Council of Ministers or Cabinet without a Legislature. So, this is not a practical matter to be considered at the present moment, and as I said, the power entirely lies in the hands of Parliament. No one knows what emergency might arise or what situation might arise, and in that case, this provision might come to our help.

As regards nominations, I might tell him that it is true that there is provision for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. But there are many Scheduled Tribes. In Manipur itself, there are the Kukis, the Khasis, there are the Paites and the Mahars—so many tribes—and everyone feels that it is sufficiently important. We do not want to exclude them. Suppose some of the tribals have come in a majority and some are left out. Then what are we to do? Will it not be advisable to give representation to those sections also? In these smaller areas, you have to look after the interests of the smaller people and the smaller sections. They are in the growth. We have to give them complete satisfaction, and, as the hon. Member desires, give a feeling of a sense of participation to all of them, so far as we can. I have myself seen in Manipur that the Mahars are equally important, and the Kukis are equally important, and if they do not get representation in the Legislature, we can give it to them

through nomination. So, in this case, it is good that we have this provision and, if necessary, exercise it. I have nothing more to say.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:
Madam, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

**Amendment No. 6 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

2. "That at page 1, line 13, after the words 'Union territories of' the word 'Delhi' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: †Amendment No. 3 is barred.

The question is:

4. "That at page 1,—

(i) in line 21 after the words 'a body,' the words 'fully elected' be inserted;

(ii) in lines 21-22, the words 'whether elected or partly nominated and partly elected' be deleted; and

(iii) in line 23, for the word 'or' the word 'and' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

7. "That at page 2, line 2, the words 'or both' be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

*For text of amendment, see Col. 5713 *supra*.

†For text of amendment, see col. 5713 *supra*.

Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri M.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
 Moideen, Shri M. J. J.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naicker, Shri M. A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Patel, Shri S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.
 Pendse, Shri Lalji.
 Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri.
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.

Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
 Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvair, Shrimati.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sher Khan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Shri Anup.
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Shri D. P.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.

Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Joshi, Shri J. H.
 Kakati, Shri R. N.
 Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
 Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
 Kathju, Shri P. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
 Khandekar, Shri R. S.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Koya, Shri Muhamed.
 Krishna Chandra, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kumaran, Shri P. K.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Lal, Prof. M. B.
 Limaye, Shri S. K.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahesh Saran, Shri.
 Maiti, Shri N. B.
 Mallik, Shri D. C.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri M.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
 Moideen, Shri M. J. J.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.

Naicker, Shri M. A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Patel, Shri S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.
 Pendse, Shri Lalji.
 Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri.
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
 Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.

Satyacharan, Shri.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sherkhan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Shri Anup.
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Shri D. P.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Syed Mahmud, Shri.
 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.

Vyas, Shri Jai Narain.
 Warerkar, Shri B. V. (Mama).
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—Nil

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.

Clause 6—Amendment of the Fourth Schedule

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are two amendments. Amendment No. 10 is a negative one. Amendment No. 11 stands in the name of Mr. Mani. Mr. Mani.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, I beg to move:

11. "That at page 2, for lines 22 to 25, the following be substituted, namely:—

'(a) after entry 20, the entries "21. Goa, Daman and Diu....1. 22. Pondicherry....1" shall be inserted;

(b) for the figures "225", the figures "227" shall be substituted.'

The question was proposed.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, I shall be very brief in explaining the purport of my amendment. According to this amendment Goa, Daman and Diu should be given a seat in the Rajya Sabha. Pondicherry gets a seat; Manipur gets a seat; Tripura gets a seat—it is the Fourth Schedule I refer to. When once we have a democratically-elected Legislature, it is only proper that the area comprising Goa, Daman and Diu should get a place in the Rajya Sabha. What has Goa, Daman

and Diu done to be denied the privilege of sending a representative to the Rajya Sabha? Madam, it has been suggested that since Goa has got two seats in the Lok Sabha, it need not have a seat in the Rajya Sabha. Now, the moment it becomes a Union Territory with a Legislature it attracts the provisions of article 249 of the Constitution. Under that article Parliament has got the right to legislate on a matter relating to the State List. Under that article this House passed a resolution some months ago creating some All-India Services. There is a Constitutional Lacuna if no representation is given to Goa, Daman and Diu, and I think it will greatly strengthen our position if we place Goa, Daman and Diu on a par with Pondicherry. I should like to hear the hon. Minister's views on this subject.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: If this House is the House of States and if Goa is going to be a State, then it is obvious that that State must be represented here. It has got to be. Either Goa is a State or it is not a State, and if you are making it a State, then that State must be represented in this House. That is all I am saying.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the Home Minister to say anything? And before the Home Minister begins, since there is a fixed discussion at 5 P.M., with the permission of the House we shall put it off for a few minutes, till we go through this Bill. The Home Minister.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Madam, what Mr. A. D. Mani has pointed out is relevant to an extent, but I might inform him and the House that the representatives of Goa, who came and discussed this matter here, were of the opinion that they should get two seats in the Lok Sabha. It was suggested to them that as in 5 P.M. other Union Territories, Pondicherry for example, one seat may be given in the Rajya Sabha and one in the Lok Sabha. But they

were rather particular to have two seats in the Lok Sabha. So, it was agreed to. Now, if we give them two seats in the Lok Sabha and one seat in the Rajya Sabha, this will mean undue weightage.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Tripura has got two seats in the Lok Sabha and one in the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: It was given at a time when there were no Legislatures. That fact has to be remembered. We have increased the number of the Members of Parliament in this House as well as in the Lok Sabha. For Delhi there are five Members. Delhi was not entitled to this number of seats but we have made it a special case because there are no Legislatures. Similarly, about Manipur and Tripura, as there were no Legislatures an additional weightage was given. Now, these are all going to have Legislatures.

Therefore, Madam, we did exactly according to . . .

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): May I suggest to the hon. Home Minister that one of the twelve nominated seats may be, by convention, given to Goa.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You want another Lt. Governor here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Home Minister finish.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Anyhow, it was done according to their wishes. But if the Goan representatives so desire, if they want to have any change in this, well, the matter could certainly be considered. But at the present moment . . .

SHRI ANUP SINGH (Punjab): On a point of clarification.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But the Home Minister has not finished. Let him finish.

Dave, Shri Rohit M.
Dwibedy, Shri Bairagi.
Gaikwad, Shri B. K.
Ghosh, Shri Niren.
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.
Khandekar, Shri R. S.
Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
Kumaran, Shri P. K.
Lal, Prof. M. B.
Limaye, Shri S. K.
Mani, Shri A. D.
Misra, Shri Lokanath.
Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
Patel, Shri S.
Pendse, Shri Lalji.

Ramamurti, Shri P.
Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
Singh, Shri D. P.
Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan.
Subba Rao, Dr. A.
Vajpayee, Shri A. B.

NOES—157

Abid Ali, Shri
Agrawal, Shri J. P.
Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin.
Ahmad, Shri Syed.
Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.
Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.
Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy,
Shrimati.
Anwar, Shri N. M.
Arora, Shri Arjun.
Asthana, Shri L. D.
Atwal, Shri Surjit Singh.
Baharul Islam, Shri.
Bansi Lal, Shri.
Barooah, Shri Lila Dhar.
Basu, Shri Santosh Kumar.
Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati.
Bharathi, Shrimati K.
Chakradhar, Shri A.
Chatterji, Shri J. C.
Chaturvedi, Shri B. D.
Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh.
Chavda, Shri K. S.
Chinai, Shri Babubhai.
Das, Shri L. N.
Das, Shri N. K.
Dasgupta, Shri T. M.
Dass, Shri Mahabir.
Deb, Shri S. C.
Deokinandan Narayan, Shri.
Desai, Shri Khandubhai K.
Desai, Shri Suresh J.
Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
Devaki (Gopidas), Shrimati.

Dharam Prakash, Dr.
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
Doogar, Shri R. S.
Dutt, Shri Krishan.
Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
Ghosh, Shri Sudhir.
Gilbert, Shri A. C.
Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
Gupta, Shri Maithilisharan.
Gurudev, Shri.
Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
Joshi, Shri J. H.
Kakati, Shri R. N.
Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
Kathju, Shri P. N.
Keshvanand, Swami.
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
Koya, Shri Muhamed.
Krishna Chandra, Shri.
Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
Lingam, Shri N. M.
Lohani, Shri I. T.
Mahesh Saran, Shri.
Maiti, Shri N. B.
Mallik, Shri D. C.
Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
Mathen, Shri Joseph.
Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati.
Mehta, Shri M. M.
Mishra, Shri S.
Misra, Shri M.
Mitra, Shri P. C.
Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
Mohanty, Shri Dhanajoy.
Moideen, Shri M. J. J.
Muhammad Ishaque, Shri

Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naicker, Shri M. A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.
 Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri.
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
 Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.

Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sherkhan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Shri Anup.
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Syed Mahmud, Shri.
 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.
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Venkateswara Rao, Shri N.
 Vijaivargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
 Vyas, Shri Jai Narain.
 Warerkar, Shri B. V. (Mama).
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

The motion was negatived.

Mathen, Shri Joseph
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S
 Misra, Shri M
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy
 Moideen, Shri M J J
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V T.
 Naicker, Shri M A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
 Neki Ram, Shri
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S
 Patel, Shri S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T S
 Pattanayak, Shri B C.
 Pawar, Shri D Y
 Pendse, Shri Lalji.
 Pillai, Shri J S
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota
 Rajagopalan, Shri G
 Ramamurti, Shri P
 Ramaswamy, Shri K S
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand
 Ramesh Chandra Shri
 Rao, Shri B Ramakrishna
 Rao, Shri V C Kesava
 Ray, Dr Nihar Ranjan
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna
 Reddi, Shri J C Nagi
 Reddy, Shri K. V

Reddy, Shri N Narotham
 Reddy, Shri N Sri Rama
 Reddy, Shri S Channa.
 Reddy, Shri M Govinda
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda
 Reddy, Shri K V Raghunatha
 Rohatgi, Dr Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri
 Sahai, Shri Ram
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
 Samuel, Shri M H.
 Santhanam, Shri K
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal
 Sarwate, Shri V V
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Savnekar Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shah, Shri K K
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari
 Sharma, Shri L Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sherkhan, Shri
 Shervani, Shri M R
 Shetty, Shri B P Basappa
 Shukla, Shri M P.
 Siddhu, Dr M M S.
 Singh, Shri Anup
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budh
 Singh, Shri D P
 Singh, Dr Gopal
 Singh, Shri Mohan
 Singh, Shri Santokh
 Singh, Shri Vijay
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad
 Sinha, Shri B K P
 Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan
 Sinha, Shri R B
 Sinha, Shri R P N
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof R D.
 Subba Rao, Dr A

Sur, Shri M. M.
 Syed Mahmud, Shri.
 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.
 Vyas, Shri Jai Narain
 Warerkar, Shri B. V. (Mama).
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—Nil

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 6 was added to the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is:

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Ayes—182, Noes—Nil

AYES—182

Abid Ali, Shri
 Agrawal, Shri J. P.
 Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin
 Ahmad Shri Syed
 Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.
 Anis Kidwai, Shrimati
 Annapurna Devi Thummareddy, Shrimati
 Anwar, Shri N. M.

Arora, Shri Arjun.
 Asthana, Shri L. D.
 Atwal, Shri Surjit Singh.
 Baharul Islam Shri.
 Bansal Lal, 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.
 Chinai, Shri Babubhai
 Das Shri L. N.
 Das, Shri N. K.
 Dasgupta, Shri T. M.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir
 Dave, Shri Rohit M.
 Deb, Shri S. C.
 Deokinandan Narayan, Shri.
 Desai, Shri Khandubhai K.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
 Devaki (Gopidas), Shrimati.
 Dharam Prakash, Dr.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dutt, Shri Krishan
 Dwivedy, Shri Bairagi
 Gaikwad, Shri B. K.
 Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
 Ghosh, Shri Niren
 Ghosh, Shri Sudhir.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gupta, Shri Maithilisharan
 Gurudev, Shri
 Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.

Iyer, Shri N Ramakrishna
 Janamdass Daulatram, Shri
 Joshi Shri J H
 Kakati, Shri R N
 Kalelkar, Kakasaheb
 Karmarkar, Shri D P
 Kasliwal, Shri N C
 Kathju, Shri P N
 Keshvanand, Swami
 Khan Shri Akbar Ali
 Khan, Shri Piri Mohammed
 Khandekar, Shri R S
 Khobaragade, Shri B D
 Koya, Shri Muhamed
 Krishna Chandra Shri
 Kumaran, Shri P K
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati
 Lal, Prof M B
 Limaye, Shri S K
 Lingam, Shri N M
 Mahesh Saran, Shri
 Maity, Shri N B
 Mallik, Shri D C
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal
 Mani, Shri A D
 Mathen, Shri Joseph
 Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati
 Mehta Shri M M
 Mishra, Shri S
 Misra, Shri Lokanath
 Misra, Shri M
 Mitra Shri P C
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy
 Moideen, Shri M J J
 Muhammad Ishaque Shri
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri
 Nagpure, Shri V T
 Naicker, Shri M A M
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati
 Narasimha Rao Dr K L
 Neki Ram, Shri

Pande, Shri C D
 Pande, Shri T
 Parmanand, Dr Shrimati Seeta
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S
 Patel, Shri S
 Pathak, Shri G S
 Patil Shri P S
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T S
 Pattanayak, Shri B C
 Pawar, Shri D Y
 Pendse, Shri Lalji
 Pillai, Shri J S
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota
 Rajagopalan, Shri G
 Ramamurti, Shri P
 Ramaswamy, Shri K S
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri
 Rao Shri B Ramakrishna
 Rao, Shri V C Kesava
 Ray Dr Nihar Ranjan
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna
 Reddi, Shri J C Nagi
 Reddy, Shri K V
 Reddy, Shri N Narotham
 Reddy, Shri N Sri Rama
 Reddy, Shri S Channa
 Reddy, Shri M Govinda
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda
 Reddy, Shri K V Raghunatha.
 Rohatgi, Dr Jawaharlal
 Sadiq Ali, Shri
 Sahai, Shri Ram
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal
 Samuel, Shri M H
 Santhanam Shri K
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal
 Sarwate, Shri V V
 Satyacharan, Shri
 Savnekar Shri Baba Saheb

Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Sethi, Shri P C
 Shah, Shri K K
 Shah, Shri M C
 Shakoori, Moulana Abdul.
 Shanta Vasisht Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram
 Sherkhan, Shri
 Shervani, Shri M R
 Shetty, Shri B P Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M P
 Siddhu, Dr M M S
 Singh, Shri Anup
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap
 Singh Sardar Budh
 Singh, Shri D P
 Singh, Dr Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan
 Singh, Shri Santokh
 Singh, Shri Vijay
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad
 Sinha, Shri B K P.
 Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan
 Sinha, Shri R B
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof R D.
 Subba Rao, Dr A.
 Sur, Shri M M.
 Syed Mahmud, Shri
 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.
 Vijavargiya, Shri Gopikrishna.
 Vyas, Shri Jai Narain.
 Warkerkar, Shri B V (Mama)
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—Nil

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 7 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—185; Noes—Nil.

AYES—185

Abid Ali, Shri
 Agrawal, Shri J P.
 Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin.
 Ahmad, Shri Syed.
 Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C
 Anis Kidwai, Shrimati
 Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati.
 Anwar, Shri N M
 Arora, Shri Arjun.
 Asthana, Shri L D
 Atwal, Shri Surjit Singh.
 Baharul Islam, Shri.
 Bansi Lal, 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
 Chinnai, Shri Babubhai.

Das, Shri L. N.
 Das, Shri N. K.
 Dasgupta, Shri T. M.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir.
 Dave, Shri Rohit M.
 Deb, Shri S. C.
 Deokinandan Narayan, Shri.
 Desai, Shri Khandubhai K.
 Desai, Shri Suresh J.
 Deshmukh, Shri R. M.
 Devaki (Gopidas), Shrimati.
 Dharam Prakash, Dr.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Doogar, Shri R. S.
 Dutt, Shri Krishan.
 Dwibedy, Shri Bairagi.
 Gaikwad, Shri B. K.
 Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.
 Ghosh, Shri Niren.
 Ghosh, Shri Sudhir.
 Gilbert, Shri A. C.
 Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
 Gupta, Shri Maithilisharan.
 Gurudev, Shri.
 Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.
 Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.
 Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri
 Joshi, Shri J. H.
 Kakati, Shri R. N.
 Kalelkar, Kakasaheb.
 Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
 Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
 Kathju, Shri P. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
 Khandekar, Shri R. S.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Koya, Shri Muhamed.
 Krishna Chandra, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.

Kumaran, Shri P. K.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Lal, Prof. M. B.
 Limaye, Shri S. K.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahesh Saran, Shri
 Maiti, Shri N. B.
 Mallik, Shri D. C.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri M.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
 Moideen, Shri M. J. J.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naicker, Shri M. A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Patel, Shri S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Pawar, Shri D. Y.
 Pendse, Shri Lalji.

Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri.
 Rao, Shri B. Ramakrishna.
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
 Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri.
 Sahai, Shri Ram.
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.
 Satyacharan, Shri.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvair, Shrimati.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sherkhan, Shri
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shetty, Shri B. B. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Shri Anup.
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.

Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Shri D. P.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Syed Mahmud. Shri.
 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.
 Vyas, Shri Jai Narain.
 Warekar, Shri B. V. (Mama).
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—Nil

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

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have two suggestions to make. (*Interruptions.*) Let the country know that they do not hear me. One suggestion is that the Home Minister should consult the representatives of Tripura, Manipur and Himachal Pradesh before formulating the consequential Bill in order to have the constitutional arrangements under this Bill. It is essential that they be consulted before the Bill is formulated. Secondly, with regard to Pondicherry and Delhi, not only the supporters of the hon. Home Minister but others, especially of the Opposition, should be consulted at every stage so that even in the formulation of the policy and the measures, he can have our views and we have an opportunity of explaining to him what we consider to be the right arrangement. This is all that I have to say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is;

"That the Bill be passed."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—185; Noes—Nil.

AYES—185

Abid Ali, Shri.

Agrawal, Shri J. P.

Ahmad, Shri Ansaruddin.

Ahmad, Shri Syed.

Ammanna Raja, Shrimati C.

Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.

Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy,
Shrimati.

Anwar, Shri N. M.

Arora, Shri Arjun.

Asthana, Shri L. D.

Atwal, Shri Surjit Singh.

Baharul Islam, Shri

Bansi Lal, 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.

Chinai, Shri Babubhai.

Das, Shri L. N.

Das, Shri N. K.

Dasgupta, Shri T. M.

Dass, Shri Mahabir.

Dave, Shri Rohit M.

Deb, Shri S. C.

Deokinandan Narayan, Shri.

Desai, Shri Khandubhai K.

Desai, Shri Suresh J.

Deshmukh, Shri R. M.

Devaki (Gopidas), Shrimati.

Dharam Prakash, Dr.

Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.

Doogar, Shri R. S.

Dutt, Shri Krishan.

Dwibedy, Shri Bairagi.

Gaikwad, Shri B. K.

Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan.

Ghosh, Shri Niren.

Ghosh, Shri Sudhir.

Gibert, Shri A. C.

Gopalakrishnan, Shri R.

Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.

Gupta, Shri Maithilisharan.

Gurudev, Shri.

Gurupada Swamy, Shri M. S.

Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal.

Iyer, Shri N. Ramakrishna.
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
 Joshi, Shri J. H.
 Kakati, Shri R. N.
 Kalelkar, Kakasaheb
 Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
 Kasliwal, Shri N. C.
 Kathju, Shri P. N.
 Keshvanand, Swami.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Khan, Shri Pir Mohammed.
 Khandekar, Shri R. S.
 Khobaragade, Shri B. D.
 Koya, Shri Muhamed.
 Krishna Chandra, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri B. T.
 Kumaran, Shri P. K.
 Kurre, Shri Dayaldas.
 Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati.
 Lal, Prof. M. B.
 Limaye, Shri S. K.
 Lingam, Shri N. M.
 Lohani, Shri I. T.
 Mahesh Saran, Shri.
 Maiti, Shri N. B.
 Mallik, Shri D. C.
 Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal.
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mathen, Shri Joseph.
 Maya Devi Chetty, Shrimati.
 Mehta, Shri M. M.
 Mishra, Shri S.
 Misra, Shri Lokanath.
 Misra, Shri M.
 Mitra, Shri P. C.
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Mohammad Ibrahim, Hafiz.
 Mohanty, Shri Dhananjoy.
 Moideen, Shri M. J. J.
 Muhammad Ishaque, Shri.
 Nafisul Hasan, Shri.
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Naicker, Shri M. A. M.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati.
 Narasimha Rao, Dr. K. L.

Nausher Ali, Shri Syed.
 Neki Ram, Shri
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pande, Shri T.
 Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta.
 Patel, Shri Dahyabhai V.
 Patel, Shri Maganbhai S.
 Patel, Shri S.
 Pathak, Shri G. S.
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Patil, Shri Sonusing Dhansing.
 Pattabiraman, Shri T. S.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Pawar, D. Y.
 Pendse, Shri Lalji.
 Pillai, Shri J. S.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaul, Shri Shiva Nand.
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri.
 Rao, Shri B. Ramakrishna.
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava.
 Ray, Dr. Nihar Ranjan.
 Ray, Shri Ramprasanna.
 Reddi, Shri J. C. Nagi.
 Reddy, Shri K. V.
 Reddy, Shri N. Narotham.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sri Rama.
 Reddy, Shri S. Channa.
 Reddy, Shri M. Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Rohatgi, Dr. Jawaharlal.
 Sadiq Ali, Shri
 Sahai, Shri Ram
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Santhanam, Shri K.
 Saraogi, Shri Pannalal.
 Sarwate, Shri V. V.

Satyacharan, Shri.
 Savnekar, Shri Baba Saheb.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul.
 Shanta Vasisht, Kumari.
 Sharma, Shri L. Lalit Madhob.
 Sharma, Shri Madho Ram.
 Sher Khan, Shri.
 Shervani, Shri M. R.
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.
 Singh, Shri Anup.
 Singh, Thakur Bhanu Pratap.
 Singh, Sardar Budh.
 Singh, Shri D. P.
 Singh, Dr. Gopal.
 Singh, Shri Mohan.
 Singh, Shri Santokh.
 Singh, Shri Vijay.
 Sinha, Shri Awadeshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri B. K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Ganga Sharan.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri R. P. N.
 Sinha Dinkar, Prof. R. D.
 Subba Rao, Dr. A.
 Sur, Shri M. M.
 Syed Mahmud, Shri.
 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
 Vyas, Shri Jai Narain.
 Warerkar, Shri B. V. (Mama).
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

NOES—Nil

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.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION RE BRITISH INDIA CORPORATION LTD., KANPUR

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is a Half-an-Hour Discussion. After this discussion there are two other Bills that we must finish this evening.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Why should we finish to-day? We can have them tomorrow morning.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): I have a submission to make. Some of us have got plans to leave after six. We would like the House to adjourn and the other Bills should stand over till the next Session.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): Yes, heavens are not going to fall.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am in favour of these Bills being passed but I want them to be passed tomorrow morning. Why not? The Half-an-Hour Discussion can take place. Why should we wait longer? Tomorrow morning is there and no other business is there.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House must adjourn *sine die* today and therefore the two other Bills will be taken up after the Half-an-Hour Discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then two hours will have to be given. Two