

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA**THE INDIAN SUCCESSION
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962**

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"I am directed to inform Rajya Sabha that the Indian Succession (Amendment) Bill, 1961, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 30th November, 1961, has been passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 28th March, 1962, with the following amendments:—

Enacting Formula

- (1) Page 1, line 1,—
for 'Twelfth Year' substitute
'Thirteenth Year'.

Clause 1

- (2) Page 1, line 4,—
for 1961' substitute '1962'.

Clause 4

- <3) Page 1, line 20,—
for '1961' substitute '1962'.

2. I am, therefore, to return herewith the said Bill in accordance with the provisions of rule 121 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha with the request that the concurrence of Rajya Sabha to the said amendments be communicated to Lok Sabha."

Sir, I lay the Bill, as passed by the Lok Sabha, on the Table.

**ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR
CONSIDERATION OF THE
APPROPRIATION (RAILWAYS)
VOTE ON ACCOUNT BILL, 1962**

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that under rule 162 (2) of the Rule* of Procedure and Conduct

of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted 30 minutes for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return of the Appropriation (Railways) Vote on Account Bill, 1962, by the Rajya Sabha, including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any, to the Bill.

SHEI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, some papers in Tamilnad have reported that I had withdrawn, what they call, my resolution to change the name of Madras State into Tamilnad. This is not at all true. In the first place, there was no resolution standing in my name. I have, however, a Constitution (Amendment) Bill to amend Schedule I of the Constitution to change the name of Madras into Tamilnad. This Bill is pending and I proposed to move it last time on the 23rd of this month. With your permission I did not take it up because I had some other business to take up. There is no truth in the report, and let the *Indian Express* in particular be asked by the Secretariat to give a correction in this respect.

**THE UNION DUTIES OF EXCISE
(DISTRIBUTION) BILL
1962—continued**

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, while the House adjourned yesterday, I was submitting that the present constitutional arrangements for federal assistance to the various States have not pleased anybody. States which are industrially advanced feel that their needs and requirements, their efficiency in managing their affairs and their efforts in mobilising their resources are not fully appreciated in these arrangements, while those States that are economically backward feel that their needs of development and the fact that they have got a high percentage of weaker sections in their community are also not fully realised in these present arrangements. In this way there is a lot of dissatisfaction among all the States regarding the