

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: I need not say anything. I think that he will receive tomorrow a copy of what I have said and he will be convinced that there was nothing like that for which he should have wasted the time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He only mentioned facts. That is all, nothing reflecting on the powers of this House.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: There was no reflection like that, but his remarks implied that since the House that has already passed this rule 19 did not see any breach of privilege, therefore it followed that this House also should not think that there was any breach of privilege. If there is a breach of the privilege of the House I am very jealous, I am very watchful about it and I will certainly raise a point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House concurs in the following motion adopted by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd August, 1956, namely:—

That the following sub-rule be substituted for sub-rule (3) of rule 19 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955, as further amended by the Notification S.R.O. No. 1161, dated the 30th April, 1956, namely:—

'(3) For the purpose of calculating the number of members of a joint family under sub-rule (2), a person who on the relevant date—

(a) was less than eighteen years of age; or

(b) was a lineal descendant in the male line of another living member of the joint family ;

shall be excluded.

Provided that where a member of a joint family had died during the period commencing on the fourteenth day of August, 1947 and ending on the relevant date leaving behind on the relevant date all or any of the following heirs, namely—

(a) a widow or widows;

(b) a son or sons (whatever the age of such son or sons);

but no lineal ascendant in the male line, then, all such heirs shall notwithstanding anything contained in this rule, be reckoned as one member of the joint family'."

The motion was adopted.

5 P.M.

THE HINDU ADOPTIONS AND MAINTENANCE BILL, 1956.

THE MINISTER FOR LEGAL AFFAIRS (SHRI H. V. PATASKAR) : Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill to amend and codify the law relating to adoptions and maintenance among Hindus be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members ; 15 members from this House, namely:—

SHRI B. M. Gupte,

SHRI T. D. Pustake,

SHRI P. N. Sapru,

Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand,

Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam,

Shri Mahesh Saran,

Shri Purna Chandra Sharma,

Shri Indra Vidyavachaspati,

Shri C. L. Varma,

Shri S.'Channa Reddy,

Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti,

Shri H. C. Dasappa,

Shri Makkineni Basavapunnaiiah,

Shri Satyapriya Banerjee, and

Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal;

and 30 members from the Lok Sabha;

that in order to constitute a meeting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that in other respect, the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Select Committee shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Chairman may make ;

that this House recommends to the Lok Sabha that the Lok Sabha do join in the said Joint Committee

and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by the Lok Sabha to the Joint Committee; and

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the last day of the first week of the next session."

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL (Pepsu): Sir, I would seek your permission to move my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the Minister finish his speech.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: Sir, the Hindu Code, as revised by the Select Committee in 1948, was divided into the following parts:—

- Part I — Preliminary
- Part II — Marriage and Divorce
- Part III — Adoption
- Part IV — Minority and Guardianship
- Part V — Joint Family and Coparcenary.
- Part VI — Women's property
- Part VII — Succession
- Part VIII — Maintenance, and
- Part IX — Miscellaneous

We have already covered Marriage and Divorce, Minority and Guardianship, Succession and Women's property in the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 and the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, 1956. This last Act has gone to the President for assent. The remaining Parts to be dealt with are the Joint Family and Coparcenary, Adoptions and Maintenance. With respect to Joint Family and Coparcenary Property, we have already conferred on women a right to share in joint family properties and for the time being that is sufficient. The question whether joint family as such should be continued or otherwise can be considered later in due time.

The only other Parts of the Hindu Code to be dealt with are, therefore. Adoptions and Maintenance, and the present Bill deals with them. Before I go to the discussion of the provisions of this Bill, I would like to urge upon the attention of hon. Members that in view of the passing of the Succession Act it has become almost necessary that

with respect to the law relating to maintenance and adoptions, it should be codified at the earliest moment and hence I am anxious that, in order that there might be some sort of a coordinated attempt at least so far as this is concerned, these two Parts of the Hindu Code should be dealt with.

Now, clauses 1, 2 and 4 of Chapter I of this Bill are identical with similar provisions made in the Acts relating to succession, marriage and minority and guardianship of Hindu children. All of them have already been considered at length at the time of the consideration of each one of those Acts and I do not think I need say anything about them.

Clause 3 deals with definitions. The definition of "custom and usage" follows the definition in the other Hindu Acts.

The definition of "maintenance" is self-explanatory. I do not think it requires any further explanation. It may, however, be pointed out that in the definition of this expression

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Would it not be better that the hon. Minister should explain his motion fully the next day? It is not right that on such an important matter he should deliver a part of his speech today and a part on another day.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to sit till six o'clock.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: In the definition of "maintenance" in the Rau Committee's report the words "including the value of gifts and presents to her or to the bridegroom on the occasion" were inserted at the end of clause 3(b) (ii). These words were omitted by the Select Committee in 1948 for the obvious that they seemed to encourage dowry reason. They have also been omitted from the present definition.

Clauses 5 to 17 contained in Chapter II deal with the law of adoption amongst Hindus.

With the passing of the Hindu Succession Act, which provides for a share to a daughter along with a share to a son, it is but natural that we should allow a person to adopt not only a son but a daughter also if it is so desired. The present Hindu Law of adoption does not specifically provide for the adoption of a daughter and the original Hindu Code

[Shri H. V. Pataskar.]

Bill provided only for the adoption of a son. Not only that but the said Bill in clause 63 as passed by the Select Committee of the provisional Parliament provided that "no female shall be adopted by or to any male or female Hindu". With this main difference these clauses follow similar provisions made in the original Hindu Code Bill as considered by the Select Committee of the provisional Parliament.

As hon. Members are aware, we have abolished what is known as the limited estate of Hindu women. Hereafter therefore any widow, who inherits the property of her husband or who has already inherited the property of her husband and is in possession of the same is absolute owner of such property. A necessary change has therefore, to be made with respect to the question of vesting and divesting of an estate as a result of adoption. In the case of adoption by a widow under the present law, the rights of the adopted son would date back to the date of the death of the husband of the widow who made that adoption. Now, no such question can arise as the widow like any other heir becomes a full owner of the estate inherited by her from her husband and no question of vesting and divesting of an estate arises in any manner. Such an adopted son will become her heir like a natural son. It is from this point of view that provisions contained in the Hindu Code Bill with respect to this matter have been altogether omitted from this Bill.

Under the present Hindu Law, as it stands in many parts of the country, a widow can adopt only if her husband had permitted her to do so. This was a fruitful source of many avoidable litigation. No such consent need now be made necessary, as the widow, who adopts, is already the full owner of the estate. This is another departure which has been made by this law.

At present any person of any age is capable of being adopted. There have been cases in which young widows have adopted men much older than themselves. This is against the very conception underlying the idea of adoption. It is therefore provided that a person to be adopted must not be over 15 years of age.

Under the present law if a person having a wife wants to adopt a son, *(he* can do so whether his wife gives her

consent to the same or not. Provision is now made that he shall not do so except with the consent of his wife or wives if more than one is alive. It will be realised that this is not only consistent with the status and dignity of a wife but is necessary in view of the fact that she is now a full heir.

Under the present law, it is only a father or a mother who can give his or her child in adoption. Apart from religious considerations, the motive underlying an adoption is the natural craving of a childless person to have a child. In fact, even in the past there have been many instances where boys had been adopted who had no parents living at the time of the adoption. But they were not valid unless justified on the ground of custom. A parentless child is really in dire need of parental care and the present law prevented such a child from being adopted. It is desirable that such children may be allowed to be adopted by persons who desire to adopt. Provision is therefore made for enabling the guardian of a child to give that child in adoption. The guardian may be a brother or any other relative or even a person who is not related. However, to prevent improper use being made of this provision by persons on the plea that they are guardians to dispose of young children from ulterior motives, a safeguard is provided that such a guardian should be either a testamentary guardian or a guardian appointed or declared by court. With this necessary safeguard, provision is now made enabling guardians of children to give children in adoption.

In order that by restoring to this device of adoption, provisions in the law of marriage restricting persons of some specified natural relationship from marrying each other may not be circumvented, it has been provided that by adoption, such a child will not have the right to marry a person whom he or she could not have married if he or she had continued in the family of his or her birth.

It has been found by experience that many an adoption is challenged in a court of law even though the adoption has been recorded in a document duly registered under the law for the time being in force. A clause has, therefore been inserted that in such cases the Court shall presume that the adoption has been made in compliance with the provisions of this Act.

It is desirable that when persons are allowed to adopt either a son or a daughter, it is necessary that such an adoption shall not take place as a result of some payment or reward in consideration of the same. Provision is therefore made in clause 17 penalising an action of this nature and making it an offence. It will be found that the provisions regarding adoption are thus simple in nature and need not raise controversy.

Adoptions have been a peculiar feature of Hindu society. Family was once the unit of Hindu society and for the continuation of such a unit adoption had an important role to play, the unit of present society is the individual. Our Constitution is based on maintaining the dignity and status of an individual. On account of vast changes in the political and economic life of the country, the individual has a necessity to be a unit of our society. Adoptions in the old sense and for the old purposes are bound to be rare under the present circumstances.

Adoptions under the existing conditions had become a source of misery in many cases during the past many years. In many cases as a result of adoptions instead of the families continuing to remain prosperous they were ruined by almost inevitable ruinous litigation in courts of law. However, out of respect for the natural craving of a person to have a child or to have a son or daughter of whom he or she can take care and whom he or she could bring up, the system of adoption with suitable modifications is being maintained by this piece of legislation.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL
(Bihar) : May I know how much time the hon. Minister will take for delivering his speech ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: It is a big book which he has got. May I at least know how long we are going to sit?

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: Is the grievance against my speech or against the time?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish his speech.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA
(Madhya Bharat): The Chair has already said that we shall sit till six o'clock.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: Sir, I have finished one part of this Bill, namely, the part relating to adoptions.

Clauses 18 to 27 contained in Chapter III deal with the law of Maintenance amongst Hindus. Clause 18 deals with the maintenance of a wife. Sub-clauses 1 and 2 of this clause are based on Rau Committee's report and clause 26 of the report of the Provisional Parliament. These clauses have, however, been redrafted so as to confine the provisions of this clause only to the maintenance of a wife. The maintenance of a widowed daughter-in-law is provided for in a separate clause (clause 19). Subclause 2 also incorporates all the provisions contained in section 2 of the Hindu Married Women's Right to Separate Residence and Maintenance Act, 1946. The clause has also been devised with a view that it should follow the language of section 10 of the Hindu Marriage Act as far as possible. Sub-clause (3) of clause 18 was added by the Select Committee of the Provisional Parliament and is based on the proviso to section 2 of Act XIX of 1946 with necessary modifications. A wife's right to maintenance is at present regulated by the 1946 Act but it may be interesting to note that under the Hindu law as such a wife is entitled to be maintained by her husband whether he possesses property or not. It is a personal obligation arising from the very existence of the relation and quite independent of the possession by the husband of any property, ancestral or self-acquired.

A question may be asked whether, in view of the provision for judicial separation and maintenance provided for in the Hindu Marriage Act, this provision is really necessary. The answer is in the affirmative because the Hindu wife may choose any remedy open to her and having regard to our own traditions in most cases a Hindu woman would prefer a remedy of this nature to judicial separation or divorce. A decree for maintenance differs in no important respect from an order for permanent alimony embodied in a decree for judicial separation such a decree would cease to be enforceable after the parties have begun to cohabit. But the significance of a decree for * maintenance as compared with a decree

[Shri H. V. Pataskar.]

for judicial separation is bound to be essentially separate in the eyes of a Hindu woman.

Clause 19: This reproduces clause 26 of Chapter II of Part IV of the Rau Committee's Bill. Under the present law the father-in-law is not under a legal obligation to maintain his widowed daughter-in-law, but if he has got separate property of his own, he is under moral obligation to maintain her out of such property. On the death of a father-in-law the moral obligation ripens into a legal obligation on the heirs. The father-in-law's moral obligation arises out of affinity between him and his daughter-in-law and irrespective of any joint family status between the father and the deceased husband.

The true principle is that a woman is entitled to maintenance only so long as she is a widow. On her re-marriage she becomes entitled to maintenance from her new husband. Therefore that change has been made.

Clause 19(2) more or less summarises the existing law.

Clause 20: This clause was added by the Select Committee in 1948. There was no similar provision in the Rau Committee's draft.

Mitakshara after quoting the following passage from Manu—

"It is declared by Manu that the aged mother and father, the chaste wife and infant child must be maintained even by doing a hundred misdeeds",

proceeds to lay down that "where there may be no property but what has been self-acquired, the only persons whose maintenance out of such property is imperative are aged parents, wife and minor children.

Under Hindu law a father is under a personal obligation to maintain his minor sons, his unmarried daughters and his aged parents, but he is under no personal obligation to maintain his grandsons or grand-daughters. He has also to maintain certain classes of illegitimate sons but there is no provision in Hindu law for the maintenance of illegitimate daughters although they may be entitled to claim maintenance from their putative father under section 488 of • the Criminal Procedure Code. The specific clause, while being based on Hindu

law, makes provision for all kinds of illegitimate children including the daughters.

Clause 21: This reproduces clause 5 of Division 2 of Part IHA of the Rau Committee's Bill.

Under the existing law the heir is. legally bound to provide, out of the estate which descends to him, maintenance for those persons whom the late proprietor was legally or morally bound to maintain, the reason being that the estate is inherited subject to the obligation to provide for such maintenance.

In arriving at a list of dependents two-views are possible because while we are dealing with the question of maintenance it has to be decided as to whom maintenance has to be given. One is that the Hindu Succession Act having determined certain persons to be preferential heirs, all of them should be regarded as dependents so that if any of them is deprived of a share in the property which would have come to him had the deceased died intestate, he should be entitled to maintenance under this law. On the other hand, it could very well be argued that the deceased could, by his will-making power, deprive any of those heirs of any share in the property. It is also undesirable that the law should provide for maintenance being payable to heirs like sons or daughters through a daughter and so on. The dependents should be limited to those who would ordinarily have been supported by the deceased.

Clause 21 as it now stands is based on the latter principle.

Clause 22: The liability to maintenance arises from the fact that the heir ' has inherited property from the deceased and obviously the amount of maintenance will depend upon the value of the share taken.

Clause 23: Sub-clause (2) deals with I the obligations laid on a husband to maintain his wife under clause 18, and on a Hindu under clause 20 to maintain his parents and children, while the maintenance payable to dependants after the death of the deceased is dealt with in sub-clause (3).

The following remarks from a decision of the Privy Council may be cited here:

"Maintenance dependes upon a gathering together of all the facts of the situation—the amount of

tree estate, the past life of the married parties and the families, a survey of the conditions and necessities and rights of the members on a reasonable view of change of circumstances possibly required in the future, regard being of course had to the scale and the mode of living, and the age, habits wants and class of life of the parties. In short, it is out of a great category of circumstances, small in themselves, that a safe and reasonable induction is to be made by a court of law in arriving at a fixed sum."

Therefore, it has been left to the discretion of the court.

Clauses 24 and 25 do not call for any comments as they are the normal features of a law of maintenance.

Clause 26 is in consonance with the existing law under which the claim even of a widow for maintenance is not a charge upon the estate of a deceased husband, whether joint or separate, until it is fixed and charged upon the estate. The charge can be created by a decree of a court or by an agreement between the widow and the holder of the estate or by the will by which the property was bequeathed.

Clause 27: Under the Hindu law a right to maintenance of a widow is liable to be defeated by a transfer of the husband's property to a *bona fide* purchaser for value without notice of the widow's claim for maintenance.

In places where the Transfer of Property Act is in force a transferee for value with notice of the right to maintenance takes it subject to the claim for maintenance; also where the transfer is gratuitous.

Clause 27 incorporates the provisions of section 39 of the Transfer of Property Act and makes that provision applicable throughout the country.

I am sorry, Sir, that I have taken a good deal of time on a subject which is probably not as attractive to at least certain sections of the House as it should be, but unfortunately as a person in charge of law and dealing with a matter which is sure to be taken up in court, I thought it my duty to try to explain in detail as to why, if any, there have been changes—substantially there have not been much, but some changes had to be introduced keeping an eye to the

6—21 Rajya Sabha/56

existing facts as well as the Acts which we have already passed and also the different decisions of different courts in India. So, that was my excuse for trying to detain some hon. Members who did not probably find this a very interesting subject to listen to, but as a part of my duty it had to be done, and I would also request hon. Members of this House that though the subject may be dry, in spite of that it deserves to be considered with a little more care and attention.

I move my motion for the acceptance of this House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

'That the Bill to amend and codify the law relating to adoptions and maintenance among Hindus be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members ; 15 members from this House, namely:—

Shri B. M. Gupte,
Shri T. D. Pustake,
Shri P. N. Sapru,
Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.
Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam,
Shri Mahesh Saran,
Shri Puma Chandra Sharma,
Shri Indra Vidyavachaspati,
Shri C. L. Varma,
Shri S. Channa Reddy,
Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Rama-murti,
Shri H. C. Dasappa,
Shri Kakkineni Basavapunniah,
Shri Satyapriya Banerjee, and
Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal;

and 30 members from the Lok Sabha;

that in order to constitute a meeting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Select Committee shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Chairman may make;

that this House recommends to the Lok Sabha that the Lok Sabha do join in the said Joint Committee

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]

and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by the Lok Sabha to the Joint Committee; and

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the last day of the first week of the next session."

There is an amendment by Mr. Kau-shal. I am afraid his amendment is not in order.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL : My only anxiety for tabling this amendment is that the Bill which the hon. Minister has introduced in this House should go through, because I am told that the other House has no time to take up this measure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendment he is referring to is to refer this Bill to a Select Committee of this House.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL : If the Select Committee is made up of both the Houses, then I am afraid the other House will not be able to give its concurrence in this session. That will only mean, Sir, that the motion for this Bill being referred to the Joint Committee will be delayed, and ultimately it may happen that this Bill may not become law during the life time of the present Lok Sabha. Therefore, my submission to the House is that instead of referring this Bill to the Joint Select Committee of both the Houses, it should be referred only to a Select Committee of this House. And later on, this Bill should be passed here. And after that, it can go to the Lok Sabha. Otherwise, I am afraid this Bill will not become law during the life time of the Lok Sabha. Sir, this Bill is very necessary especially in view of the other parts of Hindu Code which we have already enacted, and if this Bill does not become law, the whole purpose will be defeated. It is for that purpose that I want to move my amendment. If there is, however, any technical difficulty in giving effect to my amendment, then the hon. Minister may accept my amendment and move it as his own motion. My intention is that this Bill should not be delayed, and my fear is that if it is referred to the Joint Select Committee, • it will not become law so soon.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister has already moved his motion for referring this Bill to the Joint

Select Committee, and the only amendment that can be moved for that motion, according to Rule 57 (2) (b), is for its circulation. So, the hon. Minister can move it as his own motion. If you are prepared to accept that position, I have absolutely no objection.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: If the House so desires, I have no objection to moving it as my own motion. It is undoubtedly true, and I think it has become necessary also, that this Bill to amend and codify the law relating to adoptions and maintenance among Hindus should be passed along with the other pieces of legislation which we have already passed. So, if the House permits me, I will move a substitute motion, of course, not with a view to exclude the other House, but with a view to have this Bill passed during the life time of this Parliament.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any objection?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : There is one objection which, with your permission, I want to state. It is this. While on the one hand, we are all anxious to see this Bill made a law, on the other hand, we are equally anxious about that valued right which we have attained by the good and invaluable services of the Prime Minister that in each and every Select Committee which that House appoints, this House is asked to nominate its own Members. So, that right is a valued right, and we do not want to establish a precedent in which they can quote us against our selves and say that

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think so. It has already been explained that there is no time for the other House to consider this motion and take it up during this session, and if it takes it up in the next session, this Bill will not become law. If we refer it to the Select Committee of this House, it will go to the other House after the Bill is passed in this House. Then they can pass it during their next session. It is only with a view to expedite the smooth passage of the Bill that this suggestion has been made. I therefore think....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: But all the same, the precedent of establishing a separate Select Committee for this House will have been created.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Each House has got that right. They are appointing their own Committees. So,

I take it that the House has no objection to the hon. Minister moving a substitute motion.

(No hon. Member dissented.)

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: With the permission of the House, Sir, I beg to move the following substitute motion:

"That the Bill to amend and codify the law relating to adoptions and maintenance among Hindus be referred to a Select Committee consisting of—

1. Shri B. M. Gupte,
2. Shri T. D. Pustake,
3. Shri P. N. Sapru,
4. Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand,
5. Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam,
6. Shri Mahesh Saran,
7. Shri Puma Chandra Sharma,
8. Prof. Indra Vidyavachaspati,
9. Shri C. L. Varma,
10. Shri S. Channa Reddy,
11. Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti,
12. Shri H. C. Dasappa,
13. Shri Makkineni Basavapurnaiah,
14. Shri Satyapriya Banerjee,
15. Shri Pydah Venkata Narayana,
16. Shri Jaswant Singh,
17. Shri Surendra Mahanty,
18. Dr. P. V. Kane,
19. Shri Kailash Bihari Lall,
20. Shri Bheron Prasad,
21. Shri Vijay Singh,
22. Shri Amolakh Chand,
23. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal,
24. Shri C. C. Biswas; and
25. Shri H. V. Pataskar (the mover)

with instructions to report by the last day of the first week of the next session."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to amend and codify the law relating to adoptions and maintenance among Hindus be referred to a Select Committee consisting of—

1. Shri B. M. Gupte,
2. Shri T. D. Pustake,
3. Shri P. N. Sapru,
4. Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand,
5. Shrimati Savitry Devi Nigam,
6. Shri Mahesh Saran,
7. Shri Purna Chandra Sharma,
8. Prof. Indra Vidyavachaspati,
9. Shri C. L. Varma,
10. Shri S. Channa Reddy,
11. Shrimati T. Nallamuthu Ramamurti,
12. Shri H. C. Dasappa,
13. Shri Makkineni Basavapurnaiah,
14. Shri Satyapriya Banerjee,
15. Shri Pydah Venkata Narayana,
16. Shri Jaswant Singh,
17. Shri Surendra Mahanty,
18. Dr. P. V. Kane,
19. Shri Kailash Bihari Lall,
20. Shri Bheron Prasad,
21. Shri Vijay Singh,
22. Shri Amolakh Chand,
23. Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal,
24. Shri C. C. Biswas; and
25. Shri H. V. Pataskar (the mover)

with instructions to report by the last day of the first week of the next session."

The motion was adopted.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE TRAVANCORE-COCHIN APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL, 1956.

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 :

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Travancore-Cochin Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1956, as passed by, Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 28th August, 1956.