

**THE DELIMITATION BILL, 2002**

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to provide for the readjustment of the allocation of seats in the House of the People to the States, the total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly of each State, the division of each State and each Union Territory having a Legislative Assembly into territorial constituencies for elections to the House of the People and Legislative Assemblies of the States and Union Territories and for matters connected therewith, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration".

Sir, both the Houses of Parliament had approved the Eighty-Fourth Amendment to the Constitution. Pursuant to the approval of the Eighty-fourth Amendment, more than half the State Assemblies had granted their consent to the Amendment and the same has since been notified. The three principle features of that Amendment are: (a) a fresh delimitation of constituencies both for the Lok Sabha and for the State Assemblies be conducted on the basis of the last available figures of the Census, 1991; (b) the total number of seats for the Lok Sabha both at the national level and for each State be frozen till the year 2026 as also the number of seats in every State Assembly be frozen till 2026; (c) With regard to the constituencies reserved for the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe candidates, the 1991 Census be taken as the basis. After coming into force of the Amendment, it has now become necessary to have a new Delimitation Act which will be the basis on which the fresh delimitation would be conducted. This has become necessary because of the uneven growth in population as also migration of a large part of the rural population to the urban sector. The size of the constituency itself has become uneven. There are some Lok Sabha constituencies which are of different sizes. For instance, in Delhi, there is a constituency which has 3.5 lakh people, there is another constituency which has close to 30 lakh people. Therefore, the present Delimitation Bill has been proposed. Sir, you may recollect that on earlier occasions, i.e. in 1952, 1962 and in 1972 delimitation had been conducted specifically. The last delimitation came into force on 1<sup>st</sup> December, 1976. The present Bill has several features. It provides for a new Delimitation Commission to be set up the composition of which is that it would be headed by a person who is a sitting or a retired judge of the Supreme Court. The Chief Election Commissioner or the

Election Commissioner nominated by the Chief Election Commissioner would be an *ex officio* member. Similarly, the State Election Commissioner would also be a member of the Delimitation Commission. Along with it, there would be members who are elected to the Lok Sabha from the State and members who are elected to the State Assemblies. Five of them would be nominated by the Speaker in proportion to the composition of the House. The Bill also gives detailed procedure which the Delimitation Commission has to follow. It also gives an indication as to the factors that would be taken into consideration while conducting delimitation. These are contained in clause 9 of the Bill itself. It mentions that as far as practicable all constituencies would be broadly similar in size. They would also give due respect to the physical features, existing boundaries, the administrative units and various facilities for communication and public conveniences. An effort would be made to ensure that every Assembly constituency is so delimited that it falls entirely within one Parliamentary constituency. As for constituencies which are reserved for the Scheduled Caste candidates, care would be taken to see that these are those constituencies where the Scheduled Caste population is comparatively large. The word 'comparatively large' has been used in contradistinction to constituencies which are to be reserved for the Scheduled Tribe candidates where the population has to be the largest. This distinction is necessary to make sure that all the Scheduled Caste constituencies do not get concentrated only in a particular part of the State; they are spread across the State. But the Scheduled Tribe constituencies would be those where the population of the Scheduled Tribe is the largest. This, along with several procedural provisions, is contained in this particular Bill. It is anticipated that the Delimitation Commission would take about two years to finalise its recommendations and it would then be notified. But I do hope, with all the modern facilities available like computers, etc., and particularly, when the number of constituencies is not to be changed, but only re-allocation is to take place, even this period of two years can be brought down so that before the next General Elections, we have the delimitation of constituencies well in order and the people will know which constituencies are there, and the political parties will know which constituencies are relevant from their point of view. With these few comments, I commend the Bill for consideration and passing by this hon. House.

SHRI RANGANATH MISRA (Orissa): Sir, this is a constitutional process which is mandated to be done periodically. As has been

mentioned by the hon. Minister, on account of the constitutional amendments made sometime back, a provision of a special type has become necessary, and hence this Bill. I have only two suggestions to make. When we look at clause 5, it states: "...ten persons, five of whom shall be members of the House of the People representing that State and five shall be members of the Legislative Assembly of that State. I suggest that the Speaker, while nominating these five Members should see to it that representation is given to various political parties, so that every political party, to the extent possible, is represented in the activities of the Commission. This is a democratic process and it is appropriate that the eyes of the people or their representatives are on the activities of the Commission.

The other suggestion which I would like to make is this. It has been mentioned that the Commission shall comprise of a retired Judge of the Supreme Court, the Chief Election Commissioner or his nominee and the State Election Commissioner. Their actions can be questioned from the angle of gerry-mandering. Gerry-mandering is a process which is relevant to the United States of America. We have the example of the Kapoor Commission, -- it was in existence in 1971, which functioned well and their activities had been commended even in this House. Before concluding, I urge upon the hon. Minister to see that while nomination is made by the Speaker, representation is given to all the political parties as far as possible. Subject to this, I think, the rest of it is all right.

SHRI RAMA MUNI REDDY SIRIGIREDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Delimitation Bill, 2002, which is a natural corollary to the Constitution (Ninety-first) Amendment which was passed by both the Houses of Parliament last year. The present amendment permits internal drawing of the boundaries and rationalisation of the Lok Sabha and the Assembly constituencies within each State. It has become mandatory because, for example, Lakshadweep, with a population of less than 40,000 electorate sends one M.P., which means, 20,000 voters there have one representative; whereas, in the Outer Delhi Constituency, 22 lakh voters send one M.P., that means, 11 lakh voters here have one representative. In our State of Andhra Pradesh, Bhadrachalam Parliamentary constituency falls in four districts. So, I suggest that each parliamentary constituency should not cover more than two districts. As the House is well aware the last delimitation was done through the Forty-second Constitution Amendment. The present Bill has become necessary, in view of article 82 of the

Constitution, which says, "Upon completion of each census, the allocation of Lok Sabha seats between States and the division of each State into territorial constituencies should be readjusted by such authority and in such manner as Parliament may by law determine." Similarly, the Constitution (Eighty-fourth) Amendment provides for refixing the number of seats reserved for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the Lower House and in the State Assemblies, on the basis of the 1991 Census. Here, I want to make a point. We have successfully completed the exercise of the 2001 Census; and, with the availability of the latest technology, computerisation and manpower, there is no reason why we should not be able to publish these figures within a year or so. Of course, now, we are going ahead as per the 1991 Census because they are the only published figures available, which are mandatory under article 82 of the Constitution. Here, I fail to understand why the Government had to wait till 2002, when the figures of the 1991 Census were published a decade ago. For over ten years, you have done nothing. Why? What are the reasons for not taking up the process of delimitation for the last ten years? So, we are behind by 10 years.

Sir, the last Delimitation Commission was set up three decades ago, and since then, no Commission was set up, though we have had the published figures of the Census. I welcome the freezing of the number of seats of the Lok Sabha and the State Assemblies. It has become necessary because the States, especially the Southern States, which have been contributing quite impressively and successfully to population control, should not be punished, but should be rewarded. Had we not frozen the number of seats of the Lok Sabha and the State Assemblies, the Southern States, according to the Population Foundation of India, would have lost 10 seats and an additional six seats in 2026; whereas States like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan would have got 15 additional seats for their inefficiency in controlling the population and the family planning programmes effectively! So, the present Bill is in the right direction.

Sir, I wish to seek some clarifications from the hon. Minister and, I hope, while replying to the debate, the hon. Minister will answer my queries. Firstly, clause 3 of the Bill deals with the constitution of the Delimitation Commission. It has a Chairman, who is a judge or has been a judge of the Supreme Court, and two *ex-officio* members - the Chief Election Commissioner or an Election Commissioner nominated by the Chief Election

Commissioner and the State Election Commissioner of the concerned State. Apart from the above, under clause 5, we have ten associate members -- five from the Lok Sabha and the remaining five from the Legislative Assembly of the State concerned. Here, I would like to take you back to the last Delimitation Commission in which we had two judges. But, in the proposed Commission, we have got only one judge. Why is it so? I would like to hon. Minister to explain the reasons behind having only one judge.

My second point is this. We have got ten associate members -- five from the Lok Sabha and five from the Legislature of the concerned State. But we have not a single Member from the Rajya Sabha. Why? Don't we have any role to play in the development of the State? How does the hon. Minister, who is also an hon. Member of this House, justify the non-inclusion of Members from Rajya Sabha in the Delimitation Commission? Hence, I demand that, at least, three Members from Rajya Sabha should be associated with the Commission, and the hon. Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, in consultation with the political parties of the State concerned, may nominate the associate members to the Commission.

Sir, the other point is this. Sub-clause (4) of clause 5 clearly states that none of the associate members shall have a right to vote or sign any decision or can call for any records. Then, what for are you nominating them? Is it only for the sake of nomination you are nominating? Do you want them to be on the Commission as dormant members? I request the hon. Minister that they should also be involved actively in the proceedings of the Commission and should be given all the rights and powers that have been given to other members of the Commission.

According to sub-clause (3) of clause 7, the Commission can authorise any of its members to exercise any of the powers conferred on it by clause (a) to (c) of sub-clause (1) of clause 7. On the other hand, through sub-clause (4) of clause 5, you are imposing restrictions on the rights of the associate members. I think, there is a conflict between these two provisions. I would like to hon. Minister to clarify this. Sir, the NDA Government has taken so many steps to protect the interest of the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, by amending the Constitution, in order to provide reservation in promotions. We have also amended the statute to increase the reservation beyond 50 per cent. We all agree that the population of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes increased by 3 per cent between 1971 and 1991, following the inclusion of more castes, apart from general increase in population. So, we are taking all steps to protect the interests of

the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes. But, according to the Bill, the proposed Commission will look into the readjustment and rationalisation and also refix the number of seats to be reserved for the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes. But the Bill is silent as to how will it refix the seats for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes without increasing the number of seats in the States, to reflect the changes in population figures. The other point is, there is a need to change the reserved constituencies on rotational basis, to give equal opportunity to all people. But, I find, nothing, with regard to this, in the Bill which is before this august House. I would like the hon. Minister to clarify the reasons behind it. I feel that this rotation of seats for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes could be included under the phrase, "matters connected therewith" which is there in the first para of the Bill.

The other point concerning me and, I hope the House, as a whole, is, according to clause 10(3), after publication of every order, notification, etc., in the Gazette, the same would be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. Why is it that such an order, notification, etc., is not allowed to place on the Table of the Rajya Sabha? What are the reasons behind this? I would like to have a specific clarification on this point from the hon. Minister.

Sir, the Bill says that the Commission will complete its work within two years of its constitution. If you peep into the history, never, the earlier Delimitation Commissions completed their task within the time prescribed. This time, at least, the Government has to make sure, with the available latest technology, computerisation and manpower, the Commission should be able to complete its task entrusted to it within one year. Now, we are going ahead with the published figures of 1991 Census. That means, we are running behind ten years. To avoid this, if we continuously undertake delimitation exercise in every ten years, that is, after every Census, as envisaged under the Constitution, we can't have any backlog. For this, I suggest for constitution of a permanent Delimitation Commission which will do its work, after every census is published, because it is a continuous process. I request the hon. Minister to ponder over this suggestion seriously.

Finally, though it is not directly connected with this Bill, I would like to submit that there was a proposal before the Government of India for issuing citizenship cards to all its citizens. I don't know what has happened to that proposal. Now, you have issued Election Cards for some people to cast their votes. But its purpose is limited only to that extent. Hence, I

request the Government to issue multi-purpose cards to the people of this country, before the next General Elections, which are slated to be in 2004. The multi-purpose cards can be used for different purposes. I request the hon. Minister to look into it as well. I also request him to take effective measures for ensuring maximum voters turnout in the elections. I agree that you can't compel voters to cast their votes, but, certainly, you can persuade by educating them and also through various other measures, which helps in a larger turnout of the voters, which is the basic necessity of the democracy. Sir, now, the time has come that all the political parties sit together and ponder over this, because voters turnout is coming down quite drastically, during the last ten years or so.

So, these are some of the points which I thought that I should bring to the notice of the hon. Minister for his consideration. I request him to look into them seriously and enlighten me while replying to the debate.

With these words, I once again support the Bill moved by the Law Minister, Shri Arun Jaitley. Thank you.

**श्री जयंतीलाल बरोट (गुजरात) :** सभापति महोदय, आपने मुझे इस विषय पर बोलने का अवसर दिया, इसलिए सबसे पहले तो मैं आपका आभारी हूँ ।

सभापति जी, माननीय मंत्री जी जो यह 'डिलिमिटेशन बिल, 2002' लाए हैं, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ । 1952, 1961 और 1971 के वर्षों में तीन डिलिमिटेशन कमीशनों के बाद आज 2002 में हम फिर डिलिमिटेशन कमीशन बैठा रहे हैं । महोदय, 1971 से 2002 तक जो हमारी आबादी बढ़ी है और जिस तरह से आबादी गांवों से शहरों की ओर जा रही है, उसके कारण कई सीटों में तो आबादी कम हो गई है लेकिन कई सीटों में यह आबादी इतनी बढ़ गई है कि इसके कारण आज चुनाव में उम्मीदवार को दिक्कत होती है । महोदय, मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे गुजरात में 'सरखेज' नामक एक असेम्बली की सीट है, उसकी जनसंख्या 9.5 लाख है, जो कि झोक समा की सीट के मुताबिक है । इसी तरह से 'सूरत चौरासी' नाम की एक और असेम्बली सीट है, वहां की जनसंख्या तो 11.5 लाख हो गई है और लोक सभा की सीट में तो यह जनसंख्या 28 से 30 लाख हो गई है । हमारे गुजरात में ज्यादातर 11-12 लाख पर एक सीट थी । तो यह जो अनियमितता हो गई है, उसमें सुधार करने के लिए यह बिल बहुत जरूरी था ।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि गुजरात की ओर से हम सब लोगों की एक मांग भी थी कि हर दस सालों में ऐसा एक डिलिमिटेशन कमीशन बैठना चाहिए और शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स की आबादी के मुताबिक हर क्षेत्र में वहां रोटेशन, चेंज होना चाहिए या जिसकी आबादी ज्यादा हो, उस वर्ग को वहां पर सीट दी जानी चाहिए । इसलिए हमारा मानना है कि अगर परमानेंट डिलिमिटेशन कमीशन बैठाने का प्रावधान हो जाए तो ज्यादा अच्छा है, नहीं तो हर दस साल में ऐसा एक डिलिमिटेशन कमीशन बैठाया जाना चाहिए ताकि आबादी में जहां-जहां अनियमितता हुई है, वहां उसे ठीक किया जाए ।

मुझे दुख इस बात का है कि 1971-72 के बाद से आज 2002 तक हम सीटों में बढ़ोतरी तो नहीं कर सकते थे लेकिन शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट, शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के लोगों की नीति के अनुसार जो मिलना चाहिए था, हमने उनका वह हक डुबोया है और उनको जो लाभ मिलना चाहिए था, उनके क्षेत्र में से उन्हीं की जातियों में से नए-नए लोग, पब्लिक वर्कर, जो निकलने चाहिए थे, उन्हें हम नहीं निकाल सके। जिस सरकार ने 1975 के बाद अपने कांस्टिट्यूशन में सुधार किया कि 2000 तक डिलिमिटेशन कमीशन नहीं बैठेगा, मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उसने पिछड़ी जातियों, दलित और आदिवासी जातियों का हक डुबोया है। इसलिए मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को विनती करना चाहूंगा कि आप ऐसी व्यवस्था कर दें ताकि हर दस साल में डिलिमिटेशन कमीशन बैठे और एस0सी0, एस0टी0 की आबादी के आधार पर उनको उनका हक मिले और उनके क्षेत्रों में नए-नए लोग चुनाव जीतकर आए ताकि उनको अपनी आबादी की सेवा करने का मौका मिले।

महोदय, हमारी सरकार की यह मान्यता है कि जो बिछड़ी और पिछड़ी जातियां हैं, उनको उनका हक मिलना चाहिए और उसी के अनुसार यह डिलिमिटेशन बिल आया है, जिसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ और माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि दो साल में या और जितना जल्दी से जल्दी हो सके, वे इस कमीशन को बैठाएं ताकि उसके परिणाम आएँ और अगले चुनाव में इस डिलिमिटेशन कमीशन का असर नज़र आए।

एक बार फिर से इस बिल का समर्थन करते हुए मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

**श्रीमती सरला माहेस्वरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल) :** सभापति महोदय, 'परिसीमन विधेयक, 2002' पर कुछ भी बोलने से पहले मैं माननीय मंत्री जी द्वारा इससे पहले लोक सभा की सीटों को और 25 वर्षों तक यथावत रखने हेतु जो 91वाँ संविधान संशोधन लाया गया था, उसके बारे में कहना चाहती हूँ कि उस 91वें संविधान संशोधन पर भी मुझे बोलने का मौका मिला था और उस विधेयक पर बोलते हुए मैंने उस विषय के कई सैद्धान्तिक और व्यावहारिक पहलुओं को रखा था और यह कहा था कि आज यदि कुछ भी दांव पर लगा हुआ है तो वह हमारा सार्विक मतधिकार का अधिकार है और संसदीय जनतंत्र का सबसे बुनियादी पहलु है कि हर मत का समान अधिकार होना चाहिए, ये दो बातें मैंने उस समय भी कही थीं। सभापति जी, आज जब हम इस परिसीमन विधेयक पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं तो मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि 1971 की जनगणना के बाद परिसीमन प्रक्रिया शुरू हुई और वह 1975 में जाकर पूरी हुई तथा लोक सभा की सीटें 490 से बढ़ाकर 543 कर दी गई। उसके बाद आंतरिक आपातकाल के दौरान संविधान के 42वें संशोधन के जरिए यह व्यवस्था की गई कि आगामी 25 वर्षों तक परिसीमन का कोई काम नहीं होगा। अब नयी शताब्दी में नयी जनगणना के बाद ही परिसीमन का कोई काम शुरू होगा। इस फैसले के कारण परिसीमन का जो काम हर जनगणना के बाद पूरा कर लिया जाना चाहिए था, वह काम पूरे 27 वर्षों तक नहीं हो सका। इन 27 वर्षों में पूरे देश के पैमाने पर इतने बड़े-बड़े डेमोग्राफिक परिवर्तन हुए हैं, इतने जनसांख्यिकीय परिवर्तन हुए हैं जिनकी रोशनी में प्रत्येक मत के समान मूल्य का सिद्धांत एक मज़ाक बनकर रह गया है।



सभापति महोदय, 1976 में 60 लाख से कम आबादी के छोटे-छोटे राज्यों के लिए 36 सीटों को सुरक्षित करने का फैसला हमने किया था और वह फैसला एक सही फैसला था, एक सचेत फैसला था। भारतीय जनतंत्र की विशिष्ट परिस्थितियों को मदेनजर रखते हुए वह फैसला लिया गया था लेकिन बाकी के राज्यों में अगर एक लोकसभा सीट 20 लाख की हो, 28 लाख की हो, 32 लाख की हो और दूसरी सीट महज कुछ लाख की हो, डेढ़ लाख, दो लाख या तीन लाख की हो तो जाहिर है कि इस तरह की विकृति हमारे सामने आएगी। इसकी परिकल्पना हमने नहीं की थी। इसी दिल्ली में आउटर दिल्ली की लोकसभा सीट है जिसमें बताया जाता है कि 28 लाख लोग हैं और दूसरी ओर चांदनी चौक में सिर्फ 3 लाख लोग हैं। इस तरह के अनगिनत उदाहरण दिए जा सकते हैं। आज जब हम एक बार फिर वैज्ञानिक आधार पर परिसीमन के काम को हाथ में ले रहे हैं, तब इस बात पर जरूर विचार किया जाना चाहिए कि आखिर वह कौन से कारण थे, कौन सी व्यवस्था थी जिसके चलते हमारी चुनाव प्रणाली में इतनी बड़ी विरूपताएं पैदा हुईं? वह कौन सा दृष्टिकोण था जिसके कारण परिसीमन के इस महत्वपूर्ण कार्य को 27 वर्षों तक टाला गया? इस सवाल के साथ ही हमारे जहन में 1975 के आंतरिक आपातकाल का वह दौर घूम जाता है, जो हिंदुस्तान में सिर्फ एकदलीय तानाशाही का ही दौर नहीं था, बल्कि एक व्यक्ति की तानाशाही को आरोपित करने का दौर भी था।

सभापति महोदय, संविधान का वह 42वां संशोधन उस वक्त की उपज था जब परिवार नियोजन कार्यक्रम को बढ़ावा देने के नाम पर परिसीमन के काम को बरसों तक टाल दिया गया। परिसीमन के काम को टाला जाना और उससे चुनाव प्रणाली में विरूपताओं का पैदा होना अपने आप में कोई अलग-थलग और अकेला प्रसंग नहीं है। यह समूचा प्रसंग हमारे शासक वर्ग की संकीर्ण राजनीति के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है।

सभापति महोदय, इतिहास के पन्नों को यदि हम पलटें तो हम पाएंगे कि आज़ादी के बाद जिस कांग्रेस दल को महात्मा गांधी ने भंग करने की सलाह दी थी, उसी दल ने केन्द्र से लेकर तमाम राज्यों में कांग्रेस के एकछत्र शासन की परिकल्पना की थी।

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा (राजस्थान): सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य कांग्रेस पर बोल रही हैं या परिसीमन विधेयक पर बोल रही हैं?

श्रीमती सरला माहेडवरी : आप सुन लीजिए, मैं संसदीय जनतंत्र पर बोल रही हूँ आप जिसके बहुत बड़े भागीदार रहे हैं। सभापति महोदय, कांग्रेस के एकछत्र राज्य को इस देश की नियति मानकर संसदीय जनतंत्र कायदे-कानूनों के पुनर्लेखन का सिलसिला भी शुरू किया गया। इतिहास के इन्हीं पन्नों से पूर्व अमरीकी राजदूत श्री डैनियल पैट्रिक मोयनिहान का वह कथन मैं उद्धृत करना चाहूंगी जो उन्होंने अपनी पुस्तक में लिखा था। उन्होंने लिखा था कि -

"We had, twice, but only twice, interfered in Indian politics to the extent of providing money to a political party. Both times, this was done in the face of a prospective communist victory in a State election; once in Kerala and once in West Bengal, where Calcutta is located. Both times, money was given to the Congress Party which had asked for it."

सभापति महोदय, इन्हीं पृष्ठों में सन् 1967 और उसके बाद तमाम विपक्षी दलों की राज्य सरकारों के विरुद्ध केन्द्र सरकार के षड्यंत्रों, राज्यपाल के पदों का दुरुपयोग, आचार्य-गयाराम की तरह की विरूपताओं के लंबे इतिहास का बयान किया गया है। इन्हीं परिस्थितियों के बीच एक ऐसी राजनीतिक नैतिकता ने जन्म लिया जो सत्ता के अलावा और किसी मान-मूल्य को नहीं मानती थी। आपातकाल ऐसी ही तमाम अनीतियों और गैर-जनतांत्रिक खेलों की उपज था, जिसका प्रारंभ 2-3 वर्ष पहले पश्चिम बंगाल में 1972 में ही हो गया था। उस चुनाव में बंदूक के बल पर चुनाव को एक प्रहसन में बदल दिया गया था और ज्योति बसु जैसे सम्माननीय नेता को पराजित घोषित कर दिया गया था। सभापति जी, आज जब हम इस परिसीमन विधेयक पर विचार कर रहे हैं, निश्चित रूप में परिसीमन को टाल देने से जो विरूपताएं पैदा हुई हैं, उन विरूपताओं को दूर करने की दिशा में यह एक कदम है। हमें ऐसे सवाल को भी जरूर ..।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, it is one o'clock.

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी : सभापति जी, मैं पांच मिनट में खत्म कर रही हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will continue it after lunch. In the meantime, before we adjourn, Message from the Lok Sabha.

### MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

#### **Extension of the time for Presentation of Report of the Joint Committee on Stock Market Scam**

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

"I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on Wednesday, the 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2002, adopted the following motion:

"That this House do further extend upto the end of the Monsoon Session of 2002, the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on Stock Market Scam and Matters Relating Thereto."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned till two o'clock.

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