

which deals with drugs and narcotic substances. We have come down heavily on this group of people. They were detained under this Act, and they are being prosecuted under this Act. I have also issued directions to examine whether more severe action cannot be taken against them by invoking Article 311 of the Constitution. That is under examination.

As I said, I will now, now that I am free from the Budget exercise, begin to attend to some other aspects of my Ministry. One of them will be to review the laws relating to preventive detention both under COFEPOSA and SAFEMFOPA as well as the NDPS Act. While I do a review of these laws I will also review the administrative steps that are required to be taken to enforce these laws. I am deeply grateful to hon. Members for the number of suggestions they have made. I shall keep these suggestions in mind. I request that this Bill, which provides for the extended period of detention under Section 10 may be continued for another period of three years. The Government has found that this section is an extremely useful and deterrent section to crackdown on illicit traffic in drugs and narcotic substances all over the country and in particular in highly vulnerable areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the prevention of illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and psychotropic Substances Act, 1988 be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House will now take up clause-by-clause consideration. Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava.

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA: Madam Chairperson, I would like to say only this much that the hon. Minister has replied that this law is appropriate. There are no two opinions about it. But it should be made a bit more strict. The hon. Minister should look into this aspect and I will also submit that there should be provision for more stringent punishment in this law... (Interruptions). The number of persons consuming smack is increasing in our country. Smack is causing much harm to the youth and other people. This addiction is spreading in schools and colleges also. I, therefore, request the hon. Minister to make the law more harsh. It should be done once for all so that the need to bring forth amendments time and again is obviated.

This is why I have said that if instead of 99 it is 98 then it will be certainly good. If hon. Minister agrees to this it will be alright. My submission is that the hon. Minister should not think much of 99. Of course, I do not know what the hon. Minister has in his mind as their new Government has been constituted only recently. I am talking about their good as well as good of the country.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Are you withdrawing them?

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA : Yes, I have to withdraw it per force. I have to accept the reply being given by the hon. Minister. I am withdrawing it.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : In that case, Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava has agreed to withdraw the amendment.

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA : As per your order, and even not being satisfied by the reply given by the hon. Minister, I am withdrawing it.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is very kind of you, both for me and the hon. Minister. Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

*The Amendment was by leave withdrawn.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is:

"that clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Question is.

"That Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the title stand part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

15.28 hrs.

## REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : We now go over to Item No.19. Now, the hon. Minister to move the Bill.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS, LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP) : I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1950, be taken into consideration."

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani) : What about the amendments that we have suggested and have not so far been circulated? We don't know what the amendments are.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Do you not have them?

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Some of the amendments have not been circulated.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Minister, you speak first. Shri Banatwalla, you can surely speak on that.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA : Before that let us discuss the Bill in the light of the amendments they have been given so far.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before that, the hon. Minister has to speak actually.

Now, I am taking up Item No.19

Mr. Minister may move the Bill please.

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP : I leave it to the sense of the House whether we should take up Item Nos.19 and 20 together because Item No.19 is only a minor matter which does not, in fact, call for any debate. It is in fact a part of the electoral reforms.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The problem is that in the Order Paper, we do not have that provision. It is given separately.

[Translation]

SHRI BHAGWAN SHANKAR RAWAT (Agra) : It would be better if Item No. 20 is taken up first.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am coming to that. There are two alternatives. We can either take these two separately or we take first Item Nos. 20 and 22 together and dispose them off and then come to Item No. 20.

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN (Chandigarh) : In that case, both the items will have to be taken separately because the scope of both is different.

Item No. 20 is Electoral Reforms. Item No.19 is only relating to Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh. So both are to be taken up separately.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is not just a technical matter. But the content of it is also somewhat different.

15.30 hrs.

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP : I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend Representation of People Act, 1950 be taken into consideration."

Madam, this Bill seeks to amend the Fourth Schedule of the Representation of People Act, 1950 in relation to the States of Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh.

The electorate, for the purpose of elections to the Legislative Council of a State with the local authorities' Constituency, consists of number of Members of such

local authorities exercising jurisdiction in any place or area within the limits of that Constituency as was specified in relation to that State in the Fourth Schedule of the Representation of People Act, 1950. At present, the local authorities specified in the Fourth Schedule in relation to the State of Karnataka are Municipalities, Mandal Panchayats, Cantonment Boards, Notified Area Committees and Zila Parishads and in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh, these are Municipalities, Zila Parishads, including Antharim Zila Parishads, Cantonment Boards, Town Area Committees, Notified Area Committees and Kshetra Samitis.

Consequent to the coming into force of the Constitution Seventy-third (Amendment) Act, 1992 and the Constitution Seventy-fourth (Amendment) Act, 1992, the States of Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh have amended the laws relating to local bodies. Accordingly, the earlier local bodies in these two States have been replaced with the new local bodies and as such consequential amendments are required to be made in the Fourth Schedule in relation to these two States.

The State of Karnataka has recommended that for the existing bodies, the bodies, namely, City Municipal Corporations, City Municipal Councils, Town Municipal Councils, Town Panchayats, Zila Panchayats, Taluka Panchayats, and Cantonment Boards may be substituted.

Similarly the State of Uttar Pradesh has recommended that in place of existing bodies, the bodies, namely, Municipal Corporations, Municipal Councils, Zila Panchayats, Nagar Panchayats, Kshetra Panchayats and Cantonment Boards may be substituted.

The Bill seeks to amend the Fourth Schedule in accordance with the recommendations made by the Governments of Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh.

As the Bill seeks to effect only consequential amendments in the Fourth Schedule on account of replacement of earlier local bodies by new bodies, I hope the Bill would have the unanimous support of the House.

[Translation]

SHRI BHAGWAN SHANKAR RAWAT : Madam Chairperson, though I am supporting this Bill, I would like to draw attention towards a flaw therein. It is not a lapse on the part of the hon. Minister but it is the Government machinery which is responsible for this lapse. Till the Parliament passed the Constitution 73rd and 74th Amendment Bills, the local bodies in Uttar Pradesh were neglected insofar as elections were concerned. Even now when the Election Commission is exercising so much control, the Legislative Council there is being made fun of. There are so many areas wherefrom M.L.C.s' elections had to be conducted but this work has not been done as yet. The local bodies whose elections of M.L.C.s is being discussed here at present, even those seats will fall vacant as these people

will be retiring soon. Therefore, those local bodies and the people over there are being deprived of representation in Legislative Council. There will be nobody to look after their interest.

15.35 hrs.

[Shri Chitta Basu *in the Chair*]

I would like to add two more points here. Firstly, the Bill may be made more comprehensive and for this Gram Panchayats should also be included in it.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have to announce that there is an amendment to the motion for consideration to be moved by Shri V.M. Sudheeran. I think, he is not present in the House.

[Translation]

SHRI BHAGWAN SHANKAR RAWAT : I would like to request Shri Khalapji that in case of Uttar Pradesh, Gram Panchayat may be added in the amending Bill so that the Gram Pradhans who have always been voting in elections, and the new members of Gram Panchayats get voting rights to ensure more effective representation.

The other point I would like to dwell upon is that it appears to me that the list showing the institutions to be added, which the hon. Minister has just now read and which has been forwarded by Uttar Pradesh Government, has been dictated by some I.A.S. officers on the basis of some previous experience and thus the names of some institutions have been dictated wrongly. There are no Zila Parishads now there - neither are there any Interim Zila Parishads. Their name is now Zila Panchayats. I would like to draw the attention of hon. Minister to this flaw. This is a clerical mistake. Some bureaucrat has forwarded the old names. There are no Municipal Corporations there now. Their new name is "Nagar Nigam". The Municipal Councils also are not there now, their new nomenclature is "Nagar Parishad" and "Nagar Panchayat". He has written "Nagar Panchayat" but he has not mentioned "Nagar Parishad". If a correction is made at this end, then the Uttar Pradesh I.A.S. officers will add to their knowledge as also they will become conscious of their negligence. You have mentioned Zila Panchayats. It is good but along with this, I had requested you in the beginning to add "Gram Panchayat" also so that there is broader representation.

The other point I would like to touch upon is that this election should have been held in time. In this way, the elections are being made fun of. When 73rd and 74th amendment Bill was passed and there bodies became Constitutional requirements, the delay to the Legislative Council elections is not good. The Uttar Pradesh Government should be reminded to take action in this regard. But there is President Rule in Uttar Pradesh for the last eight months and in a way it is the Central Government which is administering the State and as such I would say that the Central Government

should have exercised care in this regard. The Central Government is responsible for this flaw.

With these words, I support the Bill.

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister, while presenting the Bill just now said that it refers to a very ordinary matter. He observed that he was sure that all sections of the House would support the Bill. Insofar as the question of inclusion of local bodies is concerned, there may not be any difference of opinion but there are two serious problems here. Firstly, as said by Shri Bhagwan Shankar Rawat just now that there is change in the nomenclature after the passing of Constitution (73rd amendment) Bill. This is one aspect. But there is an other important point also and I would like to say in this regard that the elected Panches and Sarpanches of the local bodies, whether you call these bodies as "Gram Panchayats", "Nagar Panchayats", are important limbs of the local authorities. Three-tier system prevails at municipal level where at the lowest level there is municipal committee called "Nagar Panchayat", its second stage is known as Nagar Council and then there is municipal corporation. Similar situation obtains in rural side also. There is "Gram Panchayat" and then there is an institution at the block level and then a separate institution at the district level. But as has been said by the previous hon. Member, some mistake has cropped up here. The lowest unit is Gram Panchayat and neither its members nor Sarpanch has any right to vote. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to submit that when local authority is referred to it has been defined in the general clauses act, Gram Panchayat and municipal committee are included in the block authority. But these bodies are not there in the present Bill. In this bill relating to Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh, the lowest unit, i.e., "Gram Panchayat" has not been included therein, even its "Pradhan" has not been included therein. I have given notice of an amendment in this regard and my hon. friend from Karnataka Shri Anand Kumar has also submitted an amendment. He told me that all big parties in Karnataka whether Congress or B.J.P., all these parties have demanded that "Gram Panchayats" should be included as far as Karnataka is concerned. He further told me that with the exception of ruling party over there, people belonging to all other political parties are staging a "dharna" in Vidhan Sabha and Vidhan Parishad. I, therefore, feel that it is a very important matter. This creates an impression also that as far as elections to Legislative Council is concerned, the members of local bodies are being denied the "voting" rights deliberately. As such, our party has objection to that we are of the view that the Panch or the Sarpanch of the village should also have the right to vote. It has been argued by some people that in case voting right is extended to all the Panches and Sarpanches, the electoral college would become too large. I would like to submit that we should not be governed by such notions. Those people should be involved in the election to Legislative Council to ensure that they take full part

in the elections of the local bodies. Shri Anand Kumar has submitted an amendment in relation to Karnataka and I have also given notice of an amendment in this regard. We would like that Panches and Sarpanches, with whatever nomenclature in the different States, should be included in the electoral college of Legislative Councils. At the lowest level we have Panchayats and the number of members varies from place to place; it varies from five to seven. I would like to request the hon. Minister to verify as to why this lapse has taken place - whether it is deliberate lapse or it has cropped up inadvertently. Nobody should have any objection if these two local authorities are included and extended the right to vote.

The other point I would like to dwell upon is that wherever the elections are due, they are not held on one plea or the other. This is beside the point whether 'A' wins in the elections or 'B'. But not to hold the election for a very long time means to deprive the people of their right. It means to deny them their voting right. I would like the hon. Minister to give us an assurance that after the Bill has been passed, the elections will be held soon and the people extended the right to elect their representatives.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR (Bareilly): Mr. Chairman, Sir, though the Bill is a small one, yet it has its own importance. This change has to be brought because of 73rd and 74th amendment to Constitution and I am of the view that this change could have been brought earlier. In the absence of this change, these elections could not be held for such a long time. These elections are generally known as indirect elections. In this connection, I would like to say that, as my predecessors have said, Gram Panchayats should also be included as far as Uttar Pradesh is concerned. Previously, Pradhans had an active role to play in these elections but now under the new dispensation, the Pradhans will have no role to play. In this context, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to an other point also that there is misuse of money and power in the indirect elections. Everyone knows how the voters are kept indoors, money paid to them, allurements extended and pressure put on them. These irregularities are seen most in indirect elections.

Insofar as electoral reforms are concerned, I would like to submit that though Government is showing keen interest in this regard, it has failed to bring any comprehensive Bill in the House in this connection. The irregularities resorted to in Uttar Pradesh in the elections beggars description. There is much horse-trading in the elections of block pramukhs. Wrong promises are made and votes captured. These problems will crop up during the coming elections. My submission is that proper procedure should be adopted in elections and for this Gram Panchayat units should be included. There are ten to fifteen members in each of the Gram Panchayats

and in this way their electoral college will be formed. If the election takes place amongst 5000 to 6000 voters, the possibility of rigging is certainly less, and in case there is election between only 500 voters, certainly there is going to be rigging. To check this malpractice, it is necessary to include the Gram Panchayats.

Not dwelling upon further in respect of this Bill, I support it, and urge upon the hon. Minister that as far as indirect elections are concerned, it should be ensured that these elections are fair and proper procedure followed in regard thereto.

[English]

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA (Andaman and Nicobar Islands): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this piece of legislation which the Minister has sought to be passed in this House has created a lot of controversy in the State of Karnataka. As you know, almost all the Parties, excepting the ruling Party, there in the State Assembly, opposed this attempt because thereby more than 85,000 village panchayat members would be deprived of their rights to cast votes in the election for the Legislative Council. As such, here also, the Members from that State, met the hon. Prime Minister and requested to enlarge the scope. What has happened? In the past, there were mandal panchayats and they had the right to cast their votes in the election for the Legislative Council but when this was renamed as village panchayat then, the members were deprived of their right to vote by this piece of legislation. Therefore, I like to oppose this move and request the Government to reconsider this position because under no circumstances, more than 85,000 village panchayat members can be deprived of their rights to cast votes in the election for the Legislative Council.

As such I request the hon. Minister to reconsider this point. Otherwise it will be very difficult for us to vote in favour of this Bill.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar): I do not know. It was not in the business paper. Yesterday, we were not told about it. I was present in the meeting. We were told about the electoral reforms. You ask the other Members who are here. How come it came in, that I do not know. I have not seen. This is my fault. If you want to do it, please send it to the Select Committee because in Karnataka, there was an impasse for three days. Then I requested the Prime Minister to see our Members of Parliament. Then he did meet them and he said that he would look into it and get it examined. So after that, we do not know anything. How come it came in?

What they have said, the same thing is our point of view.

[Translation]

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR: I suggest that the Government should refer this Bill to the Select Committee. It is very necessary. The Government shall themselves bring forth an amendment.

[English]

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: You send it to the Select Committee. Do not try to do it. If you do not accept it, then we have to vote it out...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us listen to the hon. Minister...

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN: Sir, I have already moved an amendment to that effect. It is not going to create any problem. The amendment is just to remove that lacuna...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us come to that stage.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, please wait. There is another speaker who wants to speak. Shri Sudhir Giri, your name was called. You were not present in the House.

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI (Contai): Yes, Sir, I was absent at that time. I am sorry.

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, Bharat can be proud to be the largest democracy in the world. But muscle power and money power are the two factors which have spoiled the electoral process in our country. So, to give a direct path to the electoral process, different Committees were set up, different seminars were held, mainly the Goswami Committee ...*(Interruptions)*. No, I am coming to that. *(Interruptions)*. I am sorry, Sir, I wanted to speak on item number 20. Since this is a discussion on item number 19, I am resuming my seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Sir, I will make a short statement. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is mentioned and I quote:

"Consequent to the coming into force of the Constitution (Seventy-third Amendment) Act, 1992 and the Constitution (Seventy-fourth Amendment) Act, 1992, the States of Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh had amended the laws relating to the local bodies. The State of Karnataka has recommended that for the existing entries in the Fourth Schedule to the Representation of the People Act, 1950, the entries namely..."

They are now in the Schedule. Similarly, the Uttar Pradesh Government recommended that the entries as shown there be included in this Bill. So, basically this has come as a recommendation from the concerned State Governments. But since this issue has been raised by various Members of the House, what I would request, Sir, is that if the House permits and the Chair permits me, the consideration of this Bill could be deferred for about two or three days. Then, we can take the opinion of different sections of this House and come back to the House...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN: We have no objection to that. Kindly seek the opinion on two points.

Firstly, whether the lowest unit, Gram Panchayat, should be included or not.

Secondly, there is a doubt. Under the Seventy-third Amendment, a Member of Parliament is an ex-officio Member of the Municipal Corporations/Committees. I would like to know whether the M.P. and the M.L.A. will also have the right to vote in the elections or not. This issue should be clarified from the hon. the Prime Minister. I would like to request the hon. Minister that he may call a meeting of the Leaders of all the political parties. They may sit together and sort out the matter.

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Sir, I accept the suggestions of the hon. Members.

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN: On the above mentioned points, you may kindly seek the clarifications by calling an all Party meeting.

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: There is no prestige involved in this. We shall execute whatever is in the interest of the country.

Sir, if the Chair permits, we may defer this for about a couple of days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall take it up later on.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: We do not mind. What is the procedure? It is the property of the House and not of the hon. Minister. The desire of the House is there. I think, he should ask for leave to postpone it...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he is not withdrawing the Bill.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Then what is he doing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I have understood is that he wants postponement of discussion on the Bill.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Do the rules permit that and, if so, to what extent? They should not create another impasse. Let them do it in a proper manner. What is the procedure? Is the postponement allowed?...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he is not seeking the withdrawal of the Bill. The Bill is the property of the House. If it is to be withdrawn, it is to be withdrawn on the basis of the leave of the House to withdraw. But that is not the case. The case is that the hon. Minister wants, and many Members of the House also want, that the consideration of this particular legislation be postponed for some time...

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN: Hon. Chairman, Sir, the other day also we deferred the consideration of the Construction Workers Bill...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, there is no objection to it.

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN: Let it be deferred till next week so that the amendments come in time. It may not

be deferred for years together. It should be time-bound. Let it be deferred for a week's time.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Sir, I am sorry to say that this is a sad reflection on the part of the Government. This is the second Bill, the consideration of which is getting postponed and the House is being taken for a ride. The Government must properly study the things before they come here. This is not the way. So many terms I have passed here in this House and now I find again and again the Government sleeping on the matters and then suddenly waking up to realities. They must do their home work properly. The consideration of which Bill is now going to be adjourned? This is the second Bill in one week, the consideration of which is now going to be adjourned. They do not study the things properly. I do not know how they come before the House. (Interruptions). This is, of course, a good Bill and I support it. But I say that the Government ought to have taken care of all these things.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF TOURISM (SHRI SRIKANTA JENA): Sir, Shri G.M. Banatwalla is a senior Member of this House. With deference to the wishes of the hon. Members, we are deferring this item which has been listed in the agenda today. It is not that the Government has not applied its mind. The Government has applied its mind. But with deference to the wishes of the hon. Members, we are postponing it and we are taking up the second one. The difficulty with the second one in the secretariat is that the hon. Speaker allowed the amendments up to one o'clock. The amendments are yet to be circulated. They have not been circulated as yet. That is why I am requesting the Chair that we can go to the next item, that is, the Statutory Resolution. The electoral reforms have been agreed to by all political parties. Immediately after the amendments are circulated, we shall take up the Electoral Reforms Bill. This is precisely the point. I hope, Shri G.M. Banatwalla will appreciate this position.

[Translation]

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR: Mr. Chairman, I object to it. It was decided at 10pm. That amendments will be accepted upto 12 Noon. Then, why have they not been circulated? It is there in the list of Business.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall check it up.

[Translation]

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR: Mr. Chairman, we had come prepared for item No.20 and not for 21 or 22.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are prepared for all the items which find place in the List of Business. Anyway, let us wait for the circulation of the proposed amendments.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: We can take up the discussion. In the mean time, the amendments are being circulated... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please make up your mind.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: We are ready, Sir. The only point is that the discussion can be started and the amendments are being circulated.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKERJEE: Sir, the confusion is because one sheet was circulated. That is really a technical mistake... (Interruptions).

16.00 hrs

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Sir, I beg to move: "That the discussion on the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1996 be postponed for the next week".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the discussion on the Representation of the People (Amendment) be postponed for the next week".

The motion was adopted.

16.01 hrs.

## REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS, LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1950, and the Representation of the People Act, 1951, be taken into consideration".

Mr. Chairman, Sir... (Interruptions)

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Sir, where are the amendments?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF TOURISM (SHRI SRIKANTA JENA): They are coming. They are being circulated. They are on the way... (Interruptions)

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Sir, we are discussing this without knowing what the amendments which the hon. Members are going to bring? ... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am told that some hon. Members have already got the circulated amendments.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: They are fortunate. But what have we done? Why is this distinction between certain Members receiving them and certain Members not receiving them? What a confusion in this House? ... (Interruptions)