

LOK SABHA

**THE CRIMINAL AND ELECTION
LAWS AMENDMENT BILL, 1968**

(Report of the Joint Committee)

(Presented on the 2nd December, 1968)



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

December, 1968/Agrahayana, 1890 (Saka)

Price : 70 paise

**JOINT/SELECT COMMITTEE REPORTS
PRESENTED TO LOK SABHA
DURING - 1968**

Sl. No.	Name	Presented
1.	Salary, Allowances and other Amenities to Members of Parliament - J.C. Report.	7.8.68
2.	Constitution (Amendment) Bill, 1967 By Shri Nath Pai, M.P. - Report J.C.	22.7.68
3.	- do- Statement	
4.	- do- Evidence	
5.	Banking Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1967 Report of Select Committee.	6.5.68
6.	-do- Evidence	
7.	Gold (Control) Bill, 1968 Report of Joint Committee.	13.8.68
8.	Insurance (Amendment) Bill, 1968 Report of the Joint Committee.	11.11.68
9.	-do- Evidence	
10.	Criminal and Election Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1968 - Report of Joint Committee.	2.12.68
11.	Union Territories (Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions) Bill, 1968 (Report of Joint Committee.	10.12.68

LOK SABHA

CORRIGENDA

TO

THE REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE
ON THE CRIMINAL AND ELECTION LAWS
AMENDMENT BILL, 1968.

Minutes of Dissent

1. Page XV, line 4 for 'happend'
read 'happened'.

Bill as reported by Joint
Committee

2. Page 1, in marginal heading to clause 2,
for '5 of 1860' read '45 of 1860'.
3. Page 2, in the marginal heading to clause 2,
for ' of harmony,' read 'of harmony.'
4. Page 12 line 31,
for 'breach of Committee'
read 'breach of privilege of the Committee'.
5. Page 27,
(i) line 19, for 'ia' read 'Dharia'
(ii) line 20, for 'e'Report' read 'the Report'.

New Delhi;

Dated the 31st December, 1968.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Composition of the Joint Committee	(iii)
2. Report of the Joint Committee	(v)
3. Minutes of Dissent	(ix)
4. Bill as reported by the Joint Committee	I
 Appendix I:	
Motion in Lok Sabha for reference of the Bill to Joint Committee	7
 Appendix II:	
Motion in Rajya Sabha	9
 Appendix III	
Minutes of the sittings of the Joint Committee	10

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE CRIMINAL AND ELECTION LAWS
AMENDMENT BILL, 1968**

COMPOSITION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Vidya Charan Shukla
3. Shri Maganti Ankineedu
4. Shri S. M. Siddayya
5. Shri C. M. Kedaria
6. Shri A. K. Chanda
7. Shri K. M. Asghar Husain
8. Lt. Col. H.H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah, Tehri Garhwal
9. Shri D. Basumatari
10. Shri Jaipal Singh
11. Shri Y. B. Chavan
12. Shri Hem Raj
13. Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
14. Shri Chand Goyal
15. Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu
16. Shri H. Ajmal Khan
17. Shri Era Sezhiyan
18. Shri J. H. Patel
19. Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair
20. Shri M. Muhammad Ismail
21. Shri P. Ramamurti
22. Shri P. Viswambharan

Rajya Sabha

23. Shri Ajit Prasad Jain
24. Shri Mohan Manikchand Dharla
25. Shri Narla Venkateswara Rao

26. Shri Tribhovandas Kisibhai Patel
27. Shri Pratul Chandra Mitra
28. Dr. (Mrs.) Mangla Devi Talwar
29. Shri Ram Sahai
30. Shri Devi Singh
31. Shri Rewati Kant Sinha
32. Shri M. R. Venkataraman
33. Shri B. V. Abdullah Koya

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

1. Shri P. L. Gupta, *Addl. Legislative Counsel, Ministry of Law.*
2. Shri D. C. Hajela, *Asstt. Draftsman, Ministry of Law.*

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY

1. Shri L. P. Singh, *Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs.*
2. Shri T. C. A. Srinivasavaradan, *Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs.*
3. Shri G. K. Arora, *Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs.*
4. Shri V. K. Kapoor, *Under Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs.*

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

1. The Chairman of the Joint Committee to which the Bill* further to amend the Indian Penal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 and the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and to provide against printing and publication of certain objectionable matters, was referred, having been authorised to submit the report on their behalf, present their Report, with the Bill as amended by the Committee annexed thereto.

2. The Bill was introduced on the 27th August, 1968 in Lok Sabha. The motion for reference of the Bill to a Joint Committee was moved in Lok Sabha by Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs on the 29th August, 1968 and was discussed and adopted on the same day (Appendix I).

3. Rajya Sabha discussed the said motion on the 31st August, 1968 and concurred therein on the same day (Appendix II).

4. The message from Rajya Sabha was published in the Lok Sabha Bulletin, Part II, dated the 2nd September, 1968.

5. The Committee held seven sittings in all.

6. The first sitting of the Committee was held on the 4th October, 1968 to draw up their programme of work. The Committee at this sitting decided to hear oral evidence from the press, public bodies and other associations desirous of presenting their views before the Committee and to issue a Press Communique inviting memoranda for the purpose. The Committee also decided to invite the views of the State Governments, Bar Councils and other public bodies. The Chairman was authorised to decide, after examining the memoranda submitted by the parties, as to which of them should be called upon to give oral evidence before the Committee.

7. Three memoranda on the Bill were received by the Committee from the Press Council of India, New Delhi; the Panchjanya Weekly,

*Published in Gazette of India, Extraordinary. Part II, Section 2, dated the 27th August, 1968.

New Delhi and the Organiser Weekly, New Delhi, which were circulated to the members.

8. At their second and third sittings held on the 1st and 2nd November, 1968 the Committee heard the evidence of the representatives of the Panchjanya Weekly, New Delhi and the Organiser Weekly, New Delhi respectively. At their fourth sitting held on the 20th November, 1968 the Committee heard the views of the Attorney-General on the provisions of the Bill.

9. The Report of the Committee was to be presented by the 11th November, 1968. As this could not be done, the Committee, at their third sitting held on the 2nd November, 1968, decided to ask for extension of time for presentation of their report upto the 2nd December, 1968. Necessary motion for extension of time was brought before the House and adopted on the 11th November, 1968.

10. The Committee have decided that the evidence given before them should be printed and laid on the Tables of both the Houses *in extenso*.

11. The Committee considered the Bill clause-by-clause at their fifth and sixth sittings held on the 22nd and 23rd November, 1968.

12. The Committee considered and adopted the Report on the 29th November, 1968.

13. The observations of the Committee with regard to the principal changes proposed in the Bill are detailed in the succeeding paragraphs.

14. *Clause 2.*—The Committee are of the opinion that, having regard to the enhanced punishment of imprisonment up to five years provided in sub-section (2) of clause 2, the provision for minimum punishment of imprisonment of two years may be omitted. Accordingly, the words 'which shall not be less than two years but' in sub-section (2) of proposed section 153A have been omitted.

15. *Clause 3.*—The Committee feel that in the Exception under section 505 of the Indian Penal Code, the element of 'good faith' should be added and that the Exception should be made applicable to section 505 as a whole. Further for the parity of reasoning given in paragraph 14, the provision with regard to minimum imprisonment of two years prescribed for offences committed under proposed section 505(3) should also be omitted.

The clause has been amended accordingly.

16. *Clause 4.*—The amendments made in the clause are consequential to the changes proposed in clauses 2 and 3.

17. *Clause 6.*—The Committee are of the view that the powers of seizure of any printing press or other instrument or apparatus used in the publication, conferred upon the Executive under sub-clause (2) of the clause are of a very drastic nature and are likely to affect the freedom of the press, and that the duration of an order passed under the sub-clause for the seizure of the printing press or other instrument or apparatus used in the publication should be limited to the period for which an order under sub-clause (1) of the clause would operate.

The Committee, therefore, propose to amend sub-clause (2) so as to restrict the power of the Executive to order—

- (a) the seizure of copies of the publication made in violation of an order made under sub-clause (1), and
- (b) the closure of the printing press, instrument or apparatus used in the publication for the period for which the order under sub-clause (1) is in operation.

The clause has been amended accordingly.

18. *Clause 8.*—During the course of discussion on clause 8, the Minister-in-charge of the Bill explained that the proposed Press Consultative Committee at the Centre and the State level will consist of 10-15 members and 7-10 members respectively and that the members of the Committees would be chosen by Government in consultation with the representative organisations of editors, newspaper managements and journalists. The Government would invite panels of names from representative bodies like the All India Newspapers Editors' Conference and choose the persons to be appointed as members of the Consultative Committee out of the names suggested by such representative body. Regarding the role of the Press Consultative Committee, the Minister-in-charge clarified that the Press Consultative Committees would consider the representations made by persons against whom action may have been taken under clause 6(1) and would advise the Government whether the orders passed under clause 6(1) should be modified, confirmed or rescinded.

(viii)

The Committee trust that although the role of the Press Consultative Committees would be purely advisory in character, the concerned Governments would attach due importance to the views expressed by the Press Consultative Committees.

19. The Joint Committee recommend that the Bill as amended be passed.

NITIRAJ SINGH,
Chairman,
Joint Committee.

NEW DELHI;
29th November, 1968.
Agrahayana 8, 1890 (S).

MINUTES OF DISSENT

I

1 regret I am unable to agree with several provisions of The Criminal and Election Laws Amendment Bill, 1968, as passed and adopted by the Joint Select Committee.

2. In the statement of objects and reasons, it is claimed by the Government that this legislation is sought to be made on the recommendations of the National Integration Council. I have gone through the recommendations of the National Integration Council. At the National Integration Conference in Srinagar, a Committee on Communal Aspects had made certain specific recommendations. They include one to amend Section 153A of the Indian Penal Code to provide for punishment of communal activities. The Committee on Regional Aspects also has made certain recommendations. But those recommendations do not include a suggestion for the amendment of the Penal Code. But when the Bill in question was drafted by the Government, they decided to make it an omnibus one. Hence Section 153A of the I.P.C. is proposed to be amended as to include "place of birth, residence" apart from religion, race, language, caste or community.

3. My approach to the question is different. I feel that the main concentration should be against communal forces. Anything that causes ill-will between different sections of people on the basis of religion, race, and community has to be opposed vehemently. But there are language issues and regional issues which are sometimes genuine. According to me, it is wrong to club everything together. I am not in favour of giving extra and extraordinary powers to the executive which can be misused even on occasion when people are forced to resort to genuine democratic movements. My understanding of the intention of the National Integration Council is that they wanted mainly to concentrate on ways and means to meet the rising tide of communal violence in the country.

4. Section 6 of the Bill provides the power to exercise restraint on a publication both to the Union Government and the State Government if that kind of action is considered to be necessary for the maintenance of communal harmony. The Union Government is empowered to act directly in a State in spite of the State Government.

(x)

It is true that this is a subject under the Concurrent List. Still, it is necessary to avoid friction and conflict between the Union and the States. So I feel that it is better that the Union Government exercises this authority in the Union Territories and centrally administered areas and the State Governments are left free to deal with the situation within the respective States. Even otherwise the Union Government has got powers to advise or even direct the State Governments, if it becomes absolutely necessary. So the section as it stands at present is not acceptable to me.

5. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am behind none in my anxiety to curb the communal forces. But I cannot be a party to arming the Government with much more additional and extraordinary powers in the name of doing a good thing.

NEW DELHI;
29th November, 1968.

P. K. VASUDEVAN NAIR.

II

I am compelled to dissent from the report of the Committee on the omission of my amendments, that the Bill should also comprehend those who excite ill-will, hatred and the like between the "classes". My reasons for the amendments are:

(1) That the majority of conflicts which disintegrate the people, in every part of the country are economic, between tenants and landowners, employees and employers, poor and the rich unemployed and employed.

(2) That there has been dangerous development of gheraos, strikes and other obstructions of the life of people on which tendentious printing and publication can have a disastrous effect, even more so than on other grounds like religion, language, etc.

(3) That while these conflicts can only be eliminated by the economic development of the country, they should not be increased by written or spoken words of either side. The amendment is therefore not against the proper determination of the conflicts, but against their exploitation in the press and on the platform.

(4) That if "class" conflict is not included, the Bill will not be complete or courageous, and to that extent will not attract public support.

J. M. LOBO PRABHU

NEW DELHI;
29th November, 1968.

. III

The Government have failed to make out a case while bringing forth this piece of legislation. The law already existing to deal with communal, regional or caste disharmony is adequate enough. Moreover, the use of the words "or any other ground", occurring in section 153A of the Indian Penal Code, are enough to cover other cases arising from the feelings of disharmony created on the ground of place of birth or of residence. The present Bill also intends to punish those, who may not have had any intention of creating disharmony and might have believed *bona fide* in what they did. Therefore the safeguard would have been to introduce the words intentionally in sub-section (1) (a) of section 2 and ought to have deleted the words "or which is likely to create or promote" from sub-section (2) of section 3.

2. The provision for closure of the Printing Press is a very serious one and it is likely to put many people out of employment and also stop the functioning of the Printing Presses. This provision should not remain in the impugned Act.

3. Even though the Government has assured that it will respect the opinion of the Press Consultative Committee and the Press Consultative Committee will be recruited from amongst the press people but in spite of that some provision has to be made in the Act to ensure this.

NEW DELHI;
30th November, 1968.

SHRI CHAND GOYAL.
JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI.

IV

I would like to offer two comments on the report:

1. Clause 6 empowers the Central Government or any authority so authorised by the Central Government to issue orders prohibiting the printing or publication of any document not only in Union Territories but in States also with a view to maintaining communal harmony and public order. At the same time State Governments are also given the same powers. Thus two agencies are given powers to discharge the same functions. Maintenance of communal harmony and public order is the duty and function of State Government concerned. So it is not fair that the Central Government exercise this power over the head of the State Governments. This is clearly an encroachment on the powers of the State Governments. Conflicts may arise between the Central and State Government if the Central Government acts in this regard without the concurrence of the State Government. Further, the Central Government will have to depend upon the State Government Officers for the enforcement of orders passed under this clause. Hence, it is only just and proper that the Central Government reserve the right to issue orders under this clause only in respect of Union Territories, leaving these powers exclusively to State Governments. So far as States are concerned; so clause 6 has got to be amended accordingly.

2. Para 18 of the Report of the Joint Committee contains certain explanations from the Home Minister regarding constitution of the Press Consultative Committees mentioned in clause 8 of the Bill. It is better that these details are incorporated in the bill.

NEW DELHI;

P. VISWAMBHARAN, M.P.

Dated the 30th November, 1968.

The Criminal and Election Laws Amendment Bill, 1968, by amending the existing Sections 153A and 505 of the Indian Penal Code includes in the Criminal law new offences based on grounds of place of birth, residence, language etc., and enhances the punishments for the offences specified in the amended sections in case such offences are committed in any place or assembly of religious worship or religious observances. By amending Section 196 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the Bill makes the offences above referred to cognizable and non bailable ones. These offences are also made election offences and are proposed to be included in the provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 as corrupt practices. Moreover, a new procedure is sought to be established for dealing with writings, the periodicals and other publications accused of these offences.

2. Excepting these few features, the Bill, though it purports effectively to amend the existing criminal law of the country, is more or less substantively the same as the said existing law. The present law gives ample powers to the Government for dealing with and controlling the evils which this Bill is supposed to be intended to mitigate or eradicate. But in spite of the Government already possessing ample powers there have been hundreds of cases of communal violence, year after year for the last twenty one years, resulting in the destruction of huge numbers of human lives and properties and in misery and suffering particularly of the minorities and especially of the Muslims. And there has all along been a virulent and venomous communal propaganda through statements, periodicals and other publications. There is an attempt-though unsuccessful in the main-by such attacks to isolate Muslims from the mainstream of life in the country. If anything, the condition is indeed worse at present. The sense of security among the minority is at a miserably low ebb. Under such conditions what matters at present and what is required is not so much a new law as a firm, efficient and impartial implementation of the law, be it old or new.

3. About a month ago, prosecutions were launched against sixteen papers. Was not this action taken under the existing law? The

same law has been in existence all these years and yet similar actions were not taken by the Government hitherto. It is reported that during the last 21 years, there were only 21 instances of such action in spite of hundreds of violent incidents having happened in the country every year. What law was found useful a month ago, might have been used previously too.

4. Another feature—a significant one—of the last month's prosecutions is that out of sixteen papers proceeded against, only three belong to members of the majority community while the remaining thirteen—mostly Urdu—are owned by Muslims. No Hindi paper has been touched anywhere. The thing is that finding the Government not taking due legal action or counter-measures against incessant and constant communal propaganda carried on by certain persons and papers belonging to the majority community, some papers owned by minorities take to writing in defence of the minorities and because of this defensive action they have come to grief and are being prosecuted. This action against the minority's papers seem to follow a pattern that is already in vogue with regard to dealing with the minorities. That is to say that in most of the communal halocausts the Muslims and their properties were the victims. However, in very many instances the Muslims were arrested, not for affording them safety in the jails but as offenders of the law.

5. This manner of enforcing and administering the law, instead of affording relief to the victims, naturally impairs further the sense of security which is already slender and emaciated.

6. In view of such a state of affairs, it was suggested that in the present Bill a proviso might be inserted as a deterrent to the effect that any officer who may be proved to have effected the arrest of any person or to have charged any person of any of the offences specified in the Bill on baseless or flimsy grounds should be made liable to be punished and dismissed from service. But unfortunately the concerned amendment was not accepted.

7. Another questionable provision in the Bill is the distinction made between the same offences merely on the basis of the place where they are committed. An offence committed in an ordinary place is proposed to be given a certain punishment; but the very same offence if committed in a place of worship is to be given a severer punishment. Such a difference made on grounds merely of the nature of the places of committal is not justifiable and it may, for one thing, amount to discrimination.

Again, this distinction or discrimination will become a source of grave mischief and trouble to people.

8. I think one can well assume that this provision is born of an insidious and baseless propaganda that places of worship are being used as places of secret conclaves and conspiracies for hatching mischief. This propaganda is aimed particularly at the minorities and especially at the Muslim places of worship. But the fact concerning the Muslim places of worship is that most of the mosques that are in use now have been built by the people now on in the past; they have no secret or hiding places in them; they are built within villages and towns and their doors open directly on the streets and roads. Anything happening in the mosque can well be seen even from outside. In the very nature of things secret conclaves or confabulations cannot, simply, be held in mosques.

9. The people do, of course, gather together in a mosque. Such gathering is not only for regular worship or prayers; but at times, particularly in villages and small towns it is also for the discussion of the management and affairs of the mosque, for settling marriage, divorce, funeral and any dispute in the congregation and so on. Especially in villages and small towns the people have no other place excepting the mosque for carrying on such functions.

10. Since the present Bill pointedly but unnecessarily brings the places of worship into its vision, the victims of past aggression will become more anxious and are likely to be subjected to more hardships.

11. I am still firmly of the view that sub-section (2) of section 2 and sub-section (3) of Section 3 ought to be omitted.

12. Moreover, it is regrettable that the provisos myself and my friends M|s. Ebrahim Sulamain Sait and S. M. Muhammed Sheriff moved in the Lok Sabha for exempting Khutba (Sermon) in a masjid or Idgah and sermon in the church from the purview of Section 2(3) and Section 3(3) of the Bill has not been accepted. The Khutba is a part and parcel of prayers and this along with the recitations in prayers or worship have been going on for the last fourteen centuries and they ought to have definitely and dearly kept out of the provisions of the Bill.

13. Section (2) even as amended by the Joint Committee provides for the closure of the printing of Press in which an offending publication was printed. Since writer and publisher of the offending publication is punished, it is neither necessary nor fair to bring in the printing press also. The very presence of such a provision will make the printers nervous and cause hardships to the small papers which have no press of their own. Again, for the fault of one paper, other papers who are innocent but are being printed in the same press will also have to suffer. That would not be fair.

M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL

NEW DELHI;
30th November, 1968.

THE CRIMINAL AND ELECTION LAWS
AMENDMENT BILL, 1968

(AS REPORTED BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE)

(Words underlined indicate amendments suggested by the Committee;
asterisks indicate omissions.)

A
BILL

further to amend the Indian Penal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 and the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and to provide against printing and publication of certain objectionable matters.

BE it enacted by Parliament in the Nineteenth Year of the Republic of India as follows:—

1. This Act may be called the Criminal and Election Laws Amend- Short title.
ment Act, 1968.

5 of 1860. 5 2. In the Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as the Penal Substitution
Code), for section 153A, the following section shall be substituted, of new sec-
namely:— tion for
section
153A.

"153A. (1) Whoever—

10 (a) by words, either spoken or written, or by signs or Promoting
by visible representations or otherwise, promotes, or enmity
between

Different group: on grounds of religion, race, place of birth, residence, language, etc., and doing acts prejudicial to maintenance of harmony,

attempts to promote, on grounds of religion, race, place of birth, residence, language, caste or community or any other ground whatsoever, disharmony or feelings of enmity, hatred or ill-will between different religious, racial, language or regional groups or castes or communities, or

5

(b) commits any act which is prejudicial to the maintenance of harmony between different religious, racial, language or regional groups, or castes, or communities, and which disturbs or is likely to disturb the public tranquillity, shall be punished with imprisonment which may extend to three years, or with fine, or with both.

10

Offence committed in place of worship, etc.

(2) Whoever commits an offence specified in sub-section (1) in any place of worship or in any assembly engaged in the performance of religious worship or religious ceremonies, shall be punished with imprisonment * * * which may extend to five years and shall also be liable to fine."

15

Amendment of section 505.

3. Section 505 of the Penal Code shall be re-numbered as sub-section (1) of that section, and—

(i) after sub-section (1) as so re-numbered but before the Exception, the following sub-section shall be inserted, namely:—

20

* * * * *

Statements creating or promoting enmity, hatred or ill-will between classes.

"(2) Whoever makes, publishes or circulates any statement or report containing rumour or alarming news with intent to create or promote, or which is likely to create or promote, on grounds of religion, race, place of birth, residence, language, caste or community or any other ground whatsoever, feelings of enmity, hatred or ill-will between different religious, racial, language or regional groups, or castes or communities, shall be punished with imprisonment which may extend to three years, or with fine, or with both.

25

30

Offence under sub-section (2) committed in place of worship, etc.

(3) Whoever commits an offence specified in sub-section (2) in any place of worship or in any assembly engaged in the performance of religious worship or religious ceremonies, shall be punished with imprisonment * * * which may extend to five years and shall also be liable to fine.;"

35

(ii) in the Exception, after the words "circulates it", the words "in good faith and" shall be inserted.

Amendment of Act 5 of 1898.

4. In the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898,—

(a) in section 196, for the words "the State Government or some officer empowered by the State Government in this

40

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
305 (3)	False statement, rumour, etc., made in place of worship, etc., with intent to create enmity, hatred or ill-will.	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Imprisonment of either description for * * * five years, and fine.	Ditto.”;

10

(iv) for the entries in columns 3 and 7 relating to section 506 as applicable to “Criminal intimidation” (first paragraph), the entries “shall not arrest without warrant” and “imprisonment of either description for 2 years, or fine, or both” shall, respectively, be substituted. 15

Amendment of section 8.

5. In section 8 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, in sub-section (1), for the words, figures and letters “section 171E or section 171F of the Indian Penal Code”, the words, figures and letters “section 153A or section 171E or section 171F or sub-section (2) or sub-section (3) of section 505 of the Indian Penal Code” shall be substituted. 20

43 of 1951.

Power to control prejudicial publications.

6. (1) The Central Government or a State Government or any authority so authorised by the Central Government in this behalf, if satisfied that such action is necessary for the purpose of preventing or combating any activity prejudicial to the maintenance of communal harmony and affecting or likely to affect public order, may, by order in writing addressed to the printer, publisher or editor, prohibit the printing or publication of any document or any class of documents of any matter relating to a particular subject or class of subjects for a specified period or in a particular issue or issues of a newspaper or periodical: 25 30

Provided that no such order shall remain in force for more than two months from the making thereof:

Provided further that the person against whom the order has been made may, within ten days of the communication of the order, make a representation,— 35

(i) to the Central Government, where such order is made by the Central Government or any authority authorised by it; and 40

(ii) to the State Government, where such order is made by the State Government,

and the Central Government or the State Government, as the case may be, may, after consultation with a Committee, to be known as Press Consultative Committee, dispose of the matter, modifying, confirming or rescinding the order.

5 (2) In the event of disobedience of an order made under sub-section (1), the Central Government or the State Government or the authority issuing the order, as the case may be, may, without prejudice to any other penalty to which the person guilty of the disobedience is liable under this Act or under any other law for the
10 time being in force, direct that copies of the publication made in violation of an order made under sub-section (1) be seized, and that any printing press or other instrument or apparatus used in the publication be closed down for the period such order is in operation.

15 7. Whoever contravenes, disobeys or neglects to comply with any order made under section 6 of this Act, shall, on conviction, be punished with imprisonment of either description which may extend to one year, or with fine up to one thousand rupees, or with both. Penalty.

20 8. (1) A Press Consultative Committee referred to in the second proviso to sub-section (1) of section 6, shall consist of such number of persons, being editors, publishers and journalists, as may be prescribed by rules made under this section. Composition of the Press Consultative Committee and rules in respect thereof.

(2) The Central Government may make rules for the constitution of Press Consultative Committees, the term of office of the members
25 of such Committees, the allowances, if any, to be paid to such members for attending the meetings of the Committee and the manner of filling casual vacancies among them, and for all matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

(3) In particular, and without prejudice to the generality of the
30 foregoing power under sub-section (2), such rules may provide for all or any of the following matters. namely: —

(a) the number of persons who may be appointed as members of a Press Consultative Committee and the class or category of persons from whom such members are to be appointed;

35 (b) the authority or authorities which may make such appointments;

(c) the procedure to be followed by the Central Government or the State Government, as the case may be, in consulting the Press Consultative Committee;

(d) the procedure to be followed by the Press Consultative Committee;

(e) any other matter for which rules have to be made for enabling the Press Consultative Committee to function.

(4) Every rule made under this section shall be laid, as soon as may¹⁰ be after it is made, before each House of Parliament while it is in session for a total period of thirty days, which may be comprised in one session or in two successive sessions, and if before the expiry of the session in which it is so laid or the session immediately following, both Houses agree in making any modification in the rule or both¹⁵ Houses agree that the rule should not be made, the rule shall thereafter have effect only in such modified form or be of no effect as the case may be; so, however, that any such modification or annulment shall be without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done under that rule.

APPENDIX I

(Vide para 2 of the Report)

Motion in Lok Sabha for reference of the Bill to Joint Committee.

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 and the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and to provide against printing and publication of certain objectionable matters, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 33 members, 22 from this House, namely:—

- (1) Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh
- (2) Shri Vidya Charan Shukla
- (3) Shri Maganti Ankineedu
- (4) Shri S. M. Siddayya
- (5) Shri C. M. Kedaria
- (6) Shri A. K. Chanda
- (7) Shri K. M. Asghar Husain
- (8) Lt. Col. H. H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah
- (9) Shri D. Basumatari
- (10) Shri Y. B. Chavan
- (11) Shri Jaipal Singh
- (12) Shri Hem Raj
- (13) Shri Jagannath Rao Joshi
- (14) Shri Shri Chand Goyal
- (15) Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu
- (16) Shri H. Ajmal Khan
- (17) Shri Era Sezhiyan
- (18) Shri J. H. Patel
- (19) Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair
- (20) Shri P. Ramamurti
- (21) Shri M. Muhammad Ismail, and
- (22) Shri P. Viswambharan.

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

that the committee shall take a report to the House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respects, the rules of procedure of this House relating to parliamentary committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 11 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

APPENDIX II

(Vide para 3 of the Report)

Motion in Rajya Sabha

That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 and the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and to provide against printing and publication of certain objectionable matters and resolves that the following members of the Rajya Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee:—

1. Shri A. P. Jain ..
2. Shri M. M. Dharia
3. Shri N. Venkateswara Rao
4. Shri T. K. Patel
5. Shri P. C. Mitra
6. Dr. (Mrs.) Mangladevi Talwar
7. Shri Ram Sahai
8. Shri Devi Singh
9. Shri Rewati Kant Sinha
10. Shri M. R. Venkataraman
11. Shri B. V. Abdulla Koya.

APPENDIX III

Minutes of the Sitzings of the Joint Committee on the Criminal and Election Laws Amendment Bill, 1968.

I

First Sitting

The Committee sat on Friday, the 4th October, 1968 from 10.00 to 10.30 hours.

PRESENT

Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri C. M. Kedaria
3. Shri Y. B. Chavan
4. Lt. Col. H. H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah, Tehri Garhwal
5. Shri Hem Raj
6. Shri Shri Chand Goyal
7. Shri M. Muhammad Ismail
8. Shri P. Ramamurti
9. Shri P. Viswambharan

Rajya Sabha

10. Shri Ajit Prasad Jain
11. Shri Mohan Manikchand Dharia
12. Shri Pratul Chandra Mitra
13. Dr. (Mrs.) Mangla Devi Talwar
14. Shri Rewati Kant Sinha
15. Shri M. R. Venkataraman.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

1. Shri T. C. A. Srinavasavaradan, *Joint Secretary.*
2. Shri G. K. Arora, *Deputy Secretary.*
3. Shri M. D. Godbole, *Deputy Secretary.*

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Shri P. L. Gupta, *Additional Legislative Counsel, Ministry of Law.*

SECRETARIAT.

Shri M. C. Chawla, *Deputy Secretary.*

2. At the outset, the Chairman moved the following resolution condoling the death of Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao, former Deputy Speaker of Lok Sabha:

“This Committee place on record their deep sense of sorrow over the passing away of Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao, former Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha at New Delhi today morning.

The Committee send their heartfelt sympathies to the bereaved family.”

The members then stood in silence for a shortwhile.

3. The Committee then decided to issue a Press Communique inviting memoranda on the Bill from interested parties by the 28th October, 1968 at the latest (Annexure). The Committee also approved the letter to be specifically addressed to the State Governments, Press, Public bodies like Bar Councils and Bar Associations to invite their comments or suggestions on the Bill.

4. The Committee desired that copies of the Punjab Special Powers (Press) Act, 1956, Andhra Pradesh Special Powers Press Bill and the Report of the National Integration Council and the details about the action taken thereon by the Central Government should be made available to the members of the Committee.

5. The Committee then adjourned to meet on Friday, the 1st November, 1968 at 10.00 hrs. and also on Saturday, the 2nd November, 1968 to hear the evidence.

ANNEXURE

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PRESS COMMUNIQUE

The Criminal and Election Laws Amendment Bill, 1968 which was introduced in Lok Sabha on the 27th August, 1968 was referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament. It seeks *inter alia* to amend sections 153A and 505 IPC and Schedule II of the Code of Criminal Procedure with a view to amplifying the scope of these sections, providing enhanced punishment for offences under these sections committed in a place of worship, and making offences under sections 153A IPC and 505 IPC (only offences relating to enmity or hatred between communities etc.) cognizable. A provision is also being made whereby offences under Section 153A and provision made in the Bill under section 505 IPC would constitute a disqualification under section 8 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951. The Bill also seeks to provide for prohibiting the printing or publication of any matter for a specified period not exceeding two months if the Central Government or the State Government is satisfied that such action is necessary in the interest of maintenance of communal harmony.

The Joint Committee at their first sitting held today under the chairmanship of Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh, M.P., decided that the State Governments, Press, individuals, public bodies, Bar Councils and Bar Associations and other associations desirous of submitting memoranda on the Bill for consideration of the Committee may send 50 copies of each memoranda so as to reach the Secretary, Lok Sabha, Parliament House, New Delhi on or before the 28th October, 1968. The memoranda which might be submitted to the Committee would form part of the records of the Committee and should be treated as strictly confidential and not circulated to anyone, as such an act would constitute a breach of Committee.

Those who are desirous of giving oral evidence before the Committee, besides sending memoranda, are requested to intimate to this effect to the Lok Sabha Secretariat by the said date for consideration of the Committee.

The Criminal and Election Laws Amendment Bill, 1968, as introduced in Lok Sabha, was published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 2, dated the 27th August, 1968.

The Committee will sit in Parliament House, New Delhi on the 1st and 2nd November, 1968 to hear the evidence.

New DELHI;
The 4th October, 1968.

No. 16/9/CII/68

Dated the 4th October. 1968.

Copy forwarded for information to the News Editor, All India Radio, New Delhi.

It is requested that this may please be broadcast from the All India Radio on three successive days and this Secretariat informed of the dates on which it is broadcast.

M. C. CHAWLA,
Deputy Secretary.

II

Second Sitting

The Committee sat on Friday, the 1st November, 1968 from 10.00 to 11.30 hours.

PRESENT

Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh—*Chairman*.

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Vidya Charan Shukla
3. Shri Maganti Ankineedu
4. Shri S. M. Siddayya
5. Shri C. M. Kedaria
6. Shri A. K. Chanda
7. Shri K. M. Asghar Husain
8. Lt. Col. H. H. Maharaja Manabendra
Shah, Tehri Garhwal
9. Shri D. Basumatari
10. Shri Y. B. Chavan
11. Shri Hem Raj
12. Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
13. Shri H. Ajmal Khan
14. Shri J. H. Patel
15. Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair
16. Shri M. Muhammad Ismail
17. Shri P. Ramamurti
18. Shri P. Viswambharan

Rajya Sabha

19. Shri Ajit Prasad Jain
20. Shri Mohan Manikchand Dharja
21. Shri Tribhovandas Kisibhai Patel
22. Shri Pratul Chandra Mitra

- 23. Dr. (Mrs.) Mangla Devi Talwar
- 24. Shri Devi Singh
- 25. Shri Rewati Kant Sinha
- 26. Shri B. V. Abdullah Koya.
- 27. Shri M. R. Venkataraman.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

- 1. Shri T. C. A. Srinivasavaradan, *Joint Secretary*.
- 2. Shri G. K. Arora, *Deputy Secretary*.
- 3. Shri M. D. Godbole, *Deputy Secretary*.
- 4. Shri V. K. Kapoor, *Under Secretary*.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Shri P. L. Gupta, *Additional Legislative Counsel, Ministry of Law.*

SECRETARIAT.

Shri D. C. Pande, *Under Secretary*

WITNESSES

PANCHJANYA WEEKLY, NEW DELHI

Spokesman:

Shri D. S. Agarwal, Editor, *Panchjanya Weekly, New Delhi.*

2. The Committee heard the views of the representative of Panchjanya, a Hindi Weekly of Delhi, on the provisions of the Bill. Before the Committee proceeded to hear the witness his attention had been drawn by the Chairman to Direction 58 of the Directions by the Speaker.

3. A verbatim record of the evidence was kept.

4. The Committee then adjourned till 10.00 hours on Saturday, the 2nd November, 1968 to hear the views of the representatives of the ORGANISER, an English Weekly of Delhi.

III

Third Sitting

The Committee sat on Saturday, the 2nd November, 1968 from 10.00 to 12.00 hours.

PRESENT

Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha ..

2. Shri Vidya Charan Shukla
3. Shri S. M. Siddayya
4. Shri C. M. Kedaria
5. Shri A. K. Chanda
6. Shri K. M. Asghar Husain
7. Lt. Col. H. H. Maharaja Manabendra
Shah, Tehri Garhwal
8. Shri D. Basumatari
9. Shri Hem Raj
10. Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
11. Shri Shri Chand Goyal
12. Shri H. Ajmal Khan
13. Shri J. H. Patel
14. Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair
15. Shri M. Muhammad Ismail
16. Shri P. Viswambharan

Rajya Sabha

17. Shri Ajit Prasad Jain
18. Shri Mohan Manickchand Dharia
19. Shri Pratul Chandra Mitra
20. Shri Ram Sahai

21. Shri Devi Singh
22. Shri Rewati Kant Sinha

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

1. Shri T. C. A. Srinavasavaradan, *Joint Secretary*.
2. Shri G. K. Arora, *Deputy Secretary*.
3. Shri V. K. Kapoor, *Under Secretary*.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Shri P. L. Gupta, *Additional Legislative Counsel, Ministry of Law*.

SECRETARIAT

Shri D. C. Pande—*Under Secretary*.

WITNESSES

'ORGANISER' WEEKLY, NEW DELHI.

Spokesman:

1. Shri K. R. Malkani, Editor, 'Organiser'.
2. Shri Ved Prakash Bhatia.

2. The Committee heard the views of the representatives of 'Organiser', an English Weekly of Delhi, on the provisions of the Bill. Before the Committee proceeded to hear the witness his attention had been drawn by the Chairman to Direction 58 of the Directions by the Speaker.

3. A verbatim record of the evidence was kept.

4. The Committee decided to seek extension of time for presentation of their Report upto the 2nd December, 1968 and authorised the Chairman and, in his absence, Shri Shri Chand Goyal, to move necessary motion in the House on the 11th November, 1968, in that behalf.

5. The Committee further decided that the notices of amendments to the Bill, if any, might be given by the members so as to reach the Lok Sabha Secretariat by the 18th November, 1968.

6. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, the 22nd November, 1968 to take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

IV

Fourth Sitting

The Committee sat on Wednesday, the 20th November, 1968 from 16.15 to 17.20 hours.

PRESENT

Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Vidya Charan Shukla
3. Shri C. M. Kedaria
4. Lt. Col. H. H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah, Tehri Garhwal
5. Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
6. Shri Shri Chand Goyal
7. Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu
8. Shri H. Ajmal Khan
9. Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair
10. Shri P. Viswambharan.

Rajya Sabha

11. Shri Mohan Manikchand Dharia
12. Shri Pratul Chandra Mitra
13. Dr. (Mrs.) Mangla Devi Talwar

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

1. Shri L. P. Singh, *Secretary.*
2. Shri T. C. A. Srinivasavaradan, *Joint Secretary.*
3. Shri G. K. Arora, *Deputy Secretary.*
4. Shri V. K. Kapoor, *Under Secretary.*

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Shri P. L. Gupta, *Additional Legislative Counsel, Ministry of Law.*

SECRETARIAT.

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Niren De, *Attorney-General of India.*

2. The Committee had to wait till 16.14 hours when there was a quorum.

3. At the outset, the Chairman invited the attention of the Attorney-General to the provisions of Direction 58.

The Attorney-General was then examined on some of the provisions of the Bill. The evidence lasted till 17.20 hours.

4. A verbatim record of the evidence was kept.

5. The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 17.00 hours on Friday, the 22nd November, 1968. to take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

V

Fifth Sitting

The Committee sat on **Friday, the 22nd November, 1968** from **17.00** to **18.15** hours.

PRESENT

Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Vidya Charan Shukla
3. Shri D. Basumatari
4. Shri Y. B. Chavan
5. Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
6. Shri Shri Chand Goyal
7. Shri H. Ajmal Khan
8. Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair
9. Shri M. Muhammad Ismail
10. Shri P. Viswambharan

Rajya Sabha

11. Shri Mohan Manikchand Dharia
12. Shri Pratul Chandra Mitra
13. Shri Ram Sahai
14. Shri Tribhovandas Kisibhai Patel.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

1. Shri L. P. Singh, *Secretary.*
2. Shri T. C. A. Srinivasavaradan, *Joint Secretary.*
3. Shri G. K. Arora, *Deputy Secretary.*
4. Shri V. K. Kapoor, *Under Secretary.*

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

1. Shri P. L. Gupta, *Addl. Legislative Counsel, Ministry of Law.*
2. Shri D. C. Hajela, *Asstt. Draftsman, Ministry of Law.*

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee took up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

3. *Clause 2.*—The following amendment was accepted:—

Page 2, lines 15-16,

omit “which shall not be less than two years but”

The clause, as amended, was adopted.

4. *Clause 3.*—The following amendment was accepted:—

Page 2, lines 38-39,

omit “which shall not be less than two years but”

Discussion on the clause was not concluded.

5. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Saturday, the 23rd November, 1968 at 15.30 hours.

VI

Sixth Sitting

The Committee sat on Saturday, the 23rd November, 1968 from 15.30 to 17.15 hours.

PRESENT

Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Vidya Charan Shukla
3. Shri A. K. Chanda
4. Shri D. Basumatari
5. Shri Y. B. Chavan
6. Shri Hem Raj
7. Shri Shri Chand Goyal
8. Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair
9. Shri M. Muhammad Ismail
10. Shri P. Viswambharan.

Rajya Sabha

11. Shri Mohan Manikchand Dharia
12. Shri Pratul Chandra Mitra

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

1. Shri L. P. Singh, *Secretary.*
2. Shri T. C. A. Srinivasavaradan, *Joint Secretary.*
3. Shri G. K. Arora, *Deputy Secretary.*
4. Shri V. K. Kapoor, *Under Secretary.*

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

1. Shri P. L. Gupta, *Addl. Legislative Counsel, Ministry of Law.*
2. Shri D. C. Hajela, *Asstt. Draftsman, Ministry of Law.*

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee resumed clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

3. *Clause 3.*—(continued *Vide* para 4 of the Minutes, dated the 22nd November, 1968.—The Committee were of the view that in the Exception under section 505 of Indian Penal Code, the element of “good faith” should be added and that the Exception should be made applicable to section 505 as a whole. Accordingly the following further amendments were accepted in the clause:—

(1) Page 2, for lines 20-24, substitute—

“(i) after sub-section (1) as so renumbered but before the *Exception*, the following sub-sections shall be inserted, namely:—”

(2) Page 2, after line 40, insert,—

“(ii) in the *Exception*, after the words ‘circulates it’, the words ‘in good faith and’ shall be inserted.”

The clause, as amended, was adopted.

4. *Clause 4.*—The following amendments were accepted:—

(1) Page 3, lines 22-26, omit,—

“not less than two years but may extend to”

(2) Page 4, lines 18-22, omit,—

“not less than two years but may extend to”.

The clause, as amended, was adopted.

5. *Clause 5.*—The clause was adopted without amendment.

6. *Clause 6.*—The Committee were of the view that the powers given to the Executive in clause 6(2) were of a very drastic nature and affected the freedom of the Press. Therefore, a definite time-limit should be provided for the operation of an order passed under that sub-clause. Accordingly the following amendment was accepted in the clause:—

Page 5, for lines 18-21, substitute,—

“time being in force, direct that copies of the publication made in violation of an order made under sub-section

(1) be seized, and that any printing press or other instrument or apparatus used in the publication be closed down for the period such order is in operation."

The clause, as amended, was adopted.

7. *Clause 7.*—The clause was adopted without amendment.

8. *Clause 8.*—Explaining the broad outline of the scheme of the Press Consultative Committee, as envisaged in the Bill, the Minister of Home Affairs stated that it was intended that the Committee at the Central level might consist of 10-15 members. The members would be chosen by Government in consultation with the representative organisations of editors, newspaper managements and journalists. Government would invite panels of names from representative bodies like the All India Newspaper Editors' Conference, and choose persons to be appointed as members of the Press Consultative Committee, out of the names suggested by such representative body. The Committees at the State level would consist of 7-10 members, and the members of the committee would be chosen by the State Governments in accordance with an identical procedure. The Committee would consider the representations made by persons against whom action might have been taken under clause 6(1) of the Bill and would advise the Government whether the orders passed under clause 6(1) should be modified, confirmed or rescinded. He assured the Committee that the role of the Press Consultative Committees would be purely advisory in character.

The Committee expressed the hope that the concerned Governments would attach the greatest importance to the views communicated by the Press Consultative Committees.

In view of the above assurance the clause was adopted without amendment.

9. *Clause 1.*—The clause was adopted without amendment.

10. *Enacting Formula and Long Title.*—The Enacting Formula and Long Title were adopted without amendment.

11. The Committee decided that (i) evidence given before them should be printed and laid on the Tables of both the Houses and (ii) copies of the memoranda received from various parties should be placed in the Parliament Library for reference by the Members, after the Report of the Committee had been presented to the House.

12. The Chairman then drew the attention of the Members of the Committee to the provisions of Direction 87 of the Directions by the Speaker regarding minutes of dissent.

13. The Legislative Counsel was authorised to correct patent errors and to carry out amendments of consequential nature in the Bill and to submit an attested copy thereof, as amended, by Wednesday, the 27th November, 1968.

14. The Chairman announced that the minutes of dissent, if any, might be sent to the Lok Sabha Secretariat so as to reach them by 17.00 hours on Saturday, the 30th November, 1968. The members were requested to give four copies of their minutes of dissent, if possible.

15. The Chairman thanked the Minister of Home Affairs and members of the Committee for their valuable cooperation and assistance in considering and passing the Bill. The Chairman also thanked the Legislative Counsel and officers of the Ministry of Home Affairs for their assistance.

16. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, the 29th November, 1968 at 10.00 hours to consider their draft Report.

VII

Seventh Sitting

The Committee sat on Friday, the 29th November, 1968 from 10.00 to 10.45 hours.

PRESENT

Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Vidya Charan Shukla
3. Shri S. M. Siddayya
4. Shri C. M. Kedaria
5. Shri A. K. Chanda
6. Shri Y. B. Chavan
7. Shri Hem Raj
8. Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
9. Shri Shri Chand Goyal
10. Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu
11. Shri Era Sezhiyan
12. Shri M. Muhammad Ismail
13. Shri P. Viswambharan

Rajya Sabha

14. Shri Mohan Manikchand Dharia
15. Shri Pratul Chandra Mitra
16. Dr. (Mrs.) Mangla Devi Talwar

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

1. Shri T. C. A. Srinivasavaradan, *Joint Secretary.*
2. Shri V. K. Kapoor, *Under Secretary.*

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

1. Shri P. L. Gupta, *Addl. Legislative Counsel, Ministry of Law.*
2. Shri D. C. Hajela, *Asstt. Draftsman, Ministry of Law.*

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla, *Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee considered and adopted the Bill as amended.
3. The Committee then considered and adopted the draft Report subject to the Minutes of Dissent, if any, to be given by the members.
4. The Chairman announced that the Minutes of Dissent, if any, might be sent to the Lok Sabha Secretariat so as to reach them by 17-00 hours on Saturday, the 30th November, 1968. The members were requested to give four copies of their Minutes of Dissent, if possible.
5. The Committee authorised the Chairman and, in his absence, Shri Chand Goyal to present the Report and to lay the evidence on the Table of the House on Monday, the 2nd December, 1968.
6. The Committee also authorised Shri Mohan Manikchand and, in his absence, Dr. (Mrs.) Mangla Devi Talwar to lay the Report and the evidence on the Table of Rajya Sabha on Monday, the 2nd December, 1968.
7. The Chairman once again thanked the members of the Committee for their cooperation and assistance at all stages of consideration of the Bill.

The Committee then adjourned.
