

PRICE CONTROL BILL*

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीस (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी अनुमति से प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि सभी अत्यावश्यक उपभोग वस्तुओं के मूल्यों का नियंत्रण करने वाले विधेयक को पेश करने की अनुमति दी जाए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to control the prices of all essential consumer articles."

The motion was adopted.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीस : मैं विधेयक प्रस्तुत करता हूँ।

CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMISSIONS BILL*

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी अनुमति से प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि वैधता तथा संविधान द्वारा प्रत्याभूत मूल वैयक्तिक स्वतंत्रताओं के उल्लंघन की जांच करने के लिए नागरिक स्वाधीनता आयोगों की स्थापना का उपबन्ध करने वाले विधेयक को पेश करने की अनुमति दी जाए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the establishment of Civil Liberties Commissions to investigate violation of legality and fundamental personal freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution."

The motion was adopted.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं विधेयक पेश करता हूँ।

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION BILL*

श्री मनुभाई पटेल (इर्षाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी अनुमति से प्रस्तावत करता हूँ कि लोक-सभा तथा राज्य-सभा में विरोधी दलों के नेता के प्रभावी ढंग से कार्य

करने का उपबन्ध करने वाले विधेयक को पेश करने की अनुमति दी जाए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the effective functioning of the Leader of the Opposition in Lok Sabha and in Rajya Sabha."

The motion was adopted.

श्री मनुभाई पटेल : मैं विधेयक पेश करता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Shri Umanath—absent; Shri Ramani—absent.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL* (Amendment of Article 222)

श्री ओम प्रकाश त्यागी (मुरादाबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी अनुमति से प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि भारत के संविधान में आगे संशोधन करने वाले विधेयक को पेश करने की अनुमति दी जाए।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

श्री ओम प्रकाश त्यागी : मैं विधेयक पेश करता हूँ।

15.11 hrs.

MATTER UNDER RULE 377

VIRES OF RULES 155, 157 AND 158 OF RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, 28 अप्रैल, 1970 को जब मेरे संविधान विधेयक पर विचार करने के प्रस्ताव पर वोट लिया गया तब विभाजन में उस विधेयक को 9/10 में भी अधिक बहुमत मिला, यानी उसके हक में 213 लोगों ने और विरोध में सिर्फ 31 लोगों ने वोट दिया। इस विधेयक के द्वारा संविधान की दफा 314 के तहत आई० सी० ए० अफसरों को जो विशेष सुविधाएं

दी गई है उस सम्बन्धी संबैधानिक संरक्षण को मैं हटाना चाहता था। आप ने तात्कालिक अन्तःप्रेरणा से कहा कि विधेयक पारित हो गया है। लेकिन बाद में आप ने कहा कि चूंकि इस पतदान में सदन की सभासद संख्या के आघे से कम ने हिस्सा लिया है यह प्रस्ताव पारित नहीं हुआ है और विधेयक फेल हो गया है।

मेरा ख्याल है कि निम्न मुद्दों की रोज़नी में आप अपने निर्णय पर पुनर्विचार करें। मेरे सारे तर्क बहुत ताकत वाले तर्क हैं।

(1) सदन को अपने कामकाज के नियम बनाने का अधिकार संविधान के दफा 118 के अन्दर हुआ है। लेकिन इस दफा में कहा गया है कि सारे नियम संविधान के अन्वूल होने चाहिए।

(2) यह साफ है कि पार्लियामेंट या विधान मण्डलों द्वारा जो कानून बनाये जाएंगे या अपनी कार्यवाही के लिए जो नियम बनाए जाएंगे यदि वे संविधान में टकराते हैं तो उनको खत्म कर देना चाहिए। नियमों और कानूनों से भी संविधान श्रेष्ठ है और उसके सामने सभी कानूनों और नियमों को झुकना चाहिए।

(3) हमारे संविधान की दफा 100 के अनुच्छेद (1) में कहा गया है :

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : It is not in the List of Business for today.

श्री मधु लिमये : मुझे इजाजत दी गई है आप क्यों एतराज करते हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has given notice of it under Rule 377 and permission has been given to him.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेने समय मांगा था। यह टाइप नहीं हो पाया था। हमको जरा ज्यादा टाइपिस्ट दिए जाएं। यहां तो भन्ते और टैक्स की बात होती है। टाइप टाइपिस्ट की माँग करते हैं।

में दफा 100 पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ

"Save as otherwise provided in this Constitution, all questions at any sitting of either house or joint sitting of the Houses shall be determined by a majority of votes of the members present and voting, other than the Speaker or person acting as Chairman or Speaker.

The Chairman or Speaker, or person acting as such, shall not vote in the first instance, but shall have and exercise a casting vote in the case of an equality of votes. "

(4) संविधान में संशोधन लाने की प्रक्रिया हमें दफा 368 में मिलती है। इस दफा के अनुसार संविधान संशोधन विधेयक विशेष बहुमत से पास होना चाहिए। "पास होना चाहिए" इन शब्दों पर मैं जोर देना चाहता हूँ। विशेष बहुमत से मतलब है कि सभासद संख्या का बहुमत मतदान करें और प्रस्ताव उपस्थित और वोट देने वाले सदस्यों के दो तिहाई बहुमत से पास हो।

(5) कानून बनाने की प्रक्रिया की कई अवस्थाएँ होती हैं। पहली अवस्था को विधेयक पेश करने की अवस्था कहा जाता है। दूसरी अवस्था विचार करने का प्रस्ताव आदि है जिसको कि पहला वाचन भी कहते हैं। तीसरी अवस्था में विधेयक के अनुच्छेदों पर विचार किया जाता है और उन्हें पास किया जाता है। इन्हें दूसरा वाचन कहा जाता है। चौथी अवस्था में विधेयक पारित करने का या पास करने का प्रस्ताव होता है जिसको तीसरा वाचन कहा जाता है। यह साफ है कि पेश करने की अवस्था में या विचार करने की दूसरी अवस्था में जिसको कि पहला वाचन कहा जाता है विधेयक को या विधेयक के किसी भी अंश को पारित करने का सवाल ही उत्पन्न नहीं होता। पारित करने का सवाल सिर्फ तीसरी और चौथी अवस्था में यानी दूसरे और तीसरे वाचन के समय उपस्थित होता है।

[श्री मधु लिमये]

(6) संविधान की धारा 100 के अनुसार सभी प्रश्नों पर सादे बहुमत से निर्णय करना पड़ता है। इसमें अपवाद सिर्फ संविधान की उन धाराओं का है जिसमें राष्ट्रपति को इम्पीच करने या अध्यक्ष को हटाने की या संविधान में संशोधन करने की प्रक्रिया समाविष्ट है। संविधान की जहाँ तक पहली तीन अवस्थाओं का सवाल है दफा 368 का कोई वास्ता नहीं है। 1951 में उस समय के अध्यक्ष ने अटर्नी जनरल की की राय जानना चाहा था। अटर्नी जनरल ने निम्न राय दी थी :

"The expression 'when the Bill is passed in each House' has reference to the passing of the Bill at the final stage. The majority insisted upon by Article 368 is, therefore, applicable only to the voting at the final stage. It is, however, better to err on the safer side and take stricter view insisting on the requisite majority at all stages of the passage of the Bill."

(7) अब मेरा सवाल है कि पार्लियामेंट और यह सदन गलती क्यों करे जब संविधान की दफा 100 साफ तौर पर और आदेशात्मक ढंग से (मेन्डेटरी ढंग से) कहती है कि सभी प्रश्नों पर निर्णय दफा 368 को छोड़कर सादे बहुमत से होना चाहिए। 368 में न विधेयक पेश करने की चर्चा है, न ही उस पर विचार करने की, न ही उसको संयुक्त समिति या प्रवर समिति के पास भेजने की, न ही विधेयक के अनुच्छेदों पर विचार करने की। यह धारा सिर्फ बिल को पारित करने या उसको पास करने का उल्लेख करती है। अब विधेयक पेश करना, उस पर विचार करना या उसको पारित करना यह शब्दावली संविधान की शब्दावली है, सिर्फ नियमों की नहीं। दफा 117 से यह बिल्कुल साफ हो जाता है।

(9) चूंकि इस सवाल से बुनियादी, कानूनी और संवैधानिक प्रश्न जुड़े हुए हैं इसमें 122

दफा का, जो सिर्फ प्रक्रिया के सम्बन्ध में है, कोई वास्ता नहीं। अगर अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप स्वयं अपनी जिम्मेदारी पर इस पर पुनर्विचार नहीं करना चाहते हैं तो आप राष्ट्रपति जी को विनन्ती करें कि संविधान की दफा 143 के तहत वह सुप्रीमकोर्ट की राय तलब करें। मैंने पढ़ा है कि शंकर प्रसाद केस में इस अदालत ने कहा है कि "हम उम्मीद करते हैं कि पार्लियामेंट सही माने में 368 दफा में जो प्रक्रिया दी गई है उसका अनुसरण करेगी।"

(10) अगर अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप स्वयं पुनर्विचार करना नहीं चाहते हैं, न ही राष्ट्रपति जी को सुप्रीम कोर्ट की राय तलब करने के सम्बन्ध में लिखना चाहते हैं तो आप कम से कम मुझे अनुमति दीजिए कि मैं उच्च न्यायालय में दफा 226 के तहत और आवश्यक पड़ने पर उसके बाद सुप्रीम कोर्ट के पास यह मामला लेकर जाऊँ, ताकि हमारे नियम 155, 157 और 168 पर संविधान की दफाओं 118, 100 और 368 के अन्तर्गत अन्तिम निर्णय हो सके।

(11) कम से कम यह मामला नियम समिति के पास भेज दिया जाए ताकि इसके सभी पहलुओं पर विचार हो सके। पुराना निर्णय 1951 का है। उस समय बालिग मताधिकार से चुनाव नहीं हुआ था। अब इस प्रतिनिधिक लोक सभा को अपने निर्णयों पर विचार करना चाहिए। यही मेरी गुजारिश और प्रार्थना है।

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI GOBINDA MENON) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Mr. Madhu Limaye's contention in effect amounts to saying that the rules in Chapter XI of our rules, Rule 155, etc. are *ultra vires* because they are against the provisions Article 100 of the Constitution, and the Rules are framed under Articles 118. My submission is this Article 100 provides for general matters. It refers not only to Bills, but to Resolutions, to Motions, to everything. The process of amending the Constit-

tution is referred to in Article 368 and when we are considering a Bill under Article 368 the Parliament is legislating in its constituent power. And, on other occasions it is legislating within its normal legislative power. Article 368 is a code by itself so far as amendment is concerned. It says that the Bill shall be passed by a special majority, only if there is a special majority and in certain cases, only after getting the concurrence of more than half the number of States in India. Rule 155 and other connected rules have been made in order to avoid absurd situations which might otherwise arise, in order to avoid difficulty to Members of the House which might otherwise arise. I will illustrate what I say. Suppose, Sir, there is a Bill which seeks to amend two Articles of the Constitution. A group of Members in the House may have no objection to one of those two Articles being amended but they may have objection to the other Article being amended. So, if the 'special majority' will apply only at the Third reading of the Bill, what would happen is this. Some Members may be there, who are prepared to give their vote for passing the amendment to one of the Clauses of the Constitution, but they are not prepared to give their vote for the amendment of the other Clauses.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आपको टोकना नहीं चाहता लेकिन मैंने स्वयं कहा है कि इंट्रोडक्शन और कंसीड्रेशन स्टेज पर विधेयक के किसी भी हिस्से को पास करने का सवाल नहीं आता है बल्कि क्लॉज वार्ड ० क्लॉज कंसिड्रेशन के समय ही आता है। मैंने डिस्टिक्शन ड्रा किया है इंट्रोडक्शन, कंसिड्रेशन और दूसरी दो स्टेजेज के बारे में।

SHRI GOVINDA MEMON : I shall come to that. The words used in Article 368 'passing the Bill' will have the same meaning with which we use the word, in the House. We say at the third reading:

"That the Bill be passed."

If that is so, then special majority need not be there even for the second reading. Only in the third reading 'passing of the Bill' comes. In the second reading, from the Chair questions will be put. The Chair will say:

"Clause so and so of the Bill do stand part of the Bill."

Then another motion from the Chair comes or the question from the Chair comes whether this clause may be part of the Bill. In that situation, unless the rules provide for special majorities for the amendment of all the clauses, the difficulty which I referred to will arise.

Therefore, if we accept the words used in Article 368 passing the Bill in the same sense in which Motions are made in the House, at the third reading, it will lead to absurdity. Now, the special majority is not required when the clauses are considered.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने यह नहीं कहा। क्लॉज के लिए विशेष बहुमत करना चाहते हैं तो करिए। कंसीड्रेशन स्टेज में पासिंग शब्द कहीं नहीं है, यही तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY (Cuddalore) : Does it require two-third majority in the House, even while speeches are going on? The article does not contemplate two-third majority at all. Always when the Bill is being discussed, at the time of voting, this two-thirds majority is required. He is misleading the House by misinterpreting the Constitution.

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : Well, there can be difference of opinion on a legal matter. If I uphold an opinion or support a certain opinion, it will be wrong to say that I am misleading the House. (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER : He does not mean that.

SHRI GOVINDA MEMON : What I am attempting to show.....

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Lawyers are here to defend. I beg to differ with him.

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : You may say you do not agree with me. But, don't say that I am misleading the House. What I am attempting to show is that if the term 'passing the Bill' as used in Article 368 has the same meaning as the motion shall mean in the third reading 'That the Bill be passed', then it cannot have that meaning for the second reading.

[Shri Govinda Menon]

For the second reading, the motion is 'not that the Bill be passed' or the 'clause be passed.' The motion then made or the question then put by the Chair is "Clause so and so stand part of the Bill."

So, if the word 'passing' as used in Article 368 would apply to this also, according to Shri Limaye.....

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने कहा था क्लॉज बाई क्लॉज वाला संदेहास्पद है। लेकिन आप कर सकते हैं। कंसीड्रेशन के बारे में मेरा दिमाग एकदम साफ़ है, उसमें विशेष बहुमत की जरूरत नहीं है।

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : I will go to consideration stage. I am going from three to two to one.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Four, three, two and one.

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : I am not speaking of the stages; I am speaking of the reading. If, therefore, the word 'pass the Bill' as used in Art. 368 of the Constitution has the meaning which we attribute when legislations are being discussed with reference to the third reading of the Bill, then it cannot apply to the second reading of the Bill. And if that cannot apply to the second reading of the Bill, then it means the word 'pass' in Art. 368 as used in a special sense applies to the rule here.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : It is nowhere defined.

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : Probably the Rules Committee wanted to provide for intelligent voting and correct voting on the part of all the Members of the House. I now read rule 155:

"Each clause or schedule or clause or schedule as amended, as the case may be, of a Bill seeking to amend the Constitution shall be put to the vote of the House separately and shall form part of the Bill if it is passed by a majority of the total membership of the House and the majority of not less than two-third of the Members present and voting."

Provided that the Speaker may, with the concurrence of the House, put

clauses and/or schedules, or clauses and/or schedules as amended, as the case may be, together to the vote of the House in which case the result of the voting shall be taken as applicable to each clause or schedule separately, and so indicated in the proceedings:

Provided further that if a Member requests that any clause or schedule, or any clause or schedule as amended, as the case may be, be put separately, the Speaker shall put that clause or schedule, or clause or schedule as amended, as the case may be, separately:."

Now, if this rule is compared with the provisions of article 100 of the Constitution, even at the second reading when clauses are discussed and put to vote, article 100 should apply and not the special majority provided in article 368. Therefore, necessarily, the provision for a special majority in article 368 applies to the second reading also. Otherwise, at the third reading, Members may be in a dilemma; they may support the amendment to one clause of the Bill but they may have disagreement with respect to another clause of the Bill. Therefore, the word 'passed' used in article 368 should be interpreted to mean the provisions with respect to the second reading also. If that can be done with respect to the second reading, and that should be done, then it follows that the word 'passed' as used in article 368 has a meaning different from the words which we use when we move for the third reading. Therefore, the word 'passed' in article 368 should be interpreted in the way in which it has been done in rule 155. If rule 155 is valid, then it goes against article 100; if that rule is valid, then the clauses should be put one by one and separately. Even when there is no amendment, a Member of the House can say that such and such schedule or clause should be put separately. It is in order to enable the Members of the House at the third stage to save themselves from the embarrassment they would have, if all the clauses of the Bill coming for discussion at the third stage are not passed according to the special majority provided in article 368. Therefore, the argument that the provisions of articles 100 should apply to the consideration also is not correct, because articles 100 in that case should be

taken as applying to a general situation, and article 368 as applying to a special situation, when the Parliament is using its constituent power, and article 368 should be deemed to contain in itself the complete goal. Therefore, when the rules were framed as in rule 155 and other rules, articles 100 has not been violated nor has any other article of the Constitution been violated. These rules which have been in force for the last several years are fully valid, and I do not think that there is any doubt about it. I do not, therefore, find myself in agreement with the hon. Mover.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : He is not in agreement even with the Attorney-General?

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay-Central) : May I just have a word ?.....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He should have got up before the hon. Minister replied.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : It does not matter.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Otherwise we shall be going round and round.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : Will you kindly listen to me ? So far as the interpretation of the constitutional provisions or the rules is concerned, it cannot be the monopoly of any party or any individual or even a Minister. Let me say this with great respect.....

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक सुझाव है। आप सोमवार को इनको सुनें। अभी आप बहस स्थगित कर दें।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am not saying the interpretation of the Constitution or the rules is the monopoly of anyone. I am concerned with regulation of the procedure.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : But according to the rules.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Yes, According to the rules, the procedure has been that when a motion is moved by a member, discussion takes place, the Minister replies and then the Mover replies. This is the convention we have been following.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : But a point is raised here. Shri Banerjee is always under a misapprehension. He thinks he only has a clear head and the rest of the world is confused.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I am helping him.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : May I suggest that the matter be sent to the Rules Committee ? There appears to be some force in the point made. I do not disagree with the Law Minister. But the fact remains that under certain conditions rules 155-157 were framed and incorporated in the rules of procedure. In view of the new situation and the emphasis laid on this point by Shri Limaye, I think the House might in its wisdom send the matter back to the Rules Committee so that we can get the point clarified.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba) : The very fact that it took so long for the Law Minister to interpret the word 'passed' in art. 368 shows very clearly that the meaning he wants to read into the word does not lie in it at all. After interpreting the word in the manner he wanted to and reading a meaning into it larger than actually remains in it, he wants to justify the rules we have made. One has no objection to the rules as they are in the book as long as they are there. But to say that the rules are there in all wisdom and therefore we need never look into them again is something unknown and never contemplated anywhere; much less in a deliberative body like Parliament. Therefore, the Law Minister should have defended the rules and his interpretation of the word 'passed' on different grounds and not on the ground that this had been done before.

As it stands, whatever be the idea of the framers of our rules and whatever be the opinion which the Attorney-General has once given, namely that it is better we err on the safe side and see that at each and every stage we do have the required majority as laid down by art. 368—whether at the consideration stage, clause by clause stage or third reading stage, we had better pass this on to the Rules Committee to look into it and find out whether there is any force in the point made by Shri Limaye, because he quoted art. 100 also under which all voting will be by a simple majority except in those circumstances specifically laid down under the Constitution. The proviso is there; the article begins with that. Therefore, it is better to send it to the Rules Committee and obtain their advice, and then later on legislate.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : Though we do not see eye to eye on several points with the Treasury Benches, I fully agree with Shri Menon because the entire argument boil down to this, whether the passing of a Bill means the last stage only or the various stages, the first, second and third readings of the Bill. That is the entire controversy. For that purpose a special guideline has been given to us by the Rules of Procedure. This is not the first time that a Constitution (Amendment) Bill could not be passed because of the lack of requisite strength. So, to re-open this question, or to challenge the ruling of the Speaker, will not be correct.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has not challenged.

SHRI P. K. DEO : So, if you think it proper, you may refer it to the Rules Committee, but the recommendation of the Rule Committee cannot have retrospective effect.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please do not anticipate.

SHRI P. K. DEO : I think it will be only for future guidance.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I have heard with rapt attention the submission made by the hon. Law Minister. On that particular day we wanted to raise it as a point of order when the Speaker first declared that the Bill would be taken into consideration. Then, he realised that two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting and 50 per cent of the total membership of the House was needed for the particular purpose because this was a Constitution (Amendment) Bill. Later on I have also consulted the various rules. As the hon. Minister said just now, let us not rely on individual wisdom, but on the collective wisdom of the Rules Committee. After all, the Rules Committee have framed the rules and the interpretation of the rules should also be left to them. I agree with Shri Bhandare, Shri Kunte and others that this should be referred to the Rules Committee.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) : Now that the question has been raised seriously, we are not breaking the convention by this round of discussion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It has been broken. That is why I am allowing you.

SHRI UMANATH : It has not been broken because here it is a question of the rules and their interpretation *vis-a-vis* the Constitution that has been raised by Shri Limaye and replied to by the Minister. The House feels that it is a serious question on which a determination has got to be made. The reply of the hon. Minister to Shri Limaye is not going to solve the issue raised here. Since the question has been raised, it has to be resolved. This proposition has now been made by Shri Bhandare, and supported by all sections of the House, that the matter should go to the Rules Committee where a thorough discussion can take place and some determination can be made. I also support it.

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : The Government has no objection.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not think Shri Limaye wants my ruling on the various points he has raised. The main question is to refer it to the Rules Committee. We will convey this to the Speaker.

15-38 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL —(contd.)

(AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 164)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We take up further consideration of Shri P. K. Deo's Bill. Shri Imam may continue his speech.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : There was a symposium on this subject recently, and a number of speakers are going to participate in this discussion. Therefore, the time allotted for this Bill may be extended.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have called Mr. Imam.

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM (Chiradurga) : I have moved an amendment to the effect that this Bill on account of its extraordinary importance must be circulated for eliciting public opinion by the 30th of June, 1970. The other day my friend, Mr. P. K. Deo while moving the Bill has given very valid and cogent reason why this bill should be passed. He had also pointed out the necessity for this provision in the changing circumstances. As pointed out by him, it is quite necessary that the person who becomes the Chief Minister of a State should be elected by the majority