

on the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to customs duties in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Bali Ram Bhagat."

The motion was adopted.

12.53 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY-FOURTH AMENDMENT) BILL—*contd.*

MR. SPEAKER : Out of six hours allotted by the Business Advisory Committee, we have already taken 4 hours and 5 minutes. Approximately we have 2 hours left.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Why do you not adjourn for lunch ?

MR. SPEAKER : I thought, you could wait for five minutes for your lunch.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Are you offering me any ?

MR. SPEAKER : You are very welcome all the time but have some consideration for my resources also.

The Prime Minister may speak at 4 O' Clock.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH) : Yes, Sir; the Prime Minister will speak at 4 O'clock.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA : Extend the time.

MR. SPEAKER : The Prime Minister will speak at 4 O'Clock and then thereafter there will be voting.

SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH ; Since this is a Constitution (Amendment) Bill, may I announce the time of voting ?

MR. SPEAKER : That will be after the Prime Minister's speech.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was

supposed to intervene yesterday but I thought that I should do it today.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Is this to comment on the performance of your party yesterday ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : As one who has dealt with this problem from 1966 onwards I thought that it was necessary for me to intervene in the debate and give the historical background to this problem as it started taking shape in 1967 and onwards.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : You are no longer the Home Minister. Why do you bother ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Yesterday I heard three important and representative speeches from the Opposition. One was from Morarjibhai, the other was from the leader of the Jana Sangh, Shri Vajapye, and the third was the speech of a representative of the princes. All these Members are important people. At least, the first two are important because of their own national stature. Therefore, one has to seriously take notice of what they have said.

Sir, before dealing with the speeches made by them, I would like to give a little of the historical background of this problem. Though in the last 20 or 22 years the question of abolition of privy purses was debated at different forums and many parties have been raising the question of abolishing privy purses, the decision was taken in the AICC session of the Congress Party in Delhi. The resolution that was passed in that AICC session read as follows :

"The privileges and privy purses.....

AN HON. MEMBER : Why are you giving importance to that ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am just giving a historical background of it. It is not giving more importance to my organisation. The resolution reads like this :

"The privileges and privy purses enjoyed by the ex-rulers are incongruous to the concept of democracy and the AICC is of the view that the

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

Government should examine it and take steps to remove it."

This was the beginning... (*Interruption*) I am just giving the background.

SHRI PILOO MODY : My father was quite right. He advised the princes to compromise, to keep the purses and let Mr. Chavan have the privy. (*Interruption*)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Sir, after this resolution was passed, it was considered necessary to start the negotiations with the princes. Some Members had raised the point yesterday that this resolution was passed by a very small majority or by a very small number of members of the AICC. But, by implication, the conduct of many members of the AICC in the months thereafter had confirmed the resolution of the AICC. The resolution was further confirmed at the Jabalpur AICC session as a part of the 10-point programme in 1967. Those Members who say that they were opposed to this resolution had never challenged the AICC to consider the issue again. If they were confident that the resolution had not the support of the majority of the members of the AICC, they could have very well challenged it..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : It is their internal quarrel. We are not interested in that... (*Interruptions*) Is this all relevant ?

MR. SPEAKER : This is perfectly relevant. He is giving the background..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am not criticising anybody... (*Interruptions*) If you are not prepared to hear the facts of history, I cannot help it (*Interruptions*)

On this basis, I have had at least 5 meetings with the princes from November, 1967 to May, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER : You may continue after lunch. We adjourn for lunch to meet again at 2 O'Clock.

13.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at two minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Chavan.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I had just begun referring to certain historical background to the negotiations and discussions that took place between the Government and the representatives of the Princes. At least I was associated with five meetings from November, 1967 to nearly February or March, 1970. I am giving this background information because I would like to refer to some of the major points made by hon. Members whom I had referred to in the beginning of my speech. The talks with the princes reveal the answers to the points made by the Opposition Members. I am merely referring to substance of the speeches because I do not want to go into them at length.

Shri Morarjibhai's main point was that the whole Bill was deceitful because Art. 363 is not deleted. That is one point. He also made another point that no real efforts for negotiations were made. This was one position that he took.

The point that was made by Mr. Vajpayee was that he felt—the word he used was '*Parampara*'; '*Progressive*' is important and '*Parampara*' is also important—that there is rather anti-democratic pressure on the princes because of the way this is being done. That is the major point he made.

The main approach of the representative of the princes was rather realistic. He laid emphasis on covenants and agreements. And the other point that he made was about self-respect.

These are the points. In the light of these points I would like to trace the history of the negotiations that took place and the arguments that went on between the Government and the rulers. In my first talk which took place in November 1967 I explained the general approach of the Government to these problems and it was that Government's policy was that the privy

purses and privileges would have to go. This basic position was made clear. I also made clear that there was a commitment on this question, but, at the same time, our approach was to give some sort of a transitional allowance and for that matter we would like to have negotiations with the princes. This was the three-fold approach to this problem.

We have never kept them in any doubt as to the intention of Government to go ahead with the proposal of abolishing the Privy Purses. At the same time we made it clear to them, that whether they agreed or not, the transition allowances will be given and we certainly would like to have negotiations. And, I think, we have not changed from this position even now. (*Interruption*) Certainly one can make the argument as to why transition allowances should be given. One thing I would like to make very clear : this transition allowance is not supposed to be compensation. Whether it will be compensation or transition allowance, it will depend upon the character of the Privy Purses themselves. Certainly they are not the property of the princes. Taking the human aspect of the problem, this transition allowance will be given. When I say, 'Human aspect' it is not merely the human problem of the princes themselves, but there are many dependents, old men who are servants also. The allowance will not be for their exclusive personal use but it will be at their discretion; I have no doubt about it. But, our expectation is that it will be used to look after the dependents and the small people who are in their employ.

So, the main point that I am making is this, that the idea was to give transition allowance and for that purpose we wanted to have negotiations. I refer to this because, a reference was made that there were never any negotiations as such. We met five times. Shri Morarji Bhai also had a talk with the princes. And, I think there were series of discussions between the Prime Minister and some of the princes. With at least five talks I was personally associated and personally involved, rather deeply involved. What was the approach of the princes? They never started negotiations; that is my assessment. They never started any negotiations..

In the first meeting they made very learned statements, historical statements but ultimately they stuck to one point, namely, that Government had no business to change its position, that they were never consulted before taking this decision, and therefore, Government should reconsider its position. Sir, this is not the idea of negotiations. Certainly they were right in the beginning to raise this question. I do not deny that. So, having taken this position, I said, it is much better that we meet again, and explain that this is our position and on this basis they may reconsider their position.

Then again we met in December, 1967 and at that time their spokesman read a statement, repeating the same legal and constitutional positions and the historical meaning of covenants and agreements and the historical role of princehood etc. At one stage they asked whether I had got any scheme to give. I said, 'I have got a scheme to give; I am prepared to hand it over to you just now. But you take the position that you are prepared to consider this. If you are not prepared to consider and go into the details of the scheme, I don't want to hand over the scheme, because that possibly will lead us nowhere.' So the whole approach was this. It is much better that the House knows what was their approach. Their whole approach and attitude towards the Privy Purses was very strange.

Yesterday I heard one point which the hon. Maharaja of Dhrangadhra made. With all respect to him, may I say it is not a personal matter; I am basing myself on certain facts which are on my record—he said 'Myself and my people'. It is really very strange indeed, as if his people were some sort of chattel, completely and finally bound to him.

DR. KARNI SINGH (Bikaner) : May I just interrupt for a minute on one point? Now that you are going back to history for certain things, I have done some research myself of the subject, and I do not agree with the statement that you made. I would like to put the historical facts, straight. During the integration period I was there on the spot. My father was the signatory

[Dr. Karni Singh]

ruler. The people collected and asked Mr. V. P. Menon that the people must have a say in this matter, too. And, Mr. V. P. Menon said, No, only the rulers will have a say, and only the leaders of the Indian people would speak on your behalf, that is, Mr. Nehru and your predecessors. The people have nothing to do with it. It is on record.

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHRAN-GADHRA (Surendranagar) : My point was this. I referred to the time of the Instrument. I have not made any kind of undemocratic statement. I merely said that at the time when India was a plurality of entities we acceded to India; this was precisely what happened. The people of Kashmir have become a part of the Indian people by the Instrument of Accession.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I have not yet completed my speech, He can say it again.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peermade) : Even before 1947, I was in the Travancore State, and we had always felt that we were part of the Indian people and not part of the Indian States.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH (Khalilabad) : I hope he feels that now also.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : I hope he feels the same thing even now. Let him not get inspiration from China.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : May I say a word? What Mr. V. P. Menon said at some place like Bikaner or Jodhpur, I cannot subscribe to it and say that; it was something on behalf of Government and not one bureaucrat talking casually to a prince..... (Interruption).

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE (Ratnagiri) : On a point of order. Who gives any of us the right to stigmatise other people and say that so-and-so is a bureaucrat, so-and-so is a bourgeois etc.? We have no right to stigmatise any one here.

SHRI P. K. DEO : On a point of order...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Is it a point of order on her point of order?

SHRI P. K. DEO : You have not heard my point of order yet. Kindly hear me... (Interruptions).

SHRI SHEO NARAIN (Basti) : We are not going to be cowed down by these Russian allies.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : My point of order is this. We have no right to cast aspersions on a person who is not here; he is not even alive. But this has happened with regard to Mr. V. P. Menon. He has been stigmatised as a bureaucrat... (Interruptions). Have we got the right to stigmatise any one here? That is my point of order.

SHRI P. K. DEO : May I say that I was a signatory to the covenant? Shri V. P. Menon was the signatory on behalf of the Government of India representing Raja ji, the then Governor General of India. Now for the Finance Minister to speak about him and say that he was a bureaucrat and so on is irresponsible, shameless and meaningless.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is entitled to his point of view, but this is no point of order.

SHRI P. K. DEO : He should withdraw it.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : No, I will not.

SHRI BABURAO PATEL (Shajapur) : On a point of order, Sir. When we came to this House, we took an oath...

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : He came to the House only today.

SHRI BABURAO PATEL : Notwithstanding this Red Robin when we first came to this House in 1967, we took an oath which reads :

"I...do swear in the name of God that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of India..."

That was for the Constitution of India as in 1967. Today that Constitution is being ravaged. By so doing are we not going back on our oath? I want your ruling on this.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is his opinion. There is no point of order.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Let me make it clear that I have nothing against any person.

He made a mention of some statement made by Shri V. P. Menon to another person privately.

SHRI P. K. DEO : Not privately.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : What else is it?

SHRI P. K. DEO : He has written to me.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : He might have. Let him send me a copy of it.

He said V. P. Menon told his father.....

DR. KARNI SINGH : It was not what he told my father. This was what he told the people. There were thousands of people when this remark was made, not to my father only.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He can deal with this when he speaks.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The main point I was going to make was this. These people talk so highly about their people now. But in my discussions with them, I had faced a very strange argument—and I would like to let the House know about it. We were telling them that the privy purse is not a property but it is some sort of allowance for certain political functions and responsibilities.

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHRAN-GADHRA : Who said?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I said that, and his answer to that was, what the Maharaja of Dhrangadhra said was, this. He said 'the only analogy I can make to the privy purse is that it is just like a royalty over an inexhaustible gold mine'. This

is their idea about their people, that they are a gold mine to be exploited completely and permanently by them. It is on record.

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHRAN-GADHRA : This is a gross misrepresentation. I am sorry he is speaking here like this, trying to indulge in this misrepresentation and trying to make out that I was exploiting my people.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : It is on record.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) : Has he taken legal opinion?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The grievance they are making is that there were no negotiations. As a matter of fact, they never wanted negotiations. Last time, before we met in Bombay in our party session, we invited them and made it clear to them that we had to make certain commitments in terms of time now, so 'let us talk and have some sort of negotiations; we are going to make a categorical statement about it in the Bombay session'. It is my responsibility and duty also to communicate this to the leaders of the prince-hood. Then they said we could discuss again. So, the main point was that they had never seriously wanted negotiations. That was my assessment of the people. Even then, we continued and continued and continued. So, it is wrong to say that we never wanted negotiation. Even after this Bill is passed, the Government would like to have some sort of talks about the transitional allowances.

AN HON. MEMBER : Why? Don't have talks.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The other point that was made by hon. Member, Shri Morarji Desai, was that this is deceitful because article 363 is not deleted. I have great respect for Shri Morarji Desai personally, as I have for any elders, as I have got for Acharya Kripalani, and for Shri Hiren Mukerjee. So, elders do demand and command our respect. What is wrong?

SHRI HEM BARUA : What about younger people?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I have got admiration for them.

His main point was that it is deceitful because article 363 is not deleted. We had many discussions with Morarji Bhai when he was in the Cabinet. Morarji Bhai, as far as I remember, I am prepared to be corrected in this matter, never made this argument in our discussion. He certainly made the point which he made yesterday about the position of Sardar Patel's commitment, and that position one can logically understand, but he also ultimately agreed that the circumstances had changed and we will have to abolish the privy purses. He undertook to negotiate with the princes also. He never made at that time the suggestion of deletion of article 363. I remember that at one time he only had a doubt about the word "dispute" in that article, and he said that it was better to get it examined constitutionally whether it would be a dangerous word, what its implication would be in case the princes go to the Supreme Court.

My answer to Shri Morarjibhai's criticism is that there is nothing wrong in retaining article 363.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Balrampur) : Do it.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am doing it. I am giving an answer for that.

The wording of article 363 is, I can read it for the benefit of Mr. Vajpayee :

"Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution but subject to the provisions of article 143, neither the Supreme Court nor any other court shall have jurisdiction in any dispute arising out of any provision of a treaty, agreement, covenant, engagement, *sanad* or other similar instrument...

So, really speaking, the scope of article 363 is not confined to certain covenants. It has a wider application. There are certain *sanads*. So, this is not meant only for privy purses. Only because you are removing privy purses, you cannot completely delete this article. It operates in a wider field.

Secondly, the agreements about the privy purses are not contractual agreements, and they cannot be made subject to the jurisdiction of the courts.

Therefore, if you look at the whole scheme of the Constitution, the purpose of it is that the rights under these covenants or agreements, which are political agreements, are inherently temporary rights, and therefore the Constitution had made the provision as incorporated in article 363. It was the intention of the Constitution-makers to keep these temporary agreements non-justiciable. That is the basic thing. That also by implication means that the Constitution-makers expected that some time this House also might change such rights...

It is clear to those who want to see the real meaning of the Constitution and the political atmosphere in which we are working. I do not think that anybody can make a statement that it is deceitful. I do not think there is anything deceitful. It is a wise political step that we are taking.

SHRI BABURAO PATEL : It is a stab in the back.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : You have done your job; today you have attended the session.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I see you are also doing your job for a change. (*Interruption*)

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHAN-GADHRA : What he says is apt to mislead the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Yesterday when you spoke for thirty minutes, I do not think anybody interrupted you. I can allow a point of order; I can allow you to put up a question, if the Member who is speaking yields. But if you want to make a statement, I am sorry, I will not be able to allow.

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHAN-GADHRA : The Minister has said about the implication of the Constitution and read out article 363. In reading that article, he did not read out a very important part. It reads as follows :

"Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution but subject to the provisions of article 143..."

Under that we appealed.

SHRI Y.B. CHAVAN : I should request His Excellency to be a little more careful in listening to me..... (*Interruptions*). His Highness; I am sorry; I am not used to this sort of durbar. My main argument was that it was not a question of being deceitful about it. I patiently heard Mr. Desai's speech yesterday; it was a totally un-Morarjilike speech. Whether one agrees with him or not, it is a different matter. But he is very straight. All the argument that he made seemed to have been based on the conviction that the abolition of privy purses was completely wrong. That would have been logical. But unfortunately he began his speech by saying: "We are committed to the abolition of privy purses". He said so and then contradicted himself practically by every word that he said later on. That is why I say that this was not the speech that I expected from Shri Morarji Desai; it was non-Morarji like from that point of view.

I do not want to go into this any more. I certainly make a request to the hon. Members who belong to Mr. Morarji's party about their commitment. I would make an appeal as a colleague. I am not criticising anyone in this House, for many years we have worked together, worked for the same freedom and for the same cause... (*Interruptions*) It is Mrs. Sinha's commitment too which she made when she was with us and then they affirmed it in the Ahmedabad session. What has happened to change it ?

Unfortunately what happens is this. I know certain military doctrines practised by army leaders. There is something like tactics in the battle and there is something like strategy in a war. Tactics change from battle to battle. I know they have got their place. Any General who adopts tactics which are completely inconsistent with strategy ultimately gets lost. (*Interruption*) Now, I would like to make an appeal to the leaders of that party; you are merely playing tactics, but you have no strategy.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

SHRI SHEO NARAIN : Ask your leader, who always plays tricks,

SHRI Y.B. CHAVAN : I am only making an appeal to you, as a colleague, as a friend, as one who has got respect for you. The point is, the strategy of any political party,—the strategy of any political party, I repeat—is contained in its economic and political programme. But if one merely goes on changing the strategy and the tactics merely because of some sort of negativism against a thing—anti-A or anti-B—then this anti-A or B makes everything anti. Therefore, no political party or philosophy... (*Interruption*).

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : The hon. Minister of Finance, Shri Chavan, has appealed to us. I do accept that it was out commitment; I do accept that this was taken at the Ahmedabad session when the AICC meeting was held there. But will the hon. Finance Minister look to his own side and say that all the strategy and tactics that have been played by them, and also the errors committed by them as well as their party leader are corrected ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I can understand tactics being used to match tactics, but you cannot use wrong strategy to match a correct strategy. Anyway, that was my appeal to you. Certainly I know there are some progressive persons in all political parties, and I would like to make a request to them that for God's sake, and for their own sake... (*Interruption*).

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN :...because, the Prime Minister yesterday while moving the Bill before the House said that this is a historic occasion. It is historic in more than one sense. It is a historic occasion because something new, something progressive, is taking place in our country today. At the same time, there is also another reason. In another sense also it is historic, because history has ordained that this should take place now. This is a compilation of history.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE *rose*—

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Mr. Vajpayee, I am coming to your point also. Some-

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

times, I feel jealous of Mr. Vajpayee's mastery over Hindi. I am really jealous of him about it.

मुझे लगता है, वाजपेयी जी, भाषा सुन्दरी आप पर प्रसन्न है और वह भाषण सुन्दरी आपको दूसरी तरफ देखने नहीं देती है।

I certainly admire his language. Sometimes, when I listen to him, I am hypnotised by his beautiful voice and wonderful Hindi.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : आपके पास भी तो सुन्दरी है।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : They are in my pockets—the language beauties ! The point is, yesterday also I heard his speech.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : You are in her pocket or she is in your pocket ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The only point that I was making was that Mr. Vajpayee was very hypnotic in his speech yesterday. The only thing I would like to point out is that while a hypnotiser hypnotises his listeners, here I find that by his beautiful voice he himself gets hypnotised. Sometimes he forgets what he has said earlier. Only a year before, in August, 1969, he opposed the abolition of privy purses, and made a wonderful statement. I am quoting him :

मैं मानता हूँ कि समय बदल रहा है और बदलते हुए समय के कुछ तकाजे हैं।

I am trying to bring before you this *taqaza* of history. When I said that history has ordained it, I meant that this is a compulsion of history today. I think if they want to ignore the writing on the wall and would like to be swept away by history and thrown into the backwaters of history, if they really want it, I can only say "Amen".

Much was said about Sardar Patel's statement. I have great regard for him as our elder statesman. He was not only the leader of those people sitting there,

but he was our leader also. Unfortunately, the hon. members opposite have missed the significance of Sardar Patel's personality. He was a dynamic person, a person who wanted to change and also who wanted to be a realist. What he did then was *taqaza* of history then. What we are doing today is again a *taqaza* of history today. I am looking to the realities of the masses of the people of India, looking to the new compulsions of history...

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Dabhoi) : You are undoing what he did.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Those who make history expect their disciples and followers to unmake what they did if necessary, for the cause of progress. That is why we say:

शिष्यादिच्छेत्पराजयं

These are blind followers merely interpreting the letters and words of what Sardar Patel said. In 1930, Sardar Patel was merely asking for the democratic functioning in the States. That was what he was asking those people who were involved in the people's movement in the States. He was against making any revolutionary change at that time and some of us who were inclined towards the left side were criticizing him and saying, "You are thwarting the people's movement". But the same man in 1947 said, get away with the princes. Of course, he tried to be human with them. We are trying to be human with them.

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHRAN-GADHRA : I had talked to Sardar Patel in 1946. He never said that.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I have no doubt that if Sardar Patel were living today and present in this House, he would have supported this Bill.

I think I have tried to reply to many of the points raised. A small point was made yesterday, probably by Mr. Vajpayee. He asked, "What is the economic aspect? It is merely Rs. 4 or 5 crores". It is not merely Rs. 4 or Rs. 5 crores. Compare

them to the ordinary citizen or even to any of the big business men. In order to have a net income of Rs. 5 crores, the man concerned will have to earn Rs 55 crores. I have got it calculated. Besides, it is not a question of merely Rs. 5 crores. Here we are talking about the rights of citizens. I am told there is something socialistic about it. In abolishing the privy purses and privileges, there is nothing socialistic. Really speaking, the question is whether it is consistent with our democratic ideals that a selected few should have unearned income and hereditary privileges.

Here many people are talking in the name of democracy. Do they want this type of a democracy to continue where one man gets not only unearned income but taxless income? What is this democracy? All of them are talking in terms of democracy? At least, those who are talking in the name of democracy, for the sake of democracy, will have to come and vote along with us....(Interruption)

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I do not want to interrupt Shri Chavan but does it lie in our mouth, enjoying so many privileges that we do, to talk of the poor here? Even the Communists cannot talk of the poor here, enjoying as they do all the rights that we get here.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Those who are talking for the princes have no right to talk of the poor. There are other monopolies.....(Interruption)

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : Even the head of the Government has no right to talk of the poor. You eat vegetables also of the Government. Even the Ministers do not pay for the vegetables which they take free from the taxpayers' money. You have no right to talk of the poor(Interruption). You are talking of the poor people... (Interruption) !

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I do not want to make any personal criticism ... (Interruption)

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : That is why I am saying...(Interruption)

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Then, somebody mentioned the advertisement of a faceless person. I think, I will have some discussion with Shri Dandekar but I must say that this faceless argument is a senseless argument. How do you compare us with them? We are getting what we are getting under the Act of Parliament.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I did not say that it was Shri Chavan's face.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : Your word was "faceless".

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : All of you are faceless.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I am coming to my last point and that is about progressive bodies and those who want to claim to be progressive. As I said in the beginning, there is a writing on the wall. The entire people of India are watching the representatives of the people as to what they are doing today. I think, on this would depend the final judgement of the people as to who are on the side of the people and who are against the people.....(Interruption).

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am glad that I get the opportunity to speak after Shri Chavan. Shri Chavan has said that the agreements that they entered into with the Princes were political agreements. I agree with that. But why did they enter into those political agreements? That is the real question.

Somebody here said that if those agreements had not been entered into, the integration of our country would not have taken place.

SHRI UMANATH : Morarji said that.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : Shri Morarji Desai said that. Remember what happened in the year 1945 at the end of the Second World War. The whole country was in a boiling cauldron. The army was in revolt. It was precisely during that period—it was admitted even by a person like the ex-Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Attlee—that

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

they saw the writing on the wall and entered into a compromise with the Congress Government here for the transfer of political power. Just like that the princely order would have been thrown into the dustbin of history in the years 1946 and 1947. With the revolts that were taking place in State after State, the princes would have gone the way the other people had gone.

But then came Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. Why did he enter into those agreements? Those agreements were entered into precisely because he wanted to save them from the doom that was theirs. That is the reality of the situation. After all, we know what happened when the gentleman by name Shri C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer wanted to declare Travancore to be an independent country. And we know what happened. Shri C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer had to go and, along with that, they had to extinguish the princes. Therefore, all this talk that this was a very wonderful act, that the agreement that had been entered into was a very wonderful act and that, but for that, the integration of the country would not have taken place is nothing but all bunkum. It was a political agreement, a political alliance, with the princes in order to rule the country for a long time. It was an alliance with the bourgeois and the feudal elements. That is the reality of the situation. They see the writing on the wall. The princes also saw the writing on the wall. That is why the princes at that time entered into an agreement. We also know that. Therefore, there is no question today of correctness or incorrectness of that wonderful act.

Today, you are bringing this amendment to the Constitution. You know that the people of this country do not want this thing to continue. Are you serious about it? If you were serious about it, no amendment to the Constitution is necessary. You are now seeking to delete clause 22 of article 366. What does it say? It says :

“Ruler” in relation to an Indian State means the Prince, Chief or other person by whom any such covenant or agreement as is referred to “in clause (1) of article 291 was entered into and who for the time being.....

—even by entering into an agreement, he

does not become a Ruler; another consideration has to be satisfied and that is :

“...and who for the time being is recognised by the President as the Ruler of the State, and includes any person who for the time being is recognised by the President as the successor of such Ruler;”

It was open to you to utilise the power vested in this. There was no need to come to Parliament. By an executive order, the President could have said, “I do not recognise such and such person as the Ruler of the State.” No question of privileges arises; no question of privy purse arises. The question could have been decided in no time whatsoever.

Now, today, when these people, the Congress Party, come forward and say that they are progressive and they want to abolish the whole thing, I question the integrity and the correctness of that statement. There is a purpose behind this. What is that purpose? After all, the Prime Minister when she spoke yesterday indicated that they want to give them some solatium which will be in terms of a smaller multiple in the case of bigger people and a bigger multiple in the case of smaller people. You have had negotiations with them for the last two years. Mr. Chavan just now said that those things had proved useless. This question has been there for the last two years. Why is it that you could not find time, all these two years, to make up your mind and say that this is the solatium, this is the multiple, you are giving to them?

What is the political game behind this? Why is it that this thing is not placed before the House here and now? I say, it is a political game. And what is the political game? After passing this Bill, the political game is to negotiate with the princes. Mr. Chavan himself has admitted that. You want to negotiate with them. For what purpose? Again, for a political purpose. At that time, it was a political agreement entered into in order to get their support. That is why so many princes joined the Congress party after 1947. Today also, there is a political purpose and the political purpose is to win the support to the ruling party.

Not only that. Why couldn't you utilise article 366 (22) directly and abolish the whole thing? There is a political purpose. Apart from that political purpose, there may be also a monetary purpose. There is also a monetary purpose. After all, when Mr. V. P. Menon negotiated the agreements with the princes, negotiations were entered into with each prince. There was no principle for the payment of the privy purse. Privy purse was not determined, the quantum of the privy purse was not determined on the basis of any principle whatsoever and the rumour is that the more money that one gentleman got, the more the privy purse was given to that person. To-day also the quantum of the compensation or solatium or whatever it is, is determined not only on the basis of the political support but also on the quantum of the amount that the ruling Congress Party's coffers would get from them. (*Interruptions*). Therefore, I say this because I have openly told the Prime Minister, 'You will be open to this charge unless you bring both the Bills together.' You cannot escape that charge. Any amount of denial by the Prime Minister on the floor of this House will not get credence in the country because people to-day do not trust you. I want to tell you.

Therefore, this is the political purpose. I do not know who is the law adviser who had advised them with regard to this. Why this section be deleted at all? What is the harm in continuing that Art. 366 (22)? What harm does it do? You can later on utilise it. The very fact that you are abolishing it means that you do want to have a political settlement with them in mutually advantageous terms. This is the real thing.

The last question I would like to pose here is this. We know the Supreme Court. Mr. Chavan has talked about Art. 363. He has read the whole Article. Therefore, I do not want to read that. Are you sure with the ideological background of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Judges as we know in the Gofaknath case and the bank nationalisation case? Are you sure that the Supreme Court will not hold that these agreements are in the nature of a property and they are just like stocks, preferential stocks of a company and you

are entitled to get so much money every year? When you hold a preferential stock in a company, 5% return you are entitled to whether the company makes profit or not. Are you sure that the Supreme Court will not hold that this is in the nature of property and, therefore, any attack on this will be subject to the law that they have laid down in the bank nationalisation case? Are you sure of that? Therefore I want to question the very way in which this whole thing has been done. You will be open to this charge. I want to point out to you.

Despite all these things there is one good thing about this. What is that good thing? The privileges are abolished. We certainly would support this Bill on this ground knowing full-well the machinations of the Prime Minister knowing full-well all the machinations of the Congress Party, knowing full-well that they are going to utilise it for political bargaining and knowing full-well that they are going to have intrigues and horse-trading. In the ultimate analysis we depend upon the power of the people in this country and it is by the power of the people in this country we are going to fight.

Therefore, question is: to-day you are going to abolish the privy purses and privileges and if the Supreme Court holds it to be in the nature of a property and strikes it down, then the people will know what this Constitution is. Despite what my friend, Mr. Dange, has said, under this Constitution nothing progressive can be made in this country and this Constitution will have to go lock, stock and barrel. Without that this country cannot make any progress. Therefore, let people understand it by your own experience, and in order that the people can understand it by your own experience, we certainly are going to support this and we believe in the ultimate analysis it is the people who are sovereigns of this country. Who are the people who are the sovereigns of the States? Not the Princes. It is the people of the States who are sovereign. Did you enter into agreements with the sovereign people of the States? No. It is only with some rulers that you entered into agreements.

Therefore, Sir, there is nothing sacrosanct about it.

Finally, despite the fact that I am absolutely certain that the passing of this Bill is going to be utilised for political

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

horse-trading—in spite of that—I say, we are going to rally the people and we are certain, even as we have broken your machinations in Kerala, despite all your attempts, we will succeed in breaking your machinations throughout the country and you will not succeed and it is only the people of this country who will succeed. Thank you.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी (पूना) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि आज के इस ऐतिहासिक मौके पर अपनी राय रखने के लिए मुझे मौका मिला। (व्यवधान)...

मेरी पार्टी की राय भी वही है जो मैं बोल रहा हूँ। मैं पार्टी की तरफ से बोल रहा हूँ क्योंकि हमारी पार्टी इंडिपेंडेंस हासिल होने के पहले तैयार हो गई थी और जब हमको इंडिपेंडेंस नहीं मिला था तब भी बार-बार उन दिनों में रंगा साहब भी हमारे साथ थे, अशोक भाई भी हमारे साथ थे और हरेक अधिवेशन में हम लोग यह कहा करते थे कि जब जमींदारी खत्म होगी या जब प्रिसेज को हम हटा देंगे तब किसी को कम्पेन्सेशन नहीं देंगे। यह बात कोई आज हम पहली बार नहीं कह रहे हैं। यह बहुत पुरानी बात है। अगर हमारे कोई लोग साथी उस रास्ते को बदलना चाहते हैं तो उनके लिए आजादी है। परन्तु हम लोगों की मांग शुरू से यह रही है। मुझे तो आश्चर्य लगता है कि जब यहां यह बताया जाता है कि जो हम ने ऐग्रीमेंट किया है उस ऐग्रीमेंट की कोई पवित्रता है। मैं यह देखता हूँ कि बार-बार ला एन्ड आर्डर की बात की जाती है। ला एन्ड आर्डर या ऐग्रीमेंट और यह सब बातें बड़ों के लिये हैं, उस ऐग्रीमेंट की पवित्रता होती है, और जब छोटों के साथ ऐग्रीमेंट होता है, गरीबों के साथ होती है तो उस ऐग्रीमेंट की कोई पवित्रता नहीं होती। मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ इस सदन को और चव्हाण साहब को भी, मैं ने उस रोज भी कहा था, कि हमारे मजदूरों के नेताओं और प्रतिनिधियों

उन के साथ आप के मिनिस्टर्स ने, नन्दा साहब भी थे, इन सब लोगों ने ऐग्रीमेंट किया, उस ऐग्रीमेंट को आप तोड़ रहे हैं, एक दिन की हड़ताल हम करते हैं, तब आप कहते हैं कि यह बड़ी सीरियस चीज है, मगर आप ऐग्रीमेंट तोड़ रहे हैं वह कोई सीरियस बात नहीं है। मैं इन लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उस उक्त ही केवल पवित्रता की बातें थीं लेकिन जब गरीबों के साथ कोई ऐग्रीमेंट होता है तो उस की कोई पवित्रता नहीं होती, अमीर के साथ होता है तो उस की पवित्रता होती है? हम पूणिया जिले में गये थे और कई बार मैंने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को लिखा था कि वहां लोगों के साथ क्या-क्या अन्याय होता है। ला एंड आर्डर की बात बार बार उठाई जाती है मगर जिस जेल में मैं रहा हूँ वहां मैं ने देखा कि संविधान की क्या मर्यादा रखी जाती है, दफा 109 में दो-दो साल से उन लोगों को रखा हुआ है जो जमीन के मामलों को ले कर लड़ रहे हैं। मालिकों ने पुलिस से सांठ-गांठ कर के उन को जेल में रखवाया है ताकि उन की शिकमी जमीनों पर वह कब्जा कर सकें। मैं इस बात को जरूर मानता हूँ और मैं चव्हाण जी से ऐग्री करता हूँ इस बात में कि यह वक्त का तकाजा है, हम लोगों को देखना चाहिए क्यों कि हम उन लोगों में हैं जो इस चीज को मानत हैं कि हमारे देश में लोकतांत्रिक तरीके से हम को बुनियादी परिवर्तन करना चाहिये, एक नई समाज व्यवस्था समता के आधार पर बनानी है और इस समाजवादी परिवर्तन के लिए जो चीजें आवश्यक है वह लोकतांत्रिक तरीके से करने की हम में हिम्मत होनी चाहिए। इसी सदन में मैं ने कहा था, मुझे याद है कि जो हमारे प्रिसेज हैं उन्हें खुद बखुद प्रिवी पर्सों को छाड़ देना चाहिये। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि एक वक्त सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल के साथ जब बात हो गई तो इन लोगों ने बहुत कुछ किया। मैं ऐसा एकदम अनग्रेंटफुल नहीं हो जाऊंगा। मगर उस चीज को 20 साल हो गये। आजादी के 20 साल के बाद,

1931 में हम लोगों ने जो आवासन गरीबों को दिया था, क्या हम लोगों ने उस पर आचरण किया है ? आज 20 साल के बाद देखते क्या हैं—देहातों में जाइये, आप को दिखाई देगा कि गरीब लोगों को, जो गिछड़ी जाति के लोग हैं, उन को दो वक्त खाना भी मयस्सर नहीं होता है। आज वक्त का तकाजा है और हमारा सदन इस बात की कसौटी है कि हम देखें कि क्या हम सही मायनों में लोकतान्त्रिक तरीके से हमारे देश की सामाजिक व्यवस्थाओं और आर्थिक व्यवस्थाओं को बदलना चाहते हैं ? यदि हां, तो इस विषयक को मंजूर करना होगा।

15 hrs.

रोज-रोज इस तरफ से सुनता हूँ,—जब, जब नक्सलाइट्स की तरफ से वायलेंस होता है, तो कहा जाता है कि ये आदमी ऐसे हैं, वंसे हैं, लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ आज जो चीज नक्सलाइट लोग गरब भूमिहीनों के लिये मांगते हैं, जमीन व्यवस्था को बदलना चाहते हैं उन की मांग को अगर हम कानूनी तरीके से नहीं करेंगे, शान्तिमय तरीके से नहीं करेंगे, तो आप गरीब अमहाय जनता को मजबूर कर देंगे कि वे नक्सल पथियों के बताये हुए रास्ते पर चलें। महात्मा गांधी के जमाने में हम लोग विद्यार्थी थे, उन दिनों हम लोगों के अन्दर मिलिटेंसी का शोक था, भगन सिंह के रास्ते पर चलना चाहते थे, मगर गांधी जी ने हम को कहा—नहीं, तुम लोगों को हमारे साथ चलना है, तो लोगों के साथ चलो, यदि लोगों को अपने साथ कर लो तो फिर हिंसा की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ—आज जब 20 साल के बाद हमारे देश में इतनी गरीबी है तो क्या हम लोगों को अधिकार है

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं 19 दिन जेल में रहा हूँ, अगर एक-एक दिन के लिये एक-एक मिनट ही दे दें, तो मेरा काम चल जायगा.....

SHRI PILOO MODY : Why was he let out today ?

SHRI S. M. JOSHI : I have been let out because I have stuck to my principles.

आज सरदार वल्लभ भाई का नाम बार-बार लिया जा रहा है। सरदार पटेल उस समय राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन के हमारे नेता थे, यद्यपि समाजवाद के बारे में उन के साथ हमारे विचार नहीं मिलते थे। हम समाजवादी थे, वे नहीं थे, अगर कोई कहता है कि सरदार समाजवादी थे तो मैं इस बात को नहीं मान सकता। उनके समाजवाद के विरोध के कारण हम सोशलिस्टों को कांग्रेस से बाहर जाना पड़ा। अब जो सरदार पटेल की बात करते हैं, मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ—क्या सरदार पटेल ने आप को कहा था कि समाजवाद कबूल करो। जब सर्वसम्मति से आपने समाजवाद को मान लिया है, तो फिर समाजवाद के भी कुछ तकाजे हैं—अगर हम लोग आज जनता को जाग्रत करते हैं, जनता को संगठित करते हैं, गरीबी की लड़ाई को शान्तिमय तरीकों से लड़ सकते हैं, तो फिर हम इन लोगों को यानी सरकार को भी अपनी बात मानने के लिये मजबूर कर सकते हैं। आज जमाना बदल रहा है, जमाने के सामने उन लोगों को भी झुकना होगा, राइटिंग-म्यान-दी वाल सिर्फ हमारे लिये ही नहीं है, उनके लिये भी है।

मैं आप लोगों से पूछता हूँ—क्या हम लोगों ने कहा था कि आप वह 10 पाइन्ट वाला प्रस्ताव पास करो। 10 प्वाइन्ट प्रोग्राम किस ने पास किया जिस का आज आप लोग विरोध कर रहे हैं। मैंने मोरारजी भाई के भाषण को बड़े ध्यान से पढ़ा, मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ, मोरार जी भाई आज पवित्रता की बात करते हैं। जब हम मजदूरों के लिये लड़ रहे थे, तब वह क्या कहते थे ? उस समय वह पवित्रता कहाँ गई थी ? इस को छोड़िये, मैं पूछता हूँ—क्या

[श्री एस० एम० जोशी]

गांधी जी को सब लोग मानते हैं ? अगर मानते हैं, मोरारजी भाई भी मानते हैं, तो मैं उन्हें याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ गांधी जी से भी पूछा गया—लूई फिशर ने पूछा था—ग्रा। जब जमींदारी प्रथा को खत्म करने जा रहे हैं तो जमींदारों को मुआवजा देंगे या नहीं ? उस समय गांधी जी ने कहा था—कैसे दे सकते हैं, अगर मुआवजा देने की कोशिश करेंगे तो कुछ बनने वाला नहीं है, वह तो अपने कंधों पर खुद बैठने जैसे होगा। कैसे बैठ सकते हैं ? इतने दिनों से वह लाभ उठा रहे हैं उतना काफी है। आज उन को मुआवजा देंगे तो व्यवस्था मौलिक रूप से कैसे बदलेगी ? तब फिर इन को क्यूँ मुआवजा देना चाहिये। हां, हम इस बात को मानते हैं कि रिहैबिलिटेशन कम्पेन्सेशन देना चाहिये, हमें किसी को विस्थापित नहीं करना है, अगर उस दृष्टि से कुछ देना है, तो जरूर दीजिये, लेकिन कम्पेन्सेशन मांगेंगे तो नहीं चलेगा।

बिहार में जमींदारी का कानून बना, उस का जो मामला जजेज के सामने चल रहा था, मैंने उस को पढ़ा। पी० आर० दास उन के एडवोकेट थे, मैंने उन के आर्ग्यूमेंट्स को पढ़ा, उन्होंने कहा था—दरभंगा राजा को कम देते हैं और छोटे जमींदारों को ज्यादा देते हैं, ऐसा क्यों ? यह बात उन के दिमाग से बाहर थी, वह ऐसा क्यों समझने लगे कि ऐसा क्यों किया जाता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी हम लोगों को समझ लेना चाहिये कि क्या हम लोग वक्त के तकाजे को कबूल करते हैं या नहीं, यह कहना कि यह चार करोड़ का मामला है या पांच करोड़ का मामला है, हमें इस से मतलब नहीं है, इस में चार करोड़ का सवाल नहीं है, चार करोड़ का सवाल तो फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर ने कुछ दिया है, लेकिन हमें यह देखना है कि अगर हमें अपनी व्यवस्था को

बदलना है तो कैसे बदलें ? मुझे याद आता है, 1952 में नासिक के एक देहात में हम लोग भाषण के लिए गये थे, उन दिनों शेडयूल्ड कास्ट फंडरेशन के साथ हमारा समझौता था। जब हम वहां बैठे थे तो हमारे एक शेडयूल्ड कास्ट के नेता ने कहा कि ब्राह्मणवाद को समाप्त करना चाहिए। तब मैंने मजाक में पूछा कि यहाँ देहातों में ब्राह्मण अब हैं नहीं तब आप ब्राह्मणों के पीछे क्यों पड़े हो ? उन्होंने कहा—ग्रा।प समझते नहीं हैं, यह जो वर्णाश्रम धर्म है, इस का जो मूल आधार है, दरअसल में वह ब्राह्मणवाद है, इस लिये सब से पहले उस को खत्म करना चाहिए, इस का मतलब ब्राह्मणों का मारने से नहीं था, ब्राह्मणवाद को खत्म करने से था। बाबा साहेब अम्बेदकर का वहना था कि वर्णाश्रम को खत्म करना है। 1956 में आखिर बाबा साहेब अम्बेदकर को कहना पड़ा कि हिन्दू धर्म में रहूंगा तो मुझे न्याय नहीं मिलेगा, कितनी बड़ी बात है ? मेरा सिर धर्म से झुक जाता है। हम उन को उस समय इतना आश्वासन भी नहीं दे सके कि तुम हिन्दू धर्म में रहो, तुम को न्याय देगे। आज छोटों को न्याय नहीं मिलता है, हम बदलना नहीं चाहते हैं।

सरदार पटेल ने उस समय जो कुछ किया, उन के सामने कुछ खास मकसद थे। आज हम सरदार पटेल को कोट करते हैं, लेकिन सरदार पटेल के बाद हम ने जो कुछ किया, उस को दृष्टि में रखते हुए आज वक्त के कुछ तकाजे हैं। फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर ने जो कुछ बतलाया, वह उन का अपना विचार है, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अब एग्जीमेंट का क्या मतलब है ? आज हमारे सामने यह सवाल है कि क्या हम लोग इस कांग्रेसी चूशन को रकना चाहते हैं या नहीं, इस कांग्रेसी चूशन के जरिये हम तबदीली ला सकते हैं या नहीं ? आप देखिये—हमारे कांस्टीचूशन में कुछ आर्ग्युमेंट्स हैं, जिन को हम डाइरेक्टिव प्रिन्सिपल कहते हैं और सुप्रीम

कोर्ट का रुलिंग है कि कुछ प्राविजनज आफ कांस्टीचूशन ऐसे हैं जो एनफोर्सिबिल नहीं हैं, लेकिन यह एनफोर्सिबिल है, तो यह हो सकता था कि हमारे जजेज कोई ऐसा विचार ले लेते कि जिससे वक्त के तकाजे को समझ कर, संविधान की स्पिरिट को समझ कर उस को इन्टरप्रेट करते, तो अच्छा होता। अभी हमारे मित्र ने कहा कि प्रिन्सिज सुप्रीम कोर्ट में जाएंगे, जायें, हो सकता है कि यह कानून वहाँ फल हो जायें, वहाँ इस के खिलाफ निर्णय हो, जैसा बैंकों के वक्त में हुआ, तो फिर क्या करेंगे? मैंने अखबार में पढ़ा था कि हमारे पार्लियामेंट्री मिनिस्टर ने कोई भाषण दिया था, यह सही हो या गलत हो, मैं उस में नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन उस का कहना यह था कि अगर यह बिल पास नहीं होता है, तो हम मिड-टर्म पोल के लिये कहेंगे। परन्तु मैं कहता हूँ कि इतना काफी नहीं है, अगर यह बिल यहां पास नहीं होता तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर को और आपकी तमाम पार्टी को इतना करेज हाथ में लेकर कहना चाहिये कि अब लोक-सभा के लिये इलैक्शन नहीं होगा, अब इलैक्शन होगा कांस्टीचूएंट असम्बली के लिये, जहाँ वह सब बात करेंगे। क्योंकि सुप्रीम कोर्ट में अगर वे जाएँ और वहाँ उसका उलटा हो जाये तो हम क्या करेंगे? जुडीशियरी हमको ओब्लाइज करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। और जनता की भलाई की जो बातें हैं, हमने जो आश्वासन दे रखे हैं उनको हमें पूरा करना है लेकिन सुप्रीम कोर्ट के इटरप्रेटेशन के चलते हम कैसे पूरा करेंगे? इसलिए मुझे कहना है खासकर अपने पुराने साथियों से और कांग्रेस आर्गेनाइजेशन वालों से कि आप कम से कम अपनी पुरानी बातों को याद रखें। आपने क्या आश्वासन दिये थे? बीस साल गुजर गए हैं और प्रस्ताव पास करने के बाद भी दो साल गुजर गए लेकिन अभी तक कोई अमल नहीं हुआ। तो यह चीज नहीं चलेगी। हमको साबित करना चाहिए और जनता को बताना चाहिये कि हम सही मानों

में गम्भोरता के साथ इस देश में बुनियादी बदलाव लाना चाहते हैं। आज जो गरीब हैं, किसान हैं या लैंडलेस हैं उनके साथ क्या व्यवहार हो रहा है? तो एक तरफ इनके साथ में यह व्यवहार रखें और दूसरी तरफ उन लोगों को कुछ न दें तो वह डिमांक्रेंसी नहीं होगी।

यहां पर हमारे बुजुर्ग साथी ने कहा कि हम लोगों को प्रिविलिजेज हैं, यहाँ पर मिनिस्टरों को प्रिविलिजेज है। महात्मा गांधी ने कहा था कि पाँच सौ रुपया लो लेकिन वह बात नहीं चली, हम उसके विरोधी हैं। लेकिन मिनिस्टर तो कोई भी बन सकता है। जिसको लोग चुनेंगे वह हो सकता है। डा० राम सुभग सिंह कल को इस तरफ बैठ सकते हैं और वे प्रिविलिजेज ले लेंगे। जब उधर बैठे थे तब प्रिविलिजेज लेते भी थे। इसलिए वह कोई प्रिविलिजेज नहीं है जिम पोस्ट पर कि कोई बैठ सकता है लेकिन क्या कल को मैं प्रिन्स हो सकता हूँ? नहीं हो सकता हूँ। तो इस तरह से काम नहीं चलेगा। सही मानों में अगर आप डिमांक्रेंसी चाहते हैं तो लोकतांत्रिक तरीके से इस देश में बुनियादी बदलाव, मौलिक परिवर्तन करना होगा। आज गरीबों के ऊपर जो अन्याय हो रहा है उससे उनमें काफी असन्तोष बढ़ रहा है। और मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि गरीब अब ज्यादा रुकने वाले नहीं हैं जब तक कि आप उनको कोई विकल्प नहीं बतायेंगे। गरीब थोड़े से भी संतोष कर लेते हैं लेकिन अगर आप उनको जरा सा भी नहीं देंगे तो वह ऐसे रास्ते पर चले जायेंगे आपको मंजूर नहीं होगा और मुझे भी मंजूर नहीं है। आखिर पूरे विश्व में इस देश की हमारी खासियत क्या है? हम कहते हैं कि हमारा इतना बड़ा देश है, बहुत सारे मजहब के लोग हैं, इतना जातिवाद है फिर भी महात्मा गांधी के बताये हुए रास्ते पर हम चलेंगे तो हम लोगों को पूरा विश्वास और यकीन है कि उसी रास्ते से हम यहां पर सामाजिक परिवर्तन ला सकते हैं इसलिए मैं आपके

[श्री एस० एम० जोशी]

जरिए अनुरोध करूंगा कि इस पर दोबारा सोचिए और यह साबित करने के लिए कि आप सही मानों में समाज में परिवर्तन चाहते हैं तो इस बिल पर वोट करना चाहिए वरना फिर यही समझा जायेगा कि आप परिवर्तन नहीं चाहते हैं। इतना कहकर इस बिल का समर्थन करते हुए मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Dr. Karan Singh.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor) : I want one clarification before he speaks, whether his privy purse will be affected if this Bill is passed.

THE MINISTER OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (DR. KARAN SINGH) : Ever since I entered Parliament over three years ago, I have never considered myself to be a representative of any particular section in Parliament or in the Cabinet. I have the honour, like every hon. Member, to represent the vast masses of this country who have elected me. This does not mean that I repudiate my ancestry or my legacy. I am proud of the fact that I belong to a family that was responsible for adding thousands of square miles to the territory of India in the 19th century. And I am also proud of the fact that I belong to a family which was largely responsible for the fact that Jammu and Kashmir State is today part of India. I am sorry ; I believe in some speeches the patriotism of the princes had been questioned. I do not want to go into historical details but shall merely ask one question. Was it unpatriotic for my father to have acceded to India when Mr. Jinnah was offering him virtually a sovereign State if he went over to Pakistan ? Therefore, I feel that words should be used, in this context particularly rather carefully because we are dealing with very delicate issues.

As far as privy purses of princes are concerned, it is true that they are the result of solemn agreements. But it is also true

that time is a great changer. We live today in a world the keynote of which is change. Centuries ago Shankaracharya said :

कालः क्रीडति गच्छति आयः

Time changes a great number of things. Perhaps twenty years ago something was considered to be sacrosanct and sacred. Today new generations have arisen ; new ideas are sweeping the world, not only our country but the entire world today is seized by a paroxysm of change and I think it will be difficult for anybody to stand against the process of change that is sweeping the country.

I agree that it would have been ideal if the change now sought to be made were made by agreement. It is a matter of deep regret to me that despite three years having elapsed since this decision was first announced no agreement was forthcoming. I do not think that it is at all necessary or useful at this stage to apportion blame. All I should say is that the Government is committed to making transitional arrangements. It is quite clear in the President's speech as well as in the speech of the Prime Minister. I would submit that there is still scope for creative dialogue on those transitional provisions. It is understood that transitional provisions are necessary because contrary to popular belief, it is not as if privy purses are invariably spent only on conspicuous consumption. I happen to know from my own personal experience that a large number of relatives and dependents and others also participate in these privy purses and therefore transitional provisions will have to be made. It is clearly Government's policy that transitional provisions will be made.

Incidentally one hon. Member raised a point as to whether my privy purse was going to be affected by this or not. My understanding of course is that it will be. But I may say quite clearly on the floor of the House that even if the legal experts say that it is not affected, I will voluntarily fall in line with it....(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHARAN-GADHRA : I welcome the statement made

by the hon. Minister. But I should like the House to notice the emphasis on the word 'voluntarily'.

DR. KARAN SINGH : It is true that it is not merely a matter which concerns money. As rightly pointed out by many speakers it is a question in which honour is involved. Honour is something far greater than material possessions and far more important. I would submit that the honour of the princes or of the people of India is not necessarily connected with material possessions. The *Isavasya Upanishad* says :

तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जीथाः

One can enjoy by renunciation also. There is a glorious heritage with the princes of India. Swathi Thirunal, the poet Maharajah of Travancore whose songs are sung to this day in every house in South India, Maharana Pratap whose very name is synonymous with chivalry and bravery throughout the world, Chhatrapati Sivaji Maharaj who out of a small area and with a handful of people created a State that withstood the power of the mightiest of the Moghuls; Maharaja Ranjit Singh who kept the British at bay as long as he was alive; there was my own ancestor Maharaja Gulab Singh who extended the territories of this country to China and Russia. These are all parts of Indian heritage and will remain part of Indian heritage whether the princes enjoyed privy purses and privileges or not.

Sir, I would submit that the matter really is that we are living in a situation in which change is becoming very, very rapid, and we are today at crucial crossroads of our history. The forces of extremism, the forces of hatred and bitterness seem to be arising and it almost appears as if the turmoil in which we are living today is a travail that precedes a new birth. I have no doubt in my mind that a new India will be reborn from the travail that we are passing through today, an India in which a better life will be made available to all sections of the people, whether they are princes or whether they are peasants.

I would submit, I would urge, that the princes also having played a historic role in 1947 and 1949, now realising the way the situation is developing, realising the fact that a new generation of Indians will come of age, should also play their part. Let us not be pushed by change. Let us take change by the forelock. Let man, in a positive way, with Divine grace, meet his own destiny. Let us seize the moment of destiny. Let us move forwards to a new India in which the princes and every section of society can play their glorious role.

With these words, I support the motion.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara) : Sir, I hope the appeal made by Dr. Karan Singh would have some response at least among the princes and that they will withdraw their opposition, and support this Bill.

Sir, by this simple measure, we are only removing a slur on our Constitution. The Constitution of our Republic, by these articles, had created double citizenship in this country. Some were given privileged position, and not only privileged position but they were enjoying unearned income and certain privileges which were not available to the ordinary citizen of this country. Whatever might have been the compulsion of events when integration took place, whatever might be the reasons for coming into agreements with them, when the new Constitution came into being or at least when the reorganisation of States took place, and even Rajpramukhs were abolished and all the States completely were devoid of their identity and merged in the new Indian States, there was no reason to continue these articles in our Constitution.

Many things are being said about democracy, constitution, and other technical aspects of it. I do not want to go into them. But I would like to point out the views of a former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India, Shri Gajendra-gadkar. While taking up a case in 1964, he observed :

"If, under the Constitution, all citizens are equal, it may be desirable to

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

confine the operation of section 87B of the Code of Criminal Procedure to past transactions and not perpetuate the anomaly of distinction between the rest of the citizens and the rulers of the former Indian States."

As you know, section 87B provides a bar on any suit against the rulers. He further pointed out as follows :

"But considered broadly in the light of the basic principle of equality before the law, it seems somewhat odd that section 87B should continue to operate for all time. For the past dealings and transactions protection may justifiably be given to the rulers of the former Indian States, but the Central Government may examine the question as to whether for transactions subsequent to January 26, 1950, this protection need or should be given."

For all practical purposes, this was undemocratic and unconstitutional. But the Government, which is now going to honour its pledge to the people, hesitated and did not bring forward any measure all these years in spite of the demand made by the people. Today it has come, not because the Government have become suddenly progressive or socialistic, but because of the resolution passed in the other House unanimously to complete the procedure for abolition before the budget session. The budget session was over but still they were carrying on negotiations with the princes. Probably left to themselves, Government would not have brought forward this Bill even now. The Prime Minister said, "we are opening up a new dimension of democracy." If that was really so, they should not have carried on the negotiations with the princes.

I was surprised to hear Mr. Morarji Desai's speech. He was pleading that we must be true to our commitments and he quoted Sardar Patel *in extenso*. But he himself is going back on his own commitments. The commitment of Cong. (O) is that privy purses must

be abolished. In the course of his speech, he agreed to the abolition in principle. This Bill is only abolishing it in principle. There is no further elaboration. They have not spelt out anything else. Now he is saying that his party is opposed to it because of the manner in which it is being done. That means, he professes socialism, but it must be ushered in a manner as would bring capitalism. By passing this Bill, privy purses are really to be abolished, but he does not want to support it. But if the Bill is framed in such a manner that it will never be abolished then probably he would have supported it. That is the game his party is playing. It is very difficult to understand the political motives which guide them. He was quoting *in extenso* from the paper. But nowhere is it mentioned there that it is permanent and it cannot be changed. On page 134 of the white paper, it is said :

"No understanding can be rightly interpreted without weighing the effect of lapse of time and change of circumstances. It is not only a question of material factors; it is also a question of morale. No pact can endure when, owing to the evolution of ideas, it has ceased to square with general conceptions of right and wrong."

There is nothing sacrosanct about it. It was not a fundamental right. It was not a property right. It was a political decision guaranteed in this Constitution. A pension was given to some who came forward to cooperate with the Government. It was a political pension which can be withdrawn at any moment. There was no question of the covenant or agreement being sovereign. I was really surprised when Mr. Morarji Desai who was then in the thick of the national struggle said that but for the patriotism of the princes, there would have been no integration of this country.

May I remind him that but for the people's movement and for States' people's revolution, the princes would never have come to terms with Sardar Patel... (*Interruption*). I know, the person who is interrupting me was going to commit suicide when he was going to sign the Instrument of Accession.

SHRI P. K. DEO : There was firing in Kharswan in those days...*(Interruption)*.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : It is not voluntarily, it is not out of patriotism that the princes opted and signed the integration. It was because of compulsion of circumstances.

What had happened in Junagadh ? That was in Gujarat and I think Shri Morarji Desai must be knowing about it. Was it patriotism of the Raja ? He was somewhere in Pakistan and the people there made it impossible for him. Junagadh was integrated in India.

SHRI P. K. DEO : What happened to Kharswan ?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Kharswan is now in Bihar and no prince is there...*(Interruption)*. I will not try to waste my time describing here the misdeeds of the *ex-Orissa* rulers. Those are harrowing tales and I do not want to go into them.

What happened in Hyderabad ? Was it patriotism ? Would Shri Morarji Desai say that it was the patriotism of the Nizam that ultimately led to integration ? What about even Kashmir of which Dr. Karan Singh just now made a mention ? It was only because of the Pakistani guerillas and Pakistani hordes that the State came forward for our aid and we gave the aid.

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu) : There was a people's movement for integration.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : The princes were put in such a position at that time. When there was no governmental or military help, there was the movement of the people ; they came forward to protect themselves.

How did these princes come into being ? These are the wages of betrayal.

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHRANGADHRA : You have cited two examples—Junagadh and Hyderabad

and suggested that these are sufficient instances to show that the princes were not patriotic or did not feel for their country. I would like to point out that when the police action in Junagadh took place, it was Bhavnagar State Forces, Jamnagar State Forces and other State Forces which did the Police action ; when the police action took place in Hyderabad under General Chaudhri, the forces engaged at that time were the Rajasthan State Forces, the Mysore State Forces and the Baroda State Forces. Then the Travancore State Force were engaged during the Jammu and Kashmir operations. So, you cannot say that they were not patriotic.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : There were some princes at that time who really looked into the future and helped in that process. For them we have already given so much pension, so much privy purses and privileges, that they should now give them up voluntarily. For whatever they have done, we have paid them adequately.

It is not a question of mere patriotism that led all of them to integrate. It is because of the compulsion of events. The compulsion of circumstances also made this Government to compromise at that stage, as has been admitted by Nehru himself.

Even Shri Morarji Desai—and the Dhrangadhra Maharaja also is very much concerned about honour and self-respect. Shri Morarji Desai went on emphasizing that this Constitution, this Parliament, this sovereign House is the custodian of the self-respect—self-respect of the rulers, I thought, not of the nation. It is national honour that we have to observe and the national honour of the country.

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHRANGADHRA : I never spoke of the Rulers' honour, but country's.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : He said, voluntarily this could have been done and he was trying for it but he resigned from the Ministry. He resigned from the Ministry but what prevented him from trying to negotiate and find out a formula ?

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

I do not think the Central Cabinet told him, after his resignation, "No, no ; you do not carry on the negotiations." Did he voluntarily offer to do that ?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI (Surat) : I was asked not to carry on the negotiations.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : That may be there ; it is all right.

This thing is not going to be solved voluntarily.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi) : Why ?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : I will tell you, why. Just have patience.

In 1953, if Shri Lobo Prabhu has any notes he can see, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru wrote a letter to 100 princes who were enjoying privy purses of more than Rs. 1 lakh for a voluntary cut. What was the response ?

SHRI SRIRAJ MEGHRAJJI DHRAN-GADHRA : I have been giving a cut since 1953. You can examine my accounts.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : You are a lone individual ; you are a single individual. There have been so many individuals who did not respond. Here is a good man, an amiable man; we want a people's man, not a ruler. What I want to say is this. Mr. Nehru made this appeal and he had to give up the effort because there was no adequate response. In reply to a question in Rajya Sabha, on December 18, 1953, a supplementary was put to him asking, what about the voluntary cut and how far the princes had agreed to that and he expressed his sorrow that this thing did not happen and that they would still continue the effort which his daughter is still continuing. With what purpose we do not know.

As has been pointed out by my hon. friend Shri P. Ramamurti, there may be a political purpose. So far as the abolition of the privy purses is concerned, there is no need for any negotiations and there is no need for any talks at all. I quote what Mr. Nehru then said:

"The agreements were entered into at

a time when all kinds of factors had to be taken into consideration....."

Underline the words "kinds of factors had to be taken into consideration". The Government was facing a change-over. Everybody knows what was the situation then and how anxious we were to see that at least the Constitution was framed with the cooperation of all. Therefore, all sorts of compromises were made with all sorts of persons. They had to take into consideration all kinds of factors and, at that time, the then Government came to the decision and these agreements were entered into.

That was the compulsion of circumstances that made them to agree to this, not because of patriotism and this or that. Therefore, it clearly shows that there is no question of any obligation at all. There is no contract, no agreement, no constitutional binding. Why do you want to pay transitional allowances ? I want to make it clear that this Government is proceeding in this matter in a half-hearted manner. They do not want to, as very rightly pointed out, lose the support of their supporters. Therefore, the Prime Minister, even while indicating in her letter to the princes that smaller princes should be given lump-sum and others in other respects, she does not want to take the House into confidence to tell here and now, these are the things that they are going to do, what will be the charge on the Exchequer and who are the persons who are going to be benefited, and so on. There is a lurking fear that probably you are dangling this weapon in order to play a political game...*(Interruption)* This is a beginning of the end of things like that.

The whole question is: why do you want to negotiate ? I want to ask this. Repeatedly, the Prime Minister is emphasising, Mr. Chavan is emphasising, to negotiate with the princes, to sit with them and to see their difficulties. She went so far to say that they are admired by the people in their own States and will continue to get the respect and dignity. I ask this Government : when you acquire lands of the peasants, do you negotiate with them to give them compensation ? Have you ever done that ? You have taken peasants' lands in

public interest. Have you entered into negotiation with them? What is the point in negotiating with the princes? If you say, you want to solve this matter in a constitutional manner, in a peaceful manner, taking the Parliament into full confidence, that these are the difficulties pointed out by the smaller princes, that, with the abolition of privy purses, they will be put to an abject poverty, and all that, I could understand. She could say that. She has not taken the House into confidence. She should have taken the House into confidence, taken all the leaders of the parties into confidence, to see what in the national interest is necessary to do. This is no negotiation. They have no right whatsoever, either constitutionally or technically. The whole Bill, according to me, means nothing excepting that a good beginning has been made to end this anachronism in our Constitution.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : I do not take more time. I generally do not do that.

At the same time, when this question of Art. 363 has been raised, Morarjibhai has said that if for anything he is going to oppose, it is because this is a package deal. In the package deal only one pocket has been touched. The other pocket has remained. I would humbly ask him without going into legal complications of it : did not this Parliament, did not we amend the Constitution in order to make non-justiciable the quantum of compensation that would be given to land taken over by the Government? We passed that law that the Supreme Court will have no authority to judge upon the quantum of compensation that would be paid to the peasants.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : It is a bad law.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Everything is bad law because a feudal order is going to be abolished. Because monopolies are going to be abolished, it is all bad

to you. Anything which will bring about a change is bad to you. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PILOO MODY : Anything that is unjust is bad.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : Therefore, what we want to say is...

SHRI PILOO MODY : Unjust law is a bad law.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : If that is so, let Judges judge it. And they have given you a kick in the back. Don't forget that Judges have stood with the times and the bank nationalisation was not actually struck down but actually they gave a verdict in favour of bank nationalisation. But some flaws were there, some legal defects were there. That they pointed out. I have no grudge against the judiciary on that count. I still feel that they are the custodians of our constitution and our freedom and they will continue to discharge their duty. In this country if democracy is to survive, the judiciary has to be kept impartial and above politics. If we can amend the Constitution in order to provide this clause that quantum of compensation cannot be justiciable, why did Morarjibhai oppose it? The cat is out of the bag. Morarjibhai says, "I would have supported if you have had omitted Art. 363 also." That means the flood gates of litigation will be opened and the rulers would have gone to the Supreme Court. There will be a case and it would not have been possible to achieve what you want to do. What does he want? Rather than stressing the point about covenant and agreement, what you want to say, tell us. You are silent on that point. You are more emphatic on this point : why do you keep Art 363 debarring them from going to the law court? This is his approach. I think there has been no better advocate of the princes than Mr. Morarji Desai. Probably he lost himself because they are also playing a political game and that is very evident since this Government is playing a political game. They know them thoroughly well. They were partners, companions. They have worked together. All of them together made this country what it is to-day. There are as many sinners—good

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

sinner or bad sinner—as these people are. I do not find in the approach there is any difference between the two. But what I mean to say is : if really it was a purpose which you want to defeat politically, therefore, even on a good measure you are going to commit political suicide going against your own commitment by dissociating yourself. We can fight out. We will continue to fight this question that no compensation should be paid because compensation is not due and this is not really a property right. Only a property right can be compensated. I would warn the Prime Minister. As I have stated, this is not the only occasion. We have to have more measures like this, if monopoly, if feudalism and all other anachronisms are to be abolished. Are you going to compensate? Will this country ever be able to negotiate with the same vested interests which you want to abolish? Can you compensate? Are you in that position? Therefore, there is no question of any constitutional difficulty being involved. Even now you can say : There is no question of compensation. We have given a pension, we are withdrawing it.

Therefore, I would ask her to make it very clear that there will be no negotiations with the princes on this question and no compensation whatsoever will be paid and so far as the follow-up action is concerned, I would say this. So far as this Bill is concerned, on the 15th of October, this is going to be implemented. I would suggest this. If the Government is not able to make up its mind now, they may have a special session. It does not matter. Before the 15th of October, when this Bill is going to be implemented, there must be a special session. The public must know, actually, to what extent and in what manner you are going to abolish these Privy Purses and these privileges. That should be made public so that 16th October will really be a red-letter day in the history of our country. Thank you.

DR. KARNI SINGH (Bikaner) :

It is my intention to make this speech that I propose to make today on a high plane. A great deal has been said during the last two days on this very controversial question.

To some people, Sir, it is just another Bill, but, to us, it is a thousand year old history, it is our culture, it is our heritage and we feel strongly about it.

The reason for that is that it is not a question of any voluntary gesture that was ever asked for in the last couple of years, but, more so, because of the fact that in our opinion the whole thing was nothing but one big threat. The other Dr. K. was produced as a hydrogen bomb by the Treasury Benches, and he made a very fine speech. He is my colleague. (*Interruption*) I admire him for his point of view. There is only this difference between him and me ; I am nobody's stooge. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : Sir, I rise on a point of order. This word 'stooge' should be expunged.

DR. KARNI SINGH : I am not attacking anybody ; I am speaking about myself.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : He started saying that he is going to speak on a high plane. I seek your ruling on this point,—whether directly or indirectly, he can call some other Member a stooge. It may be by implication or directly. This is wrong. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not think there is anything unparliamentary.

DR. KARNI SINGH : I am not a stooge, Sir, but if anybody feels hurt, I am prepared to apologise. I would only say this much, Mr. Deputy-Speaker. The Prime Minister herself said that history is being written today. It is because of this that I appeal to this honourable House that when you take any decision on it one way or the other, it must be taken with all the great historical facts as a background. The fact is that on this thousand year old history the curtain is to be wrung today. It is the great history of Rana Pratap, of Shivaji Maharaj, the families that exist today, descended from the family of the great Rani of Jhansi and from the 279 other ruling houses. These are families who are proud of their background, proud of the fact that they stood

by the traditions of what they believed in and fought for.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, for 3 years this question of privy purse abolition has been taken up on the floor of this House. I can say this much that hon. Members from all sides of the House supported us in the interest of justice, in the interests of fairplay and decency. And we are very grateful to them for their kindness.

I am sorry that I have to speak on behalf of the princes myself. I never had any intention to do so, but I do feel, now that this has reached such an advanced stage, that our point of view must be placed before the House in the proper perspective because history one day must know how we expressed our views.

It does make me sad that the daughter of the great Jawaharlal Nehru should now herself be presiding over the Parliament and the Cabinet today to reverse the very decisions that her father took 20 years ago.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar) : Her father wanted it.

DR. KARNI SINGH : I will say this much again that yesterday it was carried in the papers, and it was also mentioned to us by some Members that if the Government lost this Bill they would have to hold another election.

AN HON. MEMBER : That has been denied.

DR. KARNI SINGH : That again is another threat.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It has been denied that any such statement was made.

DR. KARNI SINGH : Why are we afraid of facing the masses? If there is going to be another election, let us go to the polls. Why should we be afraid of it? But, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, before we go to the polls again, and realising the fact that this is a poor country not prepared to

spend crores on another election or on a mid-term poll, the Opposition is prepared, I am sure, to take over. If Mrs. Gandhi does not have the majority, the Opposition can take over. After all, ultimately, a two-party democratic system has to evolve in this country. The unification of the Opposition forces that are taking place is very evident today. I would like to say this much that.....

AN HON. MEMBER : Grand Alliance.

DR. KARNI SINGH :...the privy purse question is really blown out of all context. The real fact is that the forces in the country, those that are on the Treasury benches, supported by some Opposition parties, and those that sit on this part of the House (opposition) collectively are trying to try out their strength and the princes are only a pawn in the game. This is purely a stunt. But I do feel, what I said once before and I say it again, that all this privy purse talk is politically motivated. Shri P. Ramamurti was quite right; he did not beat about the bush; he came right down to the point. And I will say this much that from the 1967 elections onwards, you know perfectly well what happened in Madhya Pradesh, in Rajasthan etc; a demand grew up to declare the privy purse as an office of profit. Why? It was because the 'chairocrats' wanted to stay in power. Now, what I want to ask is this. At the end of four general elections, why did they make a demand for declaring the privy purse as an office of profit? They should have done it in 1952. But it so happened that some prince particularly the one who believed in what I shall call the people's point of view were able to go and fight for the people's interests, got elected and threw out the Congress from power. And naturally, a very astute politician like Shri Y. B. Chavan realised that the image and the myth of the princes, if you like to call it that, had to be destroyed. If Shri Y. B. Chavan was serious about privy purse abolition he could have told the princes before the 1967 elections that 'I believe we should do this'. But, no, he did not do that. But he waited till he put up his own candidate and the Rajmata of Kolhapur beat him, Shri Y. B. Chavan thought even if an old lady of 70 could beat the Home Minister's candidate in his area, surely this image had to be destroyed. That was where democracy parted

[Dr. Karni Singh]

company with the Congress people. It is because of this political Vendetta motivation that we are opposing it.

If Shri Y. B. Chavan had taken the same line that the Prime Minister has taken—I like the line that the Prime Minister has taken, and I say that—if Shri Y. B. Chavan had taken the same line without putting his foot out and saying 'Kiss it', I am sure that we would have cut our necks and put them down on a plate before him. But no decent man with self-respect is going to kiss anybody's foot in this age of democracy. And Shri Y. B. Chavan instead of dealing with princes like honourable and sensible men treated them with scorn. I remember I was once at the negotiating tables, but I am no longer in it. At that meeting, it was mentioned to Shri Y. B. Chavan that 'Surely, you should realise that you are in no position to give any compensations, because you do not know how long you yourself will be in power. If you yourself are removing these guarantees which are enshrined in the Constitution, for God's sake, what is your own word worth?' I asked Shri Chavan myself: 'If you give me a guarantee, I will say it will last a week or ten days'. This is so because he is not there in a position to carry it out since they now carry on with a minority Government.

I remember on the floor of the House I had once asked that the Opposition must come with a national Government. I said 'maybe we could have a nationalist Government'. Shri Chavan said, 'No. You try a government with the Communists.' And here they are sitting in power with the help of the Communists.

These are political expediencies and we can understand it.

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA (Gauhati): He has understood now.

DR. KARNI SINGH: Something has been said about the princes having a great deal of money to throw into politics, I would like to ask you: can anybody match the power of patronage that Government has? Shrimati Gandhi is in power today. If she were to leave that seat and

part company, it may take her 20 years to come back to power. The power of patronage is tremendous. Let us not ignore this fact. Not even the 279 privy purse-holders can match one iota of the power that the great Prime Minister wields. It is understandably so. I believe that even aeroplanes were despatched to Kerala—I am subject to correction—to get friends to come and vote today. The Government has aeroplanes at its disposal. This story may be untrue, but it is within her powers to do so, which the Opposition cannot.

The Prime Minister has been calling Independent members to her chamber trying to coerce them. Why? I know that during the Rabat debate, I was one of those who decided, amongst other members of my group, to help keep the Prime Minister in power, because we thought she believed in democracy, that we had to strengthen her hands. We supported her. But after that, she seems to have taken it for granted that we are her lackeys. One by one, Independent members are summoned to her chamber. What kind of democracy is this? Even the Independents will have to decide for themselves whether they are to join the Congress Party or sit as Independents as part of the Opposition, because every Independent has fought a Congress candidate or most of them have done so.

It has been said that the princes have outlived their use. I do not want to go into that argument. But I will just ask Shri Chavan one question. Why are the princes today still popular with the people? I must explain this (*Interruption*)

Last January, in my own area, three firings took place in one week; over a dozen people were killed and three dozen were put in hospital. I called on the Hon. Minister, Shri Chavan, presented him a memorandum and requested that he might kindly visit these firing areas. Do you know what happened? Neither he nor the Chief Minister of Rajasthan visited these firing sites. They did not have the guts to do. Only Dr. Karni Singh had it. Why?

AN HON. MEMBER: A great warrior.

DR. KARNI SINGH : No, I am a public representative like any one of you. It was their duty, because they are in the saddle. If they failed in the duty, do not turn round and say : 'These princes got elected. So let us destroy their image'. We work with the people. We are one of them, I go into my villages and I mix with the little children. They treat me like a father, They are like my own children and I love them.

That is the feeling they want to destroy and quite understandably so. But you cannot destroy that image. You must first give good government before you can make the people forget the Rulers. If you want to destroy the princes, give good government; they will be destroyed within a generation. But with your chairocratic government, your corruption, nepotism and regionalism that are injected into state politics, the princes' image may last more than a generation.

AN HON. MEMBER : Let us accept the challenge.

DR. KARNI SINGH: I am not challenging. I may be finished tonight or tomorrow. That is not the point.

If you give good government to the people, they will forget the rulers in a minute. You know perfectly well that after the integration of the States, the integrated states' moneys were pooled together, and we have been asking for equal development of all regions of our new States, Rajasthan wanted equal development. There were five divisions. It wanted all the five "Brothers" to be treated alike. Madhya Pradesh wanted the same thing. But what happened? Wherever the Chief Minister comes from, he feathers his region's nest. Then why do you blame the poor princes for getting elected.

16.00 hrs.

Yesterday the Hon. Member who opened to bat on behalf of the Congress Party, Mr. Nahata, spewed out such poison that even the Prime Minister was upset. I am very happy to see that. I wish she had picked a better man to open the innings.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : He was a left hander.

DR. KARNI SINGH : However, I would say only this much that Mr. Nahata talked about certain atrocities that were committed by the former rulers and said that people were killed in jail and firings took place. I would like to ask him to tell the House how many firings took place in his own State Jodhpur where he came from. I have got a whole lot of firings that have taken place in the last ten days alone. They are so many that I cannot read them. Somebody said that I was a good clay pigeon shooter, but this Government certainly beats me.

I would like to place before the House one or two those facts. The hon. Member Mr. Nahata came from Jodhpur Division. One or two years after the integration of the Jodhpur State, the young Maharaja who was my own age then, 27, joined the opposition forces, fought the Congress and won 31 out of 34 seats. If he and his father were terrible people I doubt if the people would have voted that way. So, I think we have to look at facts and understand them. Let us not be too bitter about these things. If you work for the people you will get the votes. Let us not ignore one basic fact. No matter what you may say about democracy, but the fact if the father is a good man, the son will always benefit. The fact that the hon. Prime Minister sits on that side as Prime Minister, 90 per cent of it is due to the fact that she is Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's daughter. What is there to be ashamed of? I am sitting here today because I am my father's son, he was a good man, my grandfather was a great good man, too.

Dr. Karan Singh made a statement to say that his father helped to consolidate the country. I am very proud of this fact because his father and my father were close friends. I would like to remind the hon. House, however, that my father was amongst the first to sign the Instrument of Accession bringing the Bikaner State into the Indian Union and his father was almost the last. His father delayed the accession to such an extent that the country is in the predicament that it is in today.

[Dr. Karni Singh]

Let us face facts. I feel that there are reasons for this privy purse question to be brought up and given so much emphasis because I feel this is diversionary tactics. There are very many more important matters in this country than destroying the Princes. The Princes are loyal citizens. We are not Chinese agents, let me remind you. If you destroy the Princes, you will have destroyed loyal Indians, but you will have saved yourself for six months because you would have diverted the attention of the nation from these most pressing points which I shall read out to you only for a short period. I am reminded of the great General who killed tiny little mice which had no more teeth to bite with. I understand that kind of bravery. I played politics for 18 years. You have also played politics. We know how it is. Let us look at some of the major problems that the country faces. Nehru's pledge to Parliament to vacate Indian territory from Chinese aggression should have priority number one. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, you were a member, I was a member of this House too then; we all stood up to pass a resolution saying that every inch of Indian territory will be vacated of Chinese aggression. I believe it was on Mr. Nehru's birthday. Have you redeemed that pledge? No, you have not even the guts to try. So, kill the princes, divert the mind of the nation for two more months...*(Interruptions)*.

There is the cartographic aggression on India's territory by the Soviet Union. If you finish the princes today, for another two months the nation will forget these maps. This maps question was a far more important problem. But, the princes must be destroyed, because the cartographic aggression can then look as a minor problem in comparison and the Government can become great heroes. The fact is that India is becoming the satellite of the Soviet Union. Day after day your policy of non-alignment is being blown to the winds. You are being tied to the apron strings of the Soviet Union. We realise only too well where this is going to take this country and what is going to happen to democracy.

Then there is the solution of the Kashmir problem. It did not occur to

the Prime Minister to tell the House what steps she proposes to take to evict Pakistan from parts occupied by them. No, Sir. Kill the princes. That is more important. They are vermin.

Then there are the findings that take place in this country every day. You take the newspaper any day. There is not a day when we do not read of firings. I should like the Prime Minister to tell us when she is replying; is there any other democratic country in the world where there are so many firings on human beings? Let her produce statistics. How many persons have been killed during the last ten or twenty years? If this is the concept of a democratic socialist Government, I can do without it.

Everybody knows that fifty thousand babies are born every day. This is going to set at naught every thing that we are trying to build. Does the Prime Minister have the guts to stand on a platform and say: this population explosion is destroying everything? The socialist philosophy believes in giving the people who live on this earth a better deal. By the socialist philosophy we must ensure prevention of unnecessary births. We talked about how to benefit the common man. Do you not have it within your means to do so? But no, the princes must be destroyed first because they are vermin.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirapalli): They are also producing.

DR. KARNI SINGH: I shall now refer to the communal trouble in the country. I shall not mention the places but we know where communal trouble has recently taken place. The hon. Prime Minister also knows. At the time of partition, when her great father was the Prime Minister of India, when India became independent, it was in the States that carnage and bloodshed was not permitted and my father and the Maharaja of Jodhpur, against whom my friend Mr. Nahata spoke the other day saw to it that fifteen lakhs of Muslims passed through without anybody being killed.

The State troops were posted all over the State. Those great rulers said that every man would be protected. I do not believe in religion being made a political ideology. The ruler's job is to protect. The rulers are now gone, and it is your job to protect the minorities.....(Interruptions). I imagine five lakhs of Muslims live in Bikaner Division. It is not now in my power to protect them. I can only represent them forcefully in Parliament. It is your job to protect them as the Government. The failure of the Government to protect the minority communities is a serious matter. Before the princes are accused I feel that the hon. Prime Minister and her Cabinet colleagues should throw some more light on this matter and tell the country how they are going to protect these poor minorities in our country. Mere talk of secularism is going to get you nowhere. Regional and communal bitterness is increasing. And in the elections your tickets are given on communal grounds. We know it, too. Will the ruling Congress come out with a statement that in the next elections seats will be given not on a communal basis? I should like the Prime Minister to assure us that in the 1972 election, they shall firmly do so. We shall then believe that and think that you are true to your word. Then, take lawlessness in the country; there is the Naxalite menace, where even decent people cannot live a decent life. Then the inter-State border dispute; and I believe that Mr. Chavan is sufficiently exercised with that problem, the rising prices; unemployment and shortage of jobs and food scarcities. The Prime Minister and Mr. Chavan, would like the House to believe that by stopping the privy purse, the whole problem of unemployment and poverty will be solved. That is a remarkable way of thinking, because two lakhs of people sustain themselves for their daily livelihood on the privy purse and the rulers do not turn on a shower with money and enjoy it themselves. This money is spent on thousands of people for their daily bread.

Mr. Dange yesterday said that "you spend more than your total amount." I said, "Yes, I do." And the reason for that is that I am not going to be the man who

fires 400 people so that I could save some money for myself. If I have got capital, let it be spent. The wealth-tax is designed for that, to erode the capital. Most of us are paying more income and wealth-tax put together than our income, and if we are left with a negative income figure, there is nothing to be surprised at. But we shall not axe the poor people. There are many men and women, old people, for which even the Prime Minister, in her generosity of heart, will not find an answer if they were to become unemployed by stopping of the privy purses.

16.10 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*.]

I now will take you back to 1950, when my father died. My father was the first ruler to die after the integration. His privy purse was in excess of Rs. 10 lakhs : it was Rs. 17 lakhs. I met Sardar Patel and said, "Sir, will you kindly give this Rs. 7 lakhs that are being cut from my Privy Purse for the benefit of the people of Bikaner?" He said, "I am very sorry, son; the law does not allow it. This must go to the Consolidated Fund." So, 300 men were thrown out of their jobs and nobody came to their rescue. Today, when you press this button, two lakhs of people will go out of jobs. Please bear this in mind. These are real problems. (Interruption)

With your permission, I will read out a small section from the speech that the hon. President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who is regarded as a *rishi* and a great man, made, about the princes in general and my father in particular, of which I am proud. It has been quoted; it has been requoted and it shall continue to be quoted because he was one of the greatest men our time has produced. Dr. Rajendra Prasad said :

"The great move for the unification of India could materialise primarily because of the goodwill and ready willingness of Princes like Maharaja Sadul Singhji...

[Dr. Karni Singh]

I am proud to be the son of that great man—

“to participate in Constitution-making and to send their representatives to the Constituent Assembly of India. It was a difficult task, too difficult to be described in words, because but for this kind of wilful co-operation India might have remained split in several bits. It redounds to the credit of the late Maharaja of Bikaner that by his bold decision he gave a correct and timely lead to other Princes. This eventually resulted in the accession of not only Bikaner but also other princely States to India. Therefore, India is, and will, remain indebted to him. When the history of that period is written, it will be recorded therein that at a time when India was faced, on the one hand, with the calamity of partition and, on the other, with the dangerous possibility of Balkanisation, Maharaja Sadul Singhji prompted by farsightedness and the most patriotic of motives stood firm like a rock and averted that possibility.”

You can also repudiate Dr. Rajendra Prasad. He was your President. But there is nothing to stop you from saying that he was nobody. It is a free country.

There is one more thing. I feel that the Prime Minister might like to take a definite and realistic approach to this question, and that is in regard to Sikkim and Bhutan. The Communist Benches have been keeping quiet about Sihanouk. He was also a prince. But they are still for him. (*Interruption*).

SHRI BHOGENDRĀ JHA : We are also for Maharani Lakshmi Bai.

DR. KARNI SINGH : May I remind the hon. House that although I concede that there were some small differences in the position of the rulers of Sikkim and Bhutan as compared to other Rulers, the fact still remains that they still sat in the Chamber of Princes and occupied a position in some cases lower than Indian rulers. Trying to be consistent, I

would like to know whether the Government proposes now to extend the merger scheme to Sikkim and Bhutan, or, are they too scared. Is it their desire to whip their own loyal citizens and keep the others who kept away as Kings? You must have seen pictures of the Prime Minister going to the airport to receive the King of Bhutan and the King of Sikkim. She comes home and plants a kick on the back of the loyal rulers. What kind of ethics is it?

As far as the rulers were concerned, our dealings were with the Home Ministry. When the Home Ministry turned round against us and instead of a handshake stuck out their foot and kicked us, although in today's situation it is understandable but still it is something that you cannot accept. The fact remains, as the saying goes in Rajasthani : 'बाड़ खेत न खावे' (the fence destroys the field). The Home Ministry is our custodian. When Mr. Chavan was Home Minister, our entire rights were to be safeguarded by him. He was our father so to say. Yet, Mr. Chavan, instead of protecting us, did everything possible to create a situation whereby the princes could be humiliated.

I will say this much in justice to Mr. Chavan. I have gone on record in having said in this House that in 1965, Mr. Chavan, with the help of the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, gave India a tremendous image, having beaten Pakistan in war. As a young man, I admired him for that and placed him on a high pedestal. But when personal vendetta and political motivation came into this question, I was hurt.

AN HON. MEMBER : Because it touched your money.

DR. KARNI SINGH : Money, Mr. Speaker, is the least important. Many newspapers have produced pictures and cartoons showing the princes dying for money. Speaking for myself, I do not care two brass buttons for money, but principles are involved and we should fight for principles. Principles of Bilateral agreements are involved. You have agreements today with the princes, and you can throw them aside. Tomorrow you will have your agreements

with trade and labour unions. You will have agreements with the State of Punjab for Continuing its bifurcation. You will have agreements with the new Hill State. Any powerful Government tomorrow can repudiate any of these agreements. The five-rupee note you carry around has this written on it : "I promise to pay..." etc. For God's sake, value your promises. What does it mean otherwise ?

SHRI PILOO MODY : Don't believe it. (*Interruptions*).

DR. KARNI SINGH : People no longer believe it. You know perfectly well what happens to a country which cannot keep its word. The princes have been used as whipping boys. For every mistake made by this Government the princes have to be whipped. The time has come when the record has to be put straight. If we oppose this Bill it is not that we are not in keeping with the times. We are in keeping with the times all right. I will go a step further. If the people of the former States decide that the privy purses should go, I have no objection. But it is not fair that people of areas outside the former States should be asked about it who are not going to be involved or affected by the large scale unemployment.

Before I conclude, I will say a few words about the privileges. You are trying to build a privilege-free society. Whatever else it may be, I admire Mr. Limaye ; he has been at last consistent. He is in the opposition and his party did not come to a merger agreement with the rulers. He cannot be blamed. But your Congress party did. There are many privileges which are in the process of dying out. We must accept that. Man has landed on the moon and will soon go to Mars, Venus and all over the space. Times are changing. Dr. Karan Singh was right to this extent. I will say only this much : What about the privileges we, Members of Parliament, enjoy ? We have a bungalow for which we pay Rs. 200, but whose rental value is Rs. 2,000. Is this not a privilege ? If you make it absolutely free to an MP and no money is to be paid for it, it is all right but certainly paying 1/10 of its actual rental value is a privilege by me.

Something was said about income-tax free incomes. We draw Rs. 51 a day income-tax free. There are many rulers in this country today whose total privy purses are less than our (M. P's) income-tax free income.

These privileges do exist. I agree that in course of time these privileges will also disappear; so will those of the rulers, but I feel that it is not fair for us not to realise this.

There is one privilege which, I have felt, has been misused in this House. We have freedom of speech. Whatever we say about anybody on the floor of the House cannot be sued in a court of law for libel or defamation. The princes also cannot be sued in a court of law without the permission of the Home Ministry in civil suits, but permission is easily forthcoming. But whatever we say on the floor of the House, even character assassination of decent citizens on the street, nobody can sue us even for libel. These are facts that we all must realise.

This is a changing democracy. Everything has to change. This will have to change, too. A very much higher standard of responsibility has to develop in this House so that we realise that we have a sacred responsibility not to slander the man-on-the-street who cannot defend himself. As they say in Hindi as matters stand today.

“किसी की भी इज्जत मिट्टी में मिला दो”

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. House for the patience with which they have listened to what I have said. I will only conclude with just one remark. It takes a thousand years for any country to build up a reputation—a reputation of honesty, a reputation of sticking to its honour and of sticking to its word. In the comity of nations in which India lives it is what you do inside your own country that affects our outside image as well. In support of this I will quote what the great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, said—you can repudiate him also if you wish— :

“It is a dangerous thing even for a powerful ruler to break his plighted word. Breach of a promise is no less an act of insolvency than a refusal to pay one's debt.”

श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विभाजन के समय अंग्रेज हिन्दुस्तान को दो हिस्सों में नहीं तीन हिस्सों में बांट कर गये। भारत और पाकिस्तान के अतिरिक्त एक हिस्सा जो अंग्रेजों ने हिन्दुस्तान में बनाया वह देशी रियासतों का था। अंग्रेज ने प्रत्यक्ष नहीं लेकिन पीछे से ब्रिटिश पोलिटिकल डिपार्टमेंट के द्वारा इस बात की कोशिश की कि किसी भी प्रकार से भी हो राजा महाराजाओं का एक प्रयत्न राजस्थान बना चाहिये और ब्रिटिश पोलिटिकल डिपार्टमेंट इस मामले में बहुत दूर तक प्रयत्न करता रहा। विभाजन से पूर्व एक इस प्रकार की स्थिति आई जब अप्रैल 1947 में बम्बई के ताजमहल होटल में एक बैठक हुई राजाओं की जिसकी अध्यक्षता तत्कालीन भोपाल नरेश ने की। इस बैठक में जब यह प्रस्ताव आया कि देशी रियासतों को अपने एक प्रयत्न संगठन और प्रथक इकाई के रूप में परिणत हो जाना चाहिये तो उस समय जो मेरे पूर्व वक्ता महाराज बीकानेर, डा० कर्णो सिंह बोल रहे थे, उन के पिता जी श्री शार्दूल सिंह पहले व्यक्ति थे जिन्होंने उस बैठक का बहिष्कार किया और बहिष्कार ही केवल नहीं किया बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर एक स्वस्थ वातावरण का भी निर्माण किया। दिल्ली के औरंगजेब रोड के पहले नम्बर के मकान में नये हिन्दुस्तान की एक नई तस्वीर बनी जिस में एक ऐतिहासिक घटना घटी। जहां सरदार बल्लभ भाई पटेल रहते थे, और वह घटना घटी तब जब महाराज जामनगर वहां पर पधारे थे। गुजरात के लोगों को याद होगा कि सरदार पटेल का जामनगर के साथ जीवन भर किस प्रकार का सम्बन्ध रहा? लेकिन सरदार पटेल ने देश की आवश्यकता को अनुभव करते हुए जाम साहब को लंच पर बुलाया। उस बैठक में दोपहर के भोजन के समय उन से क्या बात चीत हुई यह तो पता नहीं लेकिन यह सच है कि जब भोजन के बाद सरदार पटेल और जामनगर के महाराज बाहर

निकले तो दोनों में समझौता हुआ और दोनों में बात चीत हुई कि महाराज जामनगर सरदार पटेल को बड़ा भाई मानेंगे और सरदार पटेल महाराज जामनगर को अपने छोटे भाई की तरह देखेंगे। जब ब्रिटिश पोलिटिकल डिपार्टमेंट ने हिन्दुस्तान की देशी रियासतों को पृथक् रूप से यूनिट बनाने का यत्न किया तब सरदार पटेल ने देश के चार बड़े बड़े रजवाड़ों को ले कर, जिन में जामनगर का परिवार आता था, बड़ौदा का परिवार आता था, पटियाला का परिवार आता था और बीकानेर का परिवार आता था, दश में एक नये वातावरण का निर्माण किया जिस से साढ़े पांच सौ राजाओं ने अपने राज मुकुट उतार कर भारत माता के चरणों में अर्पित कर दिये। सरदार पटेल देश के उन कुशल राजनीतिज्ञों में से थे जिन्होंने इस देश के अन्दर इस प्रकार का वातावरण निर्माण किया कि अंग्रेज देश का तीन हिस्सों में बांटन का जा मनसूबा पूरा करना चाहता था, उस को उन्होंने अपने कुशल दिमाग और मजबूत हाथों से धूल में मिला दिया।

जहां तक राजाओं के जेब खच को खत्म करने की बात है, मैं इस प्रश्न को चार हिस्सों में बांटता हूँ। एक है इस समस्या का सर्व-धानिक पक्ष, दूसरा है इस समस्या का आर्थिक पक्ष, तीसरा है इस समस्या का नैतिक पक्ष और चौथा है इस समस्या का राजनीतिक पक्ष। हमारे संविधान में यह व्यवस्था की गई है कि जब कभी इस प्रकार का प्रश्न आये जहां संविधान के विपरीत सरकार को निर्णय लेने की आवश्यकता हो—दुनिया के और देशों के विधान में इस प्रकार की स्थिति कम है, लेकिन भारतीय संविधान के निर्माताओं ने यह स्थिति रखी है—उस समय सरकार को सुप्रीम कोर्ट की ऐडवाइजरी ओपीनियन लेनी चाहिये, उस का परामर्श लेना चाहिये। लेकिन मुझे यह प्रतीत होता है कि इस प्रकार के महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न

पर भी अगर ग्राज सरकार ने सर्वोच्च न्यायालय की राय नहीं ली तो सरकार का इस न्याय मंदिर से विश्वास उठ गया है या फिर सरकार सर्वोच्च न्यायालय पर विश्वास करती है तो इस की आवश्यकता अनुभव नहीं करती। लेकिन जो बात में विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि कहीं कल ऐसी स्थिति न आये जैसे बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के सम्बन्ध में हुआ था। अच्छा यह होता, और यह सरकार के भी हित में था तथा देश के भी हित में था, कि सरकार सर्वोच्च न्यायालय से परामर्श लेती।

दूसरी बात यह है कि हमारे संविधान में मूलभूत अधिकारों के विषय में कुछ गारन्टीज दी गई हैं। इस नाते से नहीं कि ये राजे-महाराजे हैं बल्कि इस देश के वे नागरिक भी हैं इस नाते से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि गोलकनाथ केस में जो सर्वोच्च न्यायालय का निर्णय हुआ था उस को ध्यान में रख कर क्या सरकार को यह अधिकार है कि इस पर जितनी भी समस्याएँ हमारे सामने आयेँ उन सारे के सारे प्रश्नों पर मूलभूत अधिकारों का हनन करे और मूलभूत की उपेक्षा करे ?

यों भी संवैधानिक दृष्टि से यह बिल अपूर्ण है क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री ने जो विधेयक उपस्थित किया है उस में यह तो कहा कि इन व्यवस्थाओं को समाप्त किया जाता है, लेकिन बैकल्पिक व्यवस्था क्या है इस को उन्होंने सुरक्षित रक्खा है। मेरा अपना अनुमान यह है कि वह चुनावों में राजा-महाराजाओं के सिर पर प्रलोभन की तलवार लटकाये रखना चाहती है ताकि इस प्रकार की स्थिति आये तो कहीं राजे-महाराजे इस प्रकार का कोई निर्णय न लें जिस से सत्तारूढ़ दल को जीतने में कठिनाई हो।

अब मैं इस समस्या के दूसरे पक्ष की ओर जाता हूँ जिस को आर्थिक पक्ष कहा जाता है।

आर्थिक पक्ष की स्थिति यह है कि मुक्त को प्रतीत होता है कि सरकार का मंहगाई के साथ एक समझौता हुआ है। सत्तारूढ़ दल और मंहगाई का आपस में एक समझौता हो गया है। राजाओं के जेब खर्च का बिल तो आज आया है, लेकिन सच्चाई यह है कि राजाओं का जेब खर्च तो ग्राज से बहुत पहले कम किया जा चुका है। राजाओं-महाराजाओं को जो जेब खर्च 4 करोड़ ६० के लगभग दिया जाता है आज उस रुपये की कीमत क्या है ? आज उस की कीमत एक चौथाई रह गई है। सच्चाई यह है कि 4 करोड़ रुपया जो रक्खा गया है वह आज 1 करोड़ रुपये के बराबर है। दूसरी सब से बड़ी स्थिति यह है कि सरदार पटेल ने संविधान सभा में भाषण देते हुए कहा था कि जिन राजाओं ने हमें पैसा दिया है उस में 77 करोड़ ६० इस प्रकार का है जो उन्होंने हम को नकद दिया है। इस 77 करोड़ रुपये में से साढ़े 52 करोड़ रुपये तो अकेले त्रालियर राज्य का था जो मध्य भारत के राज-प्रमुख के नाते सरकार को दिया था। सरदार पटेल ने संविधान सभा में कहा था कि इस साढ़े 52 करोड़ रुपये का ब्याज जो होता है अगर उस को भी मिला लिया जाये तो हम महाराजाओं को उतना जेब खर्च नहीं देते जितना उस राये का सूद होता है। लेकिन ग्राज जिन हमारे मित्रों को 4 करोड़ रुपयों का दंड है और उस में उन को आर्थिक पक्ष दिखलाई देता है उन से मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक काश्मीर रियासत की समस्या अभी तक पूरी तरह से हल नहीं हुई है और वहाँ हम ३ ब तक 4 हजार करोड़ रुपये खर्च कर चुके हैं पिछले 23 सालों में। उस में न तो कांग्रेसियों को दंड दिखलाई देना है और न दूसरे साम्यवादी मित्रों को ही दंड दिखलाई देता है। आज इस विधेयक को रखने वाले इस बात को भी भूल जाते हैं कि जैसा कुछ समय पहले इसी सरकार ने एक प्रश्न का उत्तर देते हुए 10 मई 1968 को कहा था कि राजा-महाराजों के साथ जो सन्धि हुई

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

थी वह तो स्वतन्त्र भारत में हुई थी। लेकिन स्वतन्त्र भारत के पहले भी कुछ लोगों के साथ सन्धि हुई थी, जो 1801 में हुई थी, 1823 में हुई थी, 1846 में हुई थी और 1866 में हुई थी। 10 मई, 1968 को इसी सदन में प्रश्न का उत्तर देते हुए बतलाया गया था कि उसमें मुशिदाबाद का खानदान था, सतारा का खानदान था आरकाट का खानदान था और इसी प्रकार के 13 खानदान थे। उन सब को भारत की संचित निधि से प्रति वर्ष साढ़े 22 लाख रु० दिया जाता है। मुझ को खुशी होती अगर यह सरकार इस विधेयक को लाते समय इस बात की घोषणा करती कि ब्रिटिश गर्बनमेंट के जमाने से जो लायविलिटीज हमारे ऊपर हैं उन को भी हम समाप्त करने जा रहे हैं। उनके सम्बन्ध में यह सरकार मौन है, बिल्कुल सोचनी नहीं है। मुझे तो पता चला है कि इन में से एक दो रियासतों को अंग्रेजों के समय से भी ज्यादा पैसा बढ़ा दिया गया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री इनके बारे में भी बताएं कि वह पैसा बढ़ा है या नहीं बढ़ा है। महाराष्ट्र में वे रियासतें हैं या कहां हैं। मुझे इस की जानकारी नहीं है।

अब मैं नैतिक पक्ष की ओर आता हूँ। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं केवल दो बातें कहना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात तो यह है कि 1947 में जिस समय हमारा देश स्वतन्त्र हुआ और देश का विभाजन हुआ उस समय हमारे देश के ऊपर एक प्रकार से विनाश का पहाड़ टूट पड़ा था। लाखों लोग अपने सिर पर मुसीबत की गठड़ी रख कर काफिलों की शकल में पाकिस्तान से भारत आ रहे थे। उस समय अगर हमारे देश को परेशान करना होता तो राजे-महाराजे आसानी से कर सकते थे। उस समय अगर देश के इन साढ़े पांच सौ राजाओं ने हमारी मजबूरी का लाभ नहीं उठाया तो क्या आज यह नैतिकता का तकाजा है कि हम आज इन

राजाओं और महाराजाओं की मजबूरी का लाभ उठाएँ? यह प्रश्न मैं आप से नैतिकता की दृष्टि से पूछना चाहता हूँ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि अगर सन्धि तोड़नी है तो सन्धि तोड़ने के लिए आपके पास कई क्षेत्र थे। आप भी पता ही है कि इस देश ने इस प्रकार की कई संधियाँ कर रखी हैं, नेहरू-लियाकत पैक्ट है, ताशकन्द पैक्ट है। इन संधियों के होते हुए भी आज करोड़ों आदमी पूर्वी पाकिस्तान से निकल कर भारत आ गए हैं और आ रहे हैं। लाखों लोगों को मौत के घाट उतार दिया गया है। आज आपकी हिम्मत नहीं है कि नेहरू-लियाकत पैक्ट को आप तोड़ें, ताशकन्द पैक्ट को आप तोड़ें। लेकिन पैक्ट कौनसा तोड़ना है? पैक्ट वह तोड़ना है जो सरदार पटेल ने इनके साथ किया था। उसको तोड़ना है जो अपनी देश भक्ति का परिचय देते हुए राजाओं ने उनके साथ किया था। सच्चाई तो यह है कि जो राजाओं और महाराजाओं ने इस सरकार को दिया था उस में से भी इस सरकार ने कुछ न कुछ गंवाया ही है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि महाराजा हरी सिंह ने जितनी काश्मीर की रियासत आपको दी थी आज क्या उतनी काश्मीर की रियासत आपके पास है? कच्छ का जितना रण दिया गया था आज कच्छ का उतना रण हिन्दुस्तान के पास है? क्या उसका कुछ भाग पाकिस्तान को नहीं दिया गया है? कूच बिहार की रियासत को आप देखें। उसका क्या हुआ है? बेरूबाड़ी के इलाके के बारे में स्थिति क्या है? यह तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट को धन्यवाद दिया जाना चाहिये जिस ने अभी तक उस प्रश्न को रोक कर रखा हुआ है वरना यह सरकार तो उसको पाकिस्तान को देने का निर्णय कर चुकी है। सच तो यह है कि राजाओं ने जितना इनको दिया उसको भी ये बरकरार नहीं रख पाए उस में से भी इन्होंने कुछ गंवाया। अब तो होना यह चाहिए कि जनता की अदालत में इनको छड़े करके, इनके ऊपर कस चलाया जाना चाहिये उसके लिए जो इन्होंने गंवाया है।

आज राजाओं के साथ किये गए समझौतों को अगर आप तोड़ते हैं तो उसका एक बहुत बड़ा नुकसान यह भी होगा कि हम ने देशी और विदेशी कुछ ऋण भी अपने ऊपर ले रखे हैं और आगे के लिए भी विदेशी ऋण लेने की व्यवस्था कर रखी है। अगर सरकार इन तरह से बादा की खिलाफत करती रही तो इन देशी और विदेशी ऋणों का क्या होगा? कई राज्य इस प्रकार के हैं जहां जमींदारियों के खत्म होने के बाद जमींदारों को बांड दिए गए हैं। कल को अगर कोई सरकार आए और यह कहे कि जमींदारों को जितना मुआवजा मिल गया, मिल गया, बाकी उनको देने की जरूरत क्या है, तब स्थिति क्या बनेगी?

ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के जमाने में जो सेना थी उन लोगों को भी सरकार के खजाने से पैसे दी जाती हैं। अगर कल को सरकार के सामने यह चीज आये कि क्योंकि उन्होंने ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट की सेवा की थी, इसलिए उन पैसे को को बन्द कर दिया जाए तो उस समय आपकी स्थिति आ कर क्या बनेगी?

प्रिंसीपल के मामले में सरदार पटेल ने आश्वासन दिया था और संविधान में धारयें बनी थीं। क्योंकि वह आश्वासन उस समय सरदार पटेल ने दिया था इसलिए उसको वापिस लिया जा सकता है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि राज भाषा के सम्बन्ध में जो नेहरूजी ने आश्वासन दिया था उसको क्यों तोड़ा नहीं जा सकता है? जब यह कहा जाता है कि उस आश्वासन के मुकाबले में संविधान का माना जाए, उसका आदर किया जाए तो कहा जाता है कि नेहरूजी का अहिन्दी भाषा भाषी राज्यों के लिए आश्वासन था इसलिए इस प्रकार का बिल बनाने की जरूरत है। उसी तरह से सरदार पटेल का भी तो आश्वासन था और उस आश्वासन को क्यों तोड़ा जा रहा है?

अब मैं राजनीतिक स्थिति पर आता हूँ। राजनीतिक स्थिति क्या है? सबसे बड़ी बात तो यह है कि हम को थोड़ा शीशे के सामने खड़े हो कर अपना मुँह देखना चाहिए। आखिर इन 22 सालों में राजाओं के प्रिंसीपल के अन्दर इनको पहले ऐसी दुर्गन्ध क्यों नहीं आई? 1967 के बाद दुर्गन्ध आनी क्यों शुरू हुई? यह तब शुरू हुई जब उड़ीसा के अंदर इनकी सरकार नहीं बनी, जब मध्य प्रदेश में इनकी गवर्नमेंट को हटाया गया, जब राजस्थान के अन्दर श्री मोहन लाल सुखाड़िया को हटाने की तयारियाँ होने लगीं। तब राजाओं के प्रिंसीपल के अन्दर इनको दुर्गन्ध आने लगी, तब राजे-महाराजाओं के प्रिंसीपल इनको खतरनाक दिखाई देने लगे। लेकिन जिन मित्रों को ये साथ ले कर चल रहे हैं दुर्भाग्य यह है कि वह उसका लाभ उठा कर उसे समाप्त करना चाहते हैं। सत्तारूढ़ पार्टी के अन्दर कुछ ऐसे लोग घुसपैठ कर गए हैं जो हृदय से इनके सिद्धांतों में विश्वास नहीं रखते हैं और जिन्होंने निश्चय किया हुआ है कि इनके अन्दर जा कर विघ्न पैदा किए जाएं। अगर सरकार इन लोगों को साथ ले कर चलेगी तो घाटे में रहेगी। आज मैं प्रधान मंत्री के कानों तक अपने शब्द आपके माध्यम से पहुँचाना चाहता हूँ कि यह वही पार्टी है जिस ने गांधी जी के व्यक्तिगत सत्याग्रह के लिए यह कहा था कि बूढ़ा देश के साथ खिलवाड़ कर रहा है। यह वही पार्टी है जिस ने गांधी जी के डू और डार्ड के आन्दोलन के लिए कहा था कि देश अभी तैयार नहीं है, गांधी जी ने मुल्क को मट्टी के अन्दर क्यों भोंक दिया। यह वही पार्टी है जिस ने नेताजी सुभाष चन्द्र बोस को किंवदन्ति और कौमी गद्दार कहा था। यह वही पार्टी है जिस ने सुभाष बोस को जापनी कुत्ता कहा था, विभाजन के समय मुस्लिम लीग का साथ दिया था, शेख अब्दुल्ला का साथ दिया था आज वह आपके साथ है। कल श्री इंगे ने कहा था

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

जब तक राजाओं की जरूरत थी तब तक तो हमने उनको इस्तेमाल किया, आज जरूरत नहीं है तो उनके इस्तेमाल की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मैं कहना यही चाहता हूँ कि भारत के इतिहास में यह शब्द न कभी लिखे जाएँ कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को जब तक सत्ताधारी कांग्रेस की आवश्यकता थी, तब तक तो उसका इस्तेमाल किया, जब आवश्यकता नहीं रही, तब उनको भी उठा कर फेंक दिया।

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not surprising that this Bill should have received such wide support from different sections of the House. It is not surprising also that two of the Opposition parties should oppose the Bill so vehemently.

One of the speeches was a master piece of beautiful packaging, of beautiful words, with no substance; nor was the speech of the Maharaja of Dhrangadhra surprising. He was born and brought up in a particular milieu. He and his friends are personally involved. He has his point of view, which he has always expressed openly and in the most chaste English. He spoke of the reference to the Supreme Court. But, since this is one of the amendments, I shall deal with the amendments, when we take them up.

But, there is another party of my hon. friends opposite. It is difficult to know what to say about them. I have long since stopped being surprised by either their words or their deeds.

SHRI P. K. DEO : Sir, I rise on a point of order. The Prime Minister stated that the reference to Supreme Court is a separate amendment. But, it is not a separate amendment. It is an amendment to the Motion for consideration.

MR. SPEAKER : That is an amendment to the Motion.

SHRI P. K. DEO : This is an amendment to the Motion for consideration.

MR. SPEAKER : I know it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Sir, Government has examined all the constitutional and legal implications of this Bill. We have taken legal advice on the question of referring this matter to the Supreme Court. But the advice of the highest law officers was that the proposed Bill is constitutional and legally in order and that it is therefore not necessary to refer the matter to the Supreme Court.

Now, as I was saying, I have long since stopped being surprised by what some of my hon. friends opposite say and do.

When Shri Morarji Desai rose to lead the opposition to the Bill, the thought came to my mind, of the Kauravas setting up Bhishma Pitamah to plead their case. It was his lot to give a moral facade to an indefensible case.

Shri Morarji gave rather an one-sided view. Other Members have also mentioned that negotiations with the princes did help us at that time. But, let us not forget that had the princes taken any other course at that time, the reaction of the people would have been very different and I doubt if we would have been able to control the situation. Maybe, it would have created difficulties; I am sure it would have. But, perhaps, it would have solved some problems also.

Some point was made about Shri Chavan ji having suddenly thought of the abolition of the Privy Purses as a political device. I do not remember now. but I do not think that Shri Y. B. Chavan was a member of the Working Committee in 1953 which was when this matter was first taken up there. I myself became a Member in 1955, and there was hardly a year when this matter was not taken up and discussed. And year by year, almost month by month, the pressure from our party was growing that something should be done about it, long before the 1957 elections. So, either people do not know this or knowing it they deliberately want to distort facts.

Many points of view have been put forward, which are not in correct perspective.

tive. It was said, for instance, that the agreements and compacts with the rulers had been entered into before the Constitution came into force and that the Constitution only put a seal on those agreements, and, therefore, although the constitutional sanctions may go but the agreements would continue in force. Now, this view is based on a misunderstanding of the nature of these agreements. They are not contracts between individuals. They were political settlements which were followed by the political acts of the President in recognising the rulers under the Constitution. Some hon. Members said that the President has the right to recognise or derecognise a ruler and that the merger agreements are thus dependent on the continued recognition by the President of a ruler as a ruler. It was suggested that the Government could have discontinued the privy purse without involving the Parliament in a constitutional amendment Bill. From the nature of the merger agreements, it was possible for the Government to do so. However, Government preferred to bring about a change by the democratic method of discussion and ascertaining the collective will of the people as reflected in this House. Government's willingness to subject this proposal to a vote by the special majority required for a constitutional amendment reflects their desire to abide by the highest conventions of democratic processes.

Another criticism was of the omission of articles 291 and 362 and clause 22 of 366 and the retention of article 363. I would not deal with this matter because I think Shri Y. B. Chavan has dealt with it. It must be recognised that such settlement must be subject to the final arbitration of Parliament and not the courts and that is why the Constitution-makers decided to keep the agreements out of the courts.

A point was also made that the continuance of article 363 would deny the rulers even the ordinary right of a citizen. Surely this is a travesty of facts. The rulers have and will continue to have the same rights and remedies as ordinary citizens. Their recourse to courts is barred only in respect of the special privileges they acquired through a political settlement. Today, totally unjustified political motives have been imputed to this Bill. We have been charged that the

decision to abolish privy purses and privileges was because some rulers had contested the elections against the Congress. It has also been said that we planned to take time to strike political bargains with the rulers in settling the transitional arrangements. All this will come up in the Bill for the transitional allowances will thus come before Parliament, and hon. Members will have ample opportunity to speak about it in the House. The actual payment is supposed to be based on a multiple of the privy purse. I am sure they will realise that in such a principle which we accepted there will be no scope whatsoever for individual bargaining.

Now, much was said about heritage. I also am proud of the Indian heritage. But as I said yesterday, we do not live in that heritage. Times change, everything in life is changing every minute, every second of the day, and we cannot keep old, outmoded methods or customs which have no place in contemporary life. Shortly before I got up we were offered a high-level speech but I am afraid much of it did not strike me as high-level. If the hon. member will forgive me, I thought that much of his speech was full of the diversionary tactics which he was attributing to the Government, because all the various items were listed which have no relevance whatsoever to the matter in hand today.

We were told of special 'planes being despatched to Kerala.' Before also, we have heard the story of 'planes going to other States for different purposes.' I have still not been able to gather the information where the 'planes came from, who flew them, where they disappeared after their flights, and what problems were solved by their use.

I also believe that all members should vote as they think is right to do. I wish that the princes and some of their friends had also stuck to that belief and had not tried to put pressures on some of our members (*Interruptions*). It is not our wish to do that.

Much was said about the people who lived in the princely States. You will have

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

noticed that the most bitter speeches that were made yesterday and today were those by individuals who had the chance or ill-fortune to live in princely States. It is those people who fell more bitter about the whole question. We, who have not had that experience can afford to be generous. But even though I did not live in a princely State, I did have occasion to attend some of the meetings of the States' People's Conference. I know the deep feelings, the hurt, the atrocities and humiliations which were piled on our political workers in those days. We do not want to start recrimination against anybody. If there is to be such a debate, certainly we can have plenty to say. But I do not want to say it; this is not the occasion. In fact, I have gone out of my way to ignore that side of it and have tried to see the brighter side of the picture. I think that the least that could have been done was for the princes also to try not to hark back to the times about which much can be said on the other side as well.

Now, when we talk of heritage, does it mean we want the old feudal customs to continue, the old feudal methods of functioning? Have they been able to continue anywhere in the world? They have not. We do not want them. The people do not want them and they will see that they go. It is where there is the least education that you find there is most consideration for such old customs and so on. As education spreads, as consciousness of their rights awakens amongst the people, there is revolt against injustice and inequality. I do not think it is a thing to be proud of that you do not have such a revolt in your States, because it shows that the people there are not politically conscious; it shows the people do not know what their rights are.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi):
What about the people of Delhi?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: There has also been talk about justice. Justice is a much misused word. I have asked before in this House: justice for whom? We do not want to do injustice even to one person or to two people or 200 and odd people. But as against them, there is the question

of justice to some millions of people. I am not saying that the removal of the privy purses is going to solve the poverty problem or the unemployment problem or any of the other problems. We have not said it at any time, nor am I saying it now. But it is a step in a particular direction in which the country wants to go, and the country will go in spite of anybody. If we oppose the country in that, we also will be swept aside, I have no doubt about it.

The hon. Member said much about political moves and so on, but what seems strange to us is that this the second occasion when we have heard him applauding the speech made by the hon. Member of the C. P. Marxist Party. So, it is evident that politics make strange bed-fellows. Our views are perfectly clear. It is not we who say that merely because a person is a Communist, he is bad. We are against certain policies, we are against certain methods, we are against violence. But here is somebody who does believe that the mere word Communist is an abuse, and then he thinks it is not strange at all that he should get together with one of the extreme Communist parties, whether on this issue or the issue of Kerala elections or some other issue. I do not mind, I am just pointing this out. It is for him to decide whom he wants to be with. As I said, the question is not whether individual Princes were good or bad, whether today they are good or bad. We are not concerned with their individual qualities, but it is a principle which is in question today. The members of the princely order look at the question from one angle, I must confess that we look at it from the opposite angle.

The Constitution-makers could not foresee all eventualities. We have had amendments to the Constitution before. We must make the Constitution such as will serve the aspirations and the needs of the Indian people. The only thing that matters is what is necessary for the welfare of the people of India. The hon. Member knows that it is not just our party which has been anxious to bring this Bill here. Many other parties, who are not Communists, have been and are supporting it.

As I said earlier, I think this is an important step. It is very strange to hear that

some people feel that this is a step to destroy them. On the contrary, I think this is a step that could strengthen them because now they can make a life on their feet, not on the basis of what their forefathers did, not on the basis of money or something which is coming from the Government, but they can make a new life for themselves and, as I said, what sort of life it is, what sort of new heritage they give to future India is today in their hands.

The step we are going to take is an important step. In our segmented society, broken up by caste and creed, fragmented further by the concepts of hierarchy and graded privileges, a step, however small, which is directed towards the dissolution of vertical and horizontal division is a step in the direction of the democratisation of that society.

Personally I feel that this is of far greater significance than all the arid controversies garbed in high sounding phrases. That is why I was pained to hear a doctrine propounded here so violently in contradiction to some of the basic and essential tenets of India's national movement. The basic tenet of our national movement lay in asserting the sovereignty of the people of India, both of British India and of the Indian States as against the sovereignty of the imperial crown and that of the princely order. The assertion of this principle amounts to fighting against the system and not against an individual.

So, in advocating the adoption of this Bill, there is no animus against individuals for we are fighting for a principle; we are fighting to take the country in a particular direction.

As I said yesterday, the Bill is of historic significance. Let us walk in step with the times; let the value of men not be judged by their wealth or rank.

With these words, I commend the motion to this august House. I hope that the other motions will be rejected. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : There are some

amendments. (*Interruptions*). Order, order. Will you please settle down now ?

17.00 hrs.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : Mr. L. N. Mishra is there. Members of the Rajya Sabha should not come here. They are sitting on the back. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER : Leave it to me. Will you all please keep sitting ? Now, are there any Members, any Ministers, from Rajya Sabha ? There are no rules under which they can be asked to go out, but it is much better if they leave the House. (*Interruption*)

Now, may I have your attention please ? Stop this hilarious mood. Come to business now. In respect of the motion for consideration, we have already a few motions for reference of the Bill to the Supreme Court, and then also for circulation for public opinion, I will put them first.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA (Cutback) : Sir, a point of order. This motion for reference to the Supreme Court is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER : Do not go into those legal implications now. I will put them. It is much better to put it to the House. Now, motion No. 4 is in the name of Shri Imam. It is with reference to the Supreme Court.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY : If the whole motion is out of order, how can Parliament refer it to the Supreme Court ? I think the whole motion is out of order. How can you ask us to vote in regard to a motion which is out of order ?

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Dwivedy, there is divided opinion, and I am going to put it. (*Interruption*) I have studied the letter. I have already studied that letter. Motion No. 4 is with reference to the Supreme Court.

AN HON. MEMBER : He is not pressing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : He is pressing it.

MR. SPEAKER : Are you pressing it ?

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM (Chitradurga) : Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the motion to the vote. The question is :

"That the Bill be referred to the Supreme Court of India for its opinion regarding the competency of Parliament to terminate the agreement, covenant and the guarantee given by the former Government of Dominion of India and by the Constituent Assembly of India." (4)

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Then there are motions Nos. 13, 14 and 15. They are just the same and are out of order; we have already put amendment No. 4 to the vote.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR (Gurgaon): I want to speak on amendment No. 5. Kindly allow me.

MR. SPEAKER : No. We have discussed it for two days and after the Prime Minister's speech, I must put the amendments.

Does Mr. B. P. Mandal press his amendment No. 1 ?

SHRI B. P. MANDAL : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : I will now put amendment No. 1. This is a motion for circulation.

Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : Amendments Nos. 2, 5, 20 and 21 are also for circulation. So I need not put them.

There is amendment No. 7 of Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta for reference to a Select Committee. Is he pressing it ?

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : I will now put amendment No. 7 for reference to a Select Committee.

Amendment No. 7 was put and negatived.

@ Votes recorded through Tellers only.

MR. SPEAKER : Amendments Nos. 10, 12 and 22 are also for reference to Select Committee. Because amendment No. 7 has been negatived, these need not be put.

Before I put the main motion for consideration, this Bill being a Constitution Amendment Bill, voting has to be by division.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : There I differ, but anyway, I am not pressing it.

MR. SPEAKER : Let the lobbies be cleared.

Order, order. The lobbies have been cleared.

The question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration."

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 14]

[17.14 hrs.

AYES

Abraham, Shri K. M.
Achal Singh, Shri
Adichan, Shri P. C.
Aga, Shri Ahmed
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmad, Dr. I.
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Ahmed, Shri J.
Amjad Ali, Shri Sardar
Anbazhagan, Shri
Anbuezhian, Shri
Anirudhan, Shri K.
Ankineedu, Shri
Anthony, Shri Frank
Asghar Husain, Shri
Atam Das, Shri
Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Babunath Singh, Shri
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
@ Bakshi, Shri Ghulam Mohammad
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Barrow, Shri
Barua, Shri Bedabrata

Barua, Shri Hem
 Barua, Shri R.
 Barupal, Shri P. L.
 Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy
 Basu, Dr. Maitreyee
 Basumatari, Shri
 Baswant, Shri
 Behera, Shri Baidhar
 Besra, Shri S. C.
 Bhadoria, Shri Arjun Singh
 Bhagaban Das, Shri
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhakt Darshan, Shri
 Bhandare, Shri R. D.
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
 Birla, Shri R. K.
 Bist, Shri J. B. S.
 Biswas, Shri J. M.
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
 Bose, Shri Amiyannath
 Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
 Buta Singh, Shri
 Chakrapani, Shri C. K.
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 @ Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
 Chavan, Shri D. R.
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.
 Chittybabu, Shri C.
 Choudhary, Shri Valmiki
 Choudhury, Shri J. K.
 Dalbir Singh, Shri
 Damani, Shri S. R.
 Dange, Shri S. A.
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Daschowdhuri, Shri B. K.
 Deiveekan, Shri
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Desai, Shri Dinkar
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
 Dhandapani, Shri
 Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
 Digamber Singh, Shri
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 @ Dixit, Shri G. C.

Durairasu, Shri
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
 Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
 Esthose, Shri P. P.
 Fernandes, Shri George
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 @ Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh
 @ Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram
 Ghosh, Shri Ganesh
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal
 Gopalan, Shri A. K.
 Gopalan, Shri P.
 Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela
 Gounder, Shri Muthu
 Govind Das, Dr.
 Gowda, Shri M. H.
 Guha, Shri Samar
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Gupta, Shri Lakkan Lal
 Hajarnawis, Shri
 Halder, Shri K.
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri
 Heerji Bhai, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Iqbal Singh, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
 Jadhav, Shri V. N.
 Jaggaiah, Shri K.
 Jagjiwan Ram, Shri
 Jamir, Shri S. C.
 Jamna Lal, Shri
 Janardhanan, Shri C.
 Jha, Shri Bhogendra
 Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra
 Jharkhande Rai, Shri
 Joshi, Shri S. M.
 Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kalita, Shri Dhireswar
 Kamalanathan, Shri
 Kamble, Shri
 Kameshwar Singh, Shri
 Kamla Kumari, Kumari
 Kandappan, Shri S.
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kasture, Shri A. S.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kavade, Shri B. R.
 Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Kesri, Shri Sitaram

Khadiikar, Shri R. K.	Muhammad Ismail, Shri M.
@Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali	Muhammed Sheriff, Shri
Khan, Shri Latafat Ali	Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Khan, Shri M. A.	Mulla, Shri A. N.
Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali	Murthy, Shri B. S.
Khanna, Shri P. K.	Nahata, Shri Amrit
Kinder Lal, Shri	Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
Kisku, Shri A. K.	Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar	Nambiar, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.	Nanda, Shri
Krishna, Shri S. M.	Narayanan, Shri
Krishnamoorthi, Shri V.	Nath Pai, Shri
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.	Nayanar, Shri E. K.
Krishnappa, Shri M. V.	Nihal Singh, Shri
Kuchelar, Shri G.	@Oberoi, Shri M. S.
Kundu, Shri S.	Oraon, Shri Kartik
Kureel, Shri B. N.	Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
Lakkappa, Shri K.	Palchoudhury, Shrimati Ila
LakshmiKanthamma, Shrimati	Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
Laskar, Shri N. R.	Pant, Shri K. C.
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati	Paokai Haokip, Shri
Limaye, Shri Madhu	Parmar, Shri D. R.
Lutfal Haque, Shri	Partap Singh, Shri
Madhukar, Shri K. M.	Parthasarathy, Shri P.
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.	Paswan, Shri Kedar
Mahajan, Shri Vikram Chand	Patel, Shri Manibhai J.
Mahajan, Shri Yadav Shivram	Patil, Shri Anantrao
Maharaj Singh, Shri	Patil, Shri C. A.
Mahato, Shri Bhajahari	Patil, Shri Deorao
Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh	Patil, Shri N. R.
Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini	Patil, Shri S. B.
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.	Patil, Shri S. D.
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad	Patil, Shri T. A.
Mane, Shri Shankarrao	Pradhani, Shri K.
Manoharan, Shri	Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi
Maran, Shri Murasoli	Radhabai, Shrimati B.
Marandi, Shri	Raghu Ramaiah, Shri
Master, Shri Bhola Nath	Raj Dev Singh, Shri
Mayavan, Shri	Rajaram, Shri
Meghachandra, Shri M.	**Ram, Shri T.
Melkote, Dr.	Ram Dhan, Shri
Menon, Shri Krishna	Ram Sewak, Shri
Menon, Shri Vishwanatha	Ram Swarup, Shri
Minimata Agam Dass Guru, Shrimati	Ramabadran, Shri T. D.
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Ramamurti, Shri P.
Mishra, Shri G. S.	Ramani, Shri K.
Misra, Shri Janeshwar	Ramji Ram. Shri
Misra Shri S. N.	Ramshekhar Prashad Singh, Shri
Misra, Shri Srinibas	Rana, Shri M. B.
Modak, Shri B. K.	Randhir Singh, Shri
Mohammad Ismail, Shri	Rao, Shri Jaganath
Mohammed Yusuf, Shri	Rao, Dr. K. L.
Mohan Swarup, Shri	Rao, Shri K. Narayana
Mohsin, Shri	Rao, Shri Muthyal
Molahu Prashad, Shri	Rao, Shri Thirumala

@ Vote recorded through Tellers only.

** Vote for Noes recorded through machine, changed to Ayes through Tellers.

Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Reddi, Shri G. S.
 Reddy, Shri Esvara
 Reddy, Shri Ganga
 Reddy, Shri M. N.
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony
 Reddy, Shri Surender
 Rohtagi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Roy, Shri Chittaranjan
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman
 Saleem, Shri M. Yunus
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sambandhan, Shri S. K.
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
 Saminathan, Shri
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri
 Satya Narain Singh, Shri
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Sayeed Ali, Shri
 Sen, Shri A. K.
 Sen, Shri Deven
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
 Sen, Dr. Ranen
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Sezhiyan, Shri
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankarannd, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram
 Sharma, Shri Naval Kishore
 Sharma, Shri Yogendra
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Sher Singh, Shri
 Shinde, Shri Annasahib
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Shukla, Shri S. N.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddayya, Shri
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Sinha, Shri Mudrika
 Sinha, Shri R. K.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sivasankaran, Shri

Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Somasundaram, Shri S. D.
 Sonar, Dr. A. G.
 Sonavane, Shri
 Sreedharan, Shri A.
 Subravelu, Shri
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Sursing, Shri
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Swell, Shri
 Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
 Thakur, Shri Gunanand
 Thakur, Shri P. R.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tripathi, Shri K. D.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Uikey, Shri M. G.
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
 Umanath, Shri
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand
 Viswambharan, Shri P.
 Viswanatham, Shri Tonnети
 Viswanathan, Shri G.
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
 Yadab, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet
 Yadav, Shri Jageshwar
 Yajnik, Shri
 Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Agadi, Shri S. A.
 Amat, Shri D.
 Amin, Shri R. K.
 @ Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.
 Avedya Nath, Shri
 Ayarwal, Shri Ram Singh
 Badrudduja, Shri
 Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan
 Bansh Narain Singh, Shri
 Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Birua, Shri Kolai
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
 Brijendra Singh, Shri
 Burman, Shri Kirit Bikram Deb
 Chauhan, Shri Bharat Singh

Dandekar, Shri N.
 Dar, Shri Abdul Ghani
 Das, Shri N. T.
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deb, Shri D. N.
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
 Deo, Shri P. K.
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
 Desai, Shri Morarji
 @ Devgun, Shri Hardayal
 Dhrangadhra, Shri Sriraj Meghrajji
 Dipa, Shri A.
 Ghosh, Shri Bimaikanti
 @ Girja Kumari, Shrimati
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana
 Gowder, Shri Nanja
 Goyal, Shri Shri Chand
 Gudadinni, Shri B. K.
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
 Hari Krishna, Shri
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Himatsingka, Shri
 @ Horo, Shri N. E.
 Jai Singh, Shri
 Joshi, Shri Jagannath Rao
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Kamaraj, Shri K.
 Karni Singh, Dr.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal
 @ Kikar Singh, Shri
 Kothari, Shri S. S.
 Koushik, Shri K. M.
 Kripalani, Shri J. B.
 Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
 Kushwah, Shri Yashwant Singh
 Lobo Prabhu, Shri
 Madhok, Shri Bal Raj
 Majhi, Shri Mahendra
 Mandal, Shri B. P.
 Masani, Shri M. R.
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Meena, Shri Meetha Lal
 Mehta, Shri Asoka
 Mehta, Shri P. M.
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mody, Shri Piloo
 Mohamed Imam, Shri J.
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati

Mondal, Shri Jugal
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
 Mukne, Shri Yeshwantrao
 Murti, Shri M. S.
 Muthusami, Shri C.
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.
 Naidu, Shri Chengalraya
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 @ Naik, Shri R. V.
 Nayar, Shri K. K.
 Nayar, Shrimati Shabuntala
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila
 Nirlep Kaur, Shrimati
 Onkar Singh, Shri
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Patel, Shri Baburao
 Patel, Shri Manubhai
 Patel, Shri N. N.
 @ Patel, Shri Pashabhai
 Patil, Shri S. K.
 Patodia, Shri D. N.
 Poonacha, Shri C. M.
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash
 Rajasekharan, Shri
 Rajni Devi, Shrimati
 Raju, Dr. D. S.
 Rajyalakshmi, Shrimati Lalita
 *Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Charan, Shri
 Ram Dhani Das, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramamoorthy, Shri S. P.
 Rampur, Shri Mahadevappa
 Ranga, Shri
 Ranjeet Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Reddy, Shri R. D.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sanjiva
 @ Saboo, Shri Shri Gopal
 Sambasivam, Shri
 Sanji Rupji, Shri
 Santosham, Dr. M.
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethuraman, Shri N.
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Shah, Shri Manabendra

@ Vote recorded through Tellers only.

* Wrongly voted for NOES.

Shah, Shri Shantilal
 Shah, Shri T. P.
 Shah, Shri Virendrakumar
 Shalwale, Shri Ram Gopal
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Sharma, Shri Beni Shanker
 Sharma, Shri Naval Kishore
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar
 Sharma, Shri Shiv
 Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt
 Shashi Ranjan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
 Shastri, Shri Shiv Kumar
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Shinkre, Shri
 Shiv Charan Lal, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri D. V.
 Singh, Shri J. B.
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Solanki, Shri P. N.
 Solanki, Shri S. M.
 Somani, Shri N. K.
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Suraj Bhan, Shri
 Tapuriah, Shri S. K.
 Tyagi, Shri Om Prakash
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
 Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra
 Vidyarthi, Shri Ram Swarup
 Vijaya Raje, Shrimati
 @ Yashpal Singh, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : The result* of the division is : Ayes—336; Noes—155.

The 'Ayes' have it, the 'Ayes' have it.

The motion is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : We will now proceed with the clauses.

Clause 2—(Omission of articles 291 and 362)

SHRI SHANTILAL SHAH (Bombay-North West) : I beg to move :

Page 1, line 5,—

In Clause 2 of the Bill, mark the existing clause as sub-clause (a) and add sub-clause (b) as under :

“(b) For Article 291 substitute the following Article :

291. Nothing in Article 363 or in Article 131 shall apply to any dispute relating to any right accruing under or any liability or obligation arising out of any covenant or agreement or other similar instrument entered into by the Ruler of any Indian State before the commencement of this Constitution for payment of any sum guaranteed or assured by the Government of the Dominion of India to any ruler of such state as privy purse.” (30)

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put amendment No. 30 to vote.

Amendment No. 30 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put clause 2. Let the Lobbies be cleared—the Lobbies have been cleared.

The question is :

“That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill.”

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 15]

[17.31 hrs.

AYES

Abraham, Shri K. M.
 Achal Singh, Shri
 Adichan, Shri P. C.
 Aga, Shri Ahmed
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Ahmed, Dr. I.
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.
 Ahmed, Shri J.
 Amjad Ali, Shri Sardar
 Anbazhagan, Shri
 Anbuhezhan, Shri
 Anirudhan, Shri K.

@ Vote recorded through Tellers only.

* The figures of the division announced were on the basis of the figures shown on the machine and votes recorded through Tellers. Subsequently, on usual check with the photograph it was found that (i) the votes of Sarvashri P. L. Barupal, P. M. Sayeed, Molahu Prasad, P. Sivasankaran and Ishaq Sambhali who voted for Ayes through Tellers had already been recorded for Ayes by the machine; and (ii) the vote of Shri T. Ram who voted for Ayes through the Tellers had already been recorded for Noes by the machine. Therefore, the correct figures of the division are : Ayes 331; Noes 154. The Speaker made an announcement accordingly on 3, 9, 1970. (See L. S. Debates, dated 3, 9, 1970)

Ankineedu, Shri	Deiveekan, Shri
Anthony, Shri Frank	Deoghare, Shri N. R.
Asghar Husain, Shri	@ Desai, Shri Dinkar
Atam Das, Shri	Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri	Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha	Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
Babunath Singh Shri	Dhandapani, Shri
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar	Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
Bakshi, Shri Ghulam Mohammad	Digamber Singh, Shri
Banerjee, Shri S. M.	Dinesh Singh, Shri
Barrow, Shri	**Dixit, Shri G. C.
Barua, Shri Bedabrata	Durairasu, Shri
Barua, Shri Hem	Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Barua, Shri R.	Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Barupal, Shri P. L.	Esthose, Shri P. P.
Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy	Fernandes, Shri George
Basu, Dr. Maitreyee	Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
Basumatari, Shri	Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Baswant, Shri	Ganesh, Shri K. R.
Behera, Shri Baidhar	Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Besra, Shri S. C.	Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh
Bhadoria, Shri Arjun Singh	@ Gautam, Shri C. D.
Bhagaban Das, Shri	Gavit, Shri Tukaram
Bhagat, Shri B. R.	Ghosh, Shri Ganesh
Bhakt Darshan, Shri	Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Bhandare, Shri R. D.	Ghosh, Shri Parimal
Bhargava, Shri B. N.	@ Girja Kumari, Shrimati
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.	Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Birla, Shri R. K.	Gopalan, Shri P.
Bist, Shri J. B. S.	Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela
Biswas, Shri J. M.	Gounder, Shri Muthu
Bohra, Shri Onkarlal	Govind Das, Dr.
Bose, Shri Amiyanath	Gowda, Shri M. H.
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami	@ Guha, Shri Samar
Buta Singh, Shri	Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Chakrapani, Shri C. K.	Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal
Chanda, Shri Anil K.	Hajarnawis, Shri
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna	Halder, Shri K.
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri	Hanumanthaiya, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal	Heerji Bhai, Shri
Chandrika Prasad, Shri	Hem Raj, Shri
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.	Iqbal Singh, Shri
Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar	Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.	Jadhav, Shri V. N.
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh	Jaggaiah, Shri K.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar	** Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Chavan, Shri D. R.	Jamir, Shri S. C.
Chavan, Shri Y. B.	Jamna Lal, Shri
Chittybabu, Shri C.	Janardhanan, Shri C.
Choudhary, Shri Valmiki	Jha, Shri Bhogendra
Choudhury, Shri J. K.	Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra
Dalbir Singh, Shri	Jharkhande Rai, Shri
Damani, Shri S. R.	Joshi, Shri S. M.
Dange, Shri S. A.	Kahandole, Shri Z. M.
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas	Kalita, Shri Dhireswar
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.	Kamalanathan, Shri

@ Vote recorded through Tellers only.

** Vote for Noes recorded through machine, changed to Ayes through Tellers.

Kamble, Shri
 Kameshwar Singh, Shri
 Kamala Kumari, Kumari
 Kandappan, Shri S.
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kasture, Shri A. S.
 Kavade, Shri B. R.
 Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
 Kesri, Shri Sitaram
 Khadilkar, Shri R. K.
 Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali
 Khan, Shri Latafat Ali
 Khan, Shri M. A.
 Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
 Khanna, Shri P. K.
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kisku, Shri A. K.
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
 Krishna, Shri M. R.
 Krishna, Shri S. M.
 Krishnamoorthi, Shri V.
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
 Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
 Kuchelar, Shri G.
 Kundu, Shri S.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Lakkappa, Shri K.
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
 Laskar, Shri N. R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Limaye, Shri Madhu
 Lutfal Haque, Shri
 Madhukar, Shri K. M.
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram Chand
 Mahajan, Shri Yadav Shivram
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 Mahato, Shri Bhajahari
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao
 Manoharan, Shri
 Menan, Shri Munasali
 Marandi, Shri
 Master, Shri Bhola Nath
 Mayavan, Shri
 Meghachandra, Shri M.
 Melkote, Dr.
 Menon, Shri Viswanatha
 Minimata Agam Dass Guru, Shrimati
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mishra, Shri Janeshwar
 Misra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Shri Srinibas

@ Modak, Shri B. K.
 Mohammad Ismail, Shri
 Mohammad Yusuf, Shri
 Mohan Swarup, Shri
 Mohsin, Shri
 Molahu Prasad, Shri
 @ Muhammad Ismail, Shri M.
 Muhammad Sheriff, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Mulla, Shri A. N.
 Murthy, Shri B. S.
 Nahata, Shri Amrit
 Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
 Nair, Shri Vasudevan
 Nambiar, Shri
 Nanda, Shri
 Narayanan, Shri
 Nath Pai Shri
 Nayanar, Shri E. K.
 Nihal Singh, Shri
 @ Oberoi, Shri M. S.
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Palchaudhuri, Shrimati Ila
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Paokai Haokip, Shri
 Parmar, Shri D. R.
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarthy, Shri P.
 Paswan, Shri Kedar
 Patel, Shri Manibhai J.
 Patil, Shri Anantrao
 Patil, Shri C.A.
 Patil, Shri Deo Rao
 Patil, Shri N. R.
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Patil, Shri S. D.
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Pradhani, Shri K.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi
 Radhabai, Shrimati B.
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri
 Rajaram, Shri
 Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramabadran, Shri T. D.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramani, Shri K.
 Ramji Ram, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rana, Shri M. B.
 Randhir Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jaganath

Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Reddi, Shri G. S.
 Reddy, Shri Eswara
 Reddy, Shri Ganga
 Reddy, Shri M. N.
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony
 Reddy, Shri Surender
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Roy, Shri Chittaranjan
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman
 Saleem, Shri M. Yunus
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.
 **Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sambandhan, Shri S. K.
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
 Saminathan, Shri
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri
 Satya Narain Singh, Shri
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Sayyad Ali, Shri
 Sen, Shri A. K.
 Sen, Shri Deven
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
 Sen, Dr. Ranen
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Sezhiyan, Shri
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram
 Sharma, Shri Naval Kishore
 Sharma, Shri Yogendra
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Sher Singh, Shri
 Shinde, Shri Annasahib
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Shukla, Shri S. N.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddayya, Shri
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri

Sinha, Shri Mudrika
 Sinha, Shri R. K.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sivasankaran, Shri
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Somasundaram, Shri S. D.
 Sonar, Dr. A. G.
 Sonavane, Shri
 Sreedharan, Shri A.
 Subravelu, Shri
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Sursingh, Shri
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Swell, Shri
 Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
 Thakur, Shri Gunanand
 Thakur, Shri P. R.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tripathi, Shri K. D.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Uikey, Shri M. G.
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
 Umanath, Shri
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.
 Vermra, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand
 Viswambharan, Shri P.
 Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti
 Viswanatha, Shri G.
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
 Yadab, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet
 Yadav, Shri Jageshwar
 Yajnik, Shri

NOES

Agadi, Shri S. A.
 Amat, Shri D.
 Amin, Shri R. K.
 Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.
 Anjanappa, Shri B.
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.
 Avedya Nath, Shri
 Ayarwal, Shri Ram Singh
 Badrudduja, Shri
 Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan
 Bansh Narain Singh, Shri
 Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Birua, Shri Kolai
 @ Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri

Brijendra Singh, Shri	Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
Burman, Shri Kirit Bikram Deb	Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
Chauhan, Shri Bharat Singh	Mukne, Shri Yashwantrao
Dandekar, Shri N.	Murti, Shri M. S.
Dar, Shri Abdul Ghani	Muthusami, Shri C.
Das, Shri N. T.	Naghnoor, Shri M. N.
Dass, Shri C.	Naidu, Shri Chengalraya
Deb, Shri D. N.	Naik, Shri G. C.
Deo, Shri K. P. Singh	Naik, Shri R. V.
Deo, Shri P. K.	Nayar, Shai K. K.
Deo, Shri R. R. Singh	Nayar, Shrimati Shakuntala
Desai, Shri Morarji	Nayar, Dr. Shushila
Devgun, Shri Hardayal	Nirlep Kaur, Shrimati
Dhraagadhra, Shri Sriraj Meghrajji	Onkar Singh, Shri
Dipa, Shri A.	Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
£ Dixit, Shri G. C.	Pandey, Shri K. N.
Ghosh, Shri Bimaikanti	Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
Gowd, Shri Gadilingana	Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
Gowder, Shri Nanja	@ Patel, Shri Baburao
Goyal, Shri Shri Chand	Patel, Shri Manubhai
Gudadinni, Shri B. K.	Patel, Shri N. N.
Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal	Patel, Shri Pashabhai
Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan	Patil, Shri S. K.
Hari Krishna, Shri	Patodia, Shri D. N.
Hazarika, Shri J. N.	Poonacha, Shri C. M.
Himatsingka, Shri	Pramanik, Shri J. N.
Horo, Shri N. E.	Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash
£ Jagjiwan Ram, Shri	Rajasekharan, Shri
Jai Singh, Shri	Raju, Dr. D. S.
Joshi, Shri Jagannath Rao	@ Rajyalakshmi, Shrimati Lalita
Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand	Ram Charan, Shri
Kamaraj, Shri K.	Ram Dhani Das, Shri
Karni Singh, Dr.	Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
Katham, Shri B. N.	Ramamoorthy, Shri S. P.
Kodaria, Shri C. M.	Rampur, Shri Mahadevappa
Khan, Shri H. Ajmal	Ranga, Shri
@ Kikar Singh, Shri	Ranjeet Singh, Shri
Kothari, Shri S. S.	Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
Koushik, K. M.	Reddy, Shri R. D.
Kripalani, Shri J. B.	Reddy, Shri N. Sanjiva
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta	Saboo, Shri Shri Gopal
Kunte, Shri Dattatraya	£Samanta, Shri S. C.
Kushwah, Shri Yashwant Singh	Sambasivam, Shri
Lobo Prabhu, Shri	Sanji Rupji, Shri
Madhok, Shri Bal Raj	Santosham, Dr. M.
@ Majhi, Shri Mahendra	Sapre, Shrimati Tara
Masani, Shri M. R.	Sen, Shri P. G.
Masuriya Din, Shri	Sethuraman, Shri N.
Meena, Shri Meetha Lal	Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
Mehta, Shri Asoka	Shah, Shri Manabendra
Mehta, Shri P. M.	Shah, Shri Shantilal
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali	Shah, Shri T. P.
Mody, Shri Piloo	Shah, Shri Virendrakumar
Mohamed Imam, Shri J.	Shalwale, Shri Ram Gopal
Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati	Sharda Nand, Shri
@ Mondal, Shri Jugal	Sharma, Shri Beni Shanker

£ Wrongly Voted for Noes.

@ Vote recorded through Tellers only.

Sharma, Shri Narayan Swaroop
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar
 @ Sharma, Shri Shiv
 Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt
 Shahi Ranjan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
 Sheo Narayan, Shri
 Shinkre, Shri
 Shiv Charan Lal, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri D. V.
 Singh, Shri J. B.
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Solanki, Shri P. N.
 Solanki, Shri S. M.
 Somani, Shri N. K.
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Suraj Bhan, Shri
 Tapuriah, Shri S. K.
 Tyagi, Shri Om Prakash
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
 Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra
 Vidyarthi, Shri Ram Swarup
 @ Vijaya Raje, Shrimati
 Yashpal Singh, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : The result* of the division is : Ayes—339 ; Noes—152.

The 'Ayes' have it; the 'Ayes' have it.

Clause 2 is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : The doors are closed and they will remain closed. Do you want them to be opened ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

New Clause 2A

MR. SPEAKER : There are two amendments to add a new clause, 2A.

SHRI N. DANDEKER (Jamnagar) : I beg to move :

Page 1,—after line 5, insert—

“2A. Article 363 of the Constitution shall be omitted”. (18)

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR : I beg to move :

Page 1,—after line 5, insert—

“2A. After article 363 of the Constitution, the following article shall be inserted, namely :

“363A. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Constitution (Twenty-fourth Amendment) Act, 1970, the compensation payable to the Rulers shall be decided by the Supreme Court and approved by Parliament.” (29)

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : How can a new clause come ?

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA : These amendments No. 3, 8, 9, 18, 19, 24, 28 and 29 are out of order. Please refer to rule 80.

MR. SPEAKER : Only two amendments have been moved, No. 18 by Shri Dandekar and No. 29 by Shri Dar.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR : I want to speak.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : No.

MR. SPEAKER : Not Now. The lobbies are cleared. I am going to put them to vote. Now, I put amendments No. 18 and 29 to the vote of the House.

Amendments No. 18 and 29 were put and negatived.

Clause 3—(Amendment of article 366)

MR. SPEAKER : There is no amendment to clause 3. The Lobbies are already

@ Vote recorded through Tellers only.

*The figures of the division announced were on the basis of the figures shown on the machine and votes recorded through Tellers. Subsequently, on usual check with the photograph it was found that (i) the votes of Shrimati Ganga Devi, and Sarvashri P. L. Barupal, Chintamani Panigrahi, Gulam Mohammad Bakshi, Molahu Prasad, Sivasankaran, Ishaq Sambhali and K. M. Madhukar who voted for Ayes through Tellers had already been recorded for Ayes by the machine ; and (ii) the vote of Shri G. C. Dixit who voted for Ayes through the Teller had already been recorded for Noes by the machine. Therefore, the correct figures of the division are : Ayes = 331 ; Noes = 151.

cleared. May I put clause 3 to the vote of the House ?

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL : Every-time, the Lobbies should be cleared.

SHRI P. K. DEO : There may be some Members outside. The Lobbies should be cleared.

MR. SPEAKER : All right. Let the Lobbies be cleared...Now the Lobbies have been cleared.

I now put clause 3 to the vote of the House. The question is :

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill"

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 16]

[17.47 hrs.

AYES

Abraham, Shri K. M.
Achal Singh, Shri
Adichan, Shri P. C.
Aga, Shri Ahmed
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmad, Dr. I.
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Ahmed, Shri J.
Amjad Ali, Shri Sardar
Anbazhagan, Shri
Anbuechezian, Shri
Anirudhan, Shri K.
Ankineedu, Shri
Anthony, Shri Frank
Asghar Husain, Shri
Atam Das, Shri
Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Babunath Singh, Shri
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
Bakshi, Shri Ghulam Mohammad
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Barrow, Shri
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Barua, Shri Hem
Barua, Shri R.
Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy
Basu, Dr. Maitreyee
Basumatari, Shri
Baswant, Shri
Behera, Shri Baidhar
Besra, Shri S. C.
Bhadoria, Shri Arjun Singh

Bhagaban Das, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhandare, Shri R. D.
Bhargava, Shri B. N.
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Birla, Shri R. K.
Bist, Shri J. B. S.
Biswas, Shri J. M.
Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
Bose, Shri Amiyanath
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
Buta Singh, Shri
Chakrapani, Shri C. K.
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
Chandrika Prasad, Shri
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar
Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Chavan, Shri D. R.
Chavan, Shri Y. B.
Chittybabu, Shri C.
Choudhary, Shri Valmiki
Choudhury, Shri J. K.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Damani, Shri S. R.
Dange, Shri S. A.
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Deiveekan, Shri
Deoghare, Shri N. R.
Desai, Shri Dinkar
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
@ Dhandapani, Shri
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
Digamber Singh, Shri
Dinesh Singh, Shri
@Dixit, Shri G. C.
@Durairasu, Shri
Dwivedy, Shri Nageshwar
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Esthose, Shri P. P.
Fernandes, Shri George
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganesh, Shri K. B.
@Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh

@Gautam, Shri C. D.	Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
Gavit, Shri Tukaram	Khanna, Shri P. K.
Ghosh, Shri Ganesh	Kinder Lal Shri
Ghosh, Shri P. K.	Kisku, Shri A. K.
Ghosh, Shri Parimal	Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Girja Kumari, Shrimati	Krishna, Shri M. R.
Gopalan, Shri A. K.	Krishna, Shri S. M.
Gopalan, Shri P.	Krishnamoorthi, Shri V.
Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela	Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
Gounder, Shri Muthu	Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
Govind Das, Dr.	Kuchelar, Shri G
Gowda, Shri M. H.	Kundu, Shri S.
Guha, Shri Samar	Kureel, Shri B. N.
Gupta, Shri Indrajit	Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal	Laskar, Shri N. R.
Hajarnawis, Shri	Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Halder, Shri K.	Limaye, Shri Madhu
Hanumanthaiya, Shri	Luftal Haque, Shri
Heerji Bhai, Shri	Madhukar, Shri K. M.
Hem Raj, Shri	Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Iqbal Singh, Shri	Mahajan, Shri Vikram Chand
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas	Mahajan, Shri Yadav Shivram
Jadhav, Shri V. N.	Maharaj Singh, Shri
Jaggaiyah, Shri K.	Mahato, Shri Bhajahari
Jagjiwan Ram, Shri	Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
Jamir, Shri S. C.	Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
Jamna Lal, Shri	Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Janardhanan, Shri C.	† Mandal, Dr. P.
Jha, Shri Bhogendra	Mandal, Shri Yamna Prasad
Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra	Mane, Shri Shankarrao
Jharkhande Rai, Shri	Manoharan, Shri
Joshi, Shri S. M.	Maran, Shri Murasoli
Kahandole, Shri Z. M.	Marandi, Shri
Kalita, Shri Dhireswar	Master, Shri Bhola Nath
Kamalanathan, Shri	Mayavan, Shri
Kamble, Shri	Meghachandra, Shri M.
Kameshwar Singh, Shri	Melkote, Dr.
Kamla Kumari, Kumari	Menon, Shri Krishna
Kandappan, Shri S.	Menon, Shri Vishwanatha
Karan Singh, Dr.	Minimata Agam Dass Guru, Shrimati
Kasture, Shri A. S.	Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
@Kavade, Shri B. R.	Mishra, Shri G. S.
Kedar Nath Singh, Shri	@ Misra, Shri Janeshwar
Kesri, Shri Sitaram	Misra, Shri S. N.
Khadilkar, Shri R. K.	Misra, Shri Srinibas
Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali	Modak, Shri B. K.
Khan, Shri Latafat Ali	Mohammad Ismail, Shri
Khan, Shri M. A.	Mohammad Yusuf, Shri

@Vote recorded through Tellers only.

† Dr. P. Mandal was absent. Shri Ramshekhar Prasad Singh whose seat is adjacent to that of Dr. Mandal, voted for Ayes from Dr. Mandal's seat through the machine. He again voted for Ayes from his seat through the Teller. On 4.9.1970, in the House he explained the circumstances under which he made that mistake. The vote recorded by the machine from Dr. Mandal's seat has accordingly been deducted.

Mohan Swarup, Shri	Rao, Shri Thirumala
Mohsin, Shri	Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.
Molahu Prasad, Shri	Raut, Shri Bhola
Muhammad Ismail, Shri M.	Reddi, Shri G. S.
Muhammad Sheriff, Shri	Reddy, Shri Eswara
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.	Reddy, Shri Ganga
Mulla, Shri A. N.	Reddy, Shri M. N.
Murthy, Shri B. S.	Reddy, Shri P. Antony
Nahata, Shri Amrit	Reddy, Shri Surender
Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan	Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
Nair, Shri Vasudevan	Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Nambiar, Shri	Roy, Shri Chittaranjan
Nanda, Shri	Roy, Shrimati Uma
Narayanan, Shri	Sadhu Ram, Shri
Nath Pai, Shri	Saha, Dr. S. K.
Nayanar, Shri E. K.	Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman
Nihal Singh, Shri	Saleem, Shri M. Yunus
Oraon, Shri Kartik	Salve, Shri N. K. P.
Pahadia, Shri Jagannath	Samanta, Shri S. C.
Palchaudhuri, Shrimati Ila	Sambandhan, Shri S. K.
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani	Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
Pant, Shri K. C.	Saminathan, Shri
Paokai Haokip, Shri	Sanghi, Shri N. K.
Parmar, Shri D. R.	Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Pratap Singh, Shri	Sant Bux Singh, Shri
Parthasarathy, Shri P.	Satya Narain Singh, Shri
Paswan, Shri Kedar	Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
Patel, Shri Manibhai J.	Sayeed, Shri P. M.
Patil, Shri Anantrao	Sayyad Ali, Shri
Patil, Shri C. A.	Sen, Shri A. K.
Patil, Shri Deorao	Sen, Shri Deven
Patil, Shri S. B.	Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
Patil, Shri S. D.	Sen, Dr. Ranon
Patil, Shri T. A.	Sethi, Shri P. C.
Pradhani, Shri K.	Sezhiyan, Shri
Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi	Shambhu Nath, Shri
Radhabai, Shrimati B.	Shankaranand, Shri B.
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri	Sharma, Shri Madhoram
Raj Deo Singh, Shri	Sharma, Shri Naval Kishore
Rajaram, Shri	Sharma, Shri Yogendra
Ram, Shri T.	Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Ram Dhan, Shri	Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
Ram Sewak, Shri	Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Ram Swarup, Shri	Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Ramabadran, Shri T. D.	Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
Ramamurti, Shri P.	Sher Singh, Shri
Ramani, Shri K.	Shinde Shri, Annasahib
Ramji Ram, Shri	Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
@ Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri	Shivappa, Shri N.
Rana, Shri M. B.	Shukla, Shri S. N.
Randhir Singh, Shri	Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
Rao, Shri Jaganath	Siddayya, Shri
Rao, Dr. K. L.	Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
Rao, Shri K. Narayana	Sinha, Shri Mudrika
Rao, Shri Muthyal	Sinha Shri R. K.

Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sivasankaran, Shri
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Somasundaram, Shri S. D.
 Sonar, Dr. A. G.
 Sonavane, Shri
 Sreedharan, Shri A.
 Subravelu, Shri
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Sursingh, Shri
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Swell, Shri
 Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
 Thakur, Shri Gunanand
 Thakur, Shri P. R.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tripathi, Shri K. D.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Uikey, Shri M. G.
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
 Umanath, Shri
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand
 Viswambharan, Shri P.
 Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti
 Viswanathan, Shri G.
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
 Yadab, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet
 Yadav, Shri Jageshwar
 @ Yajnik, Shri

NOES

Agadi, Shri S. A.
 Amat, Shri D.
 Amin, Shri R. K.
 Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.
 Anjanappa, Shri B.
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.
 Avedya Nath, Shri
 Ayarwal, Shri Ram Singh
 Badrudduja, Shri
 Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan
 Bansh Narain Singh, Shri
 Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Birua, Shri Kolai
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotha, Shri
 @ Brijendra Singh, Shri
 Burman, Shri Kirti Bikram Deb

Chauhan, Shri Bharat Singh
 Dandeker, Shri N.
 @ Dar, Shri Abdul Gani
 Das, Shri N. T.
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deb, Shri D. N.
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
 Deo, Shri P. K.
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
 Desai, Shri Shri Morarji
 Devgun, Shri Hardayal
 Dhrangadhra, Shri Sriraj Meghrajji
 Dipa, Shri A.
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana
 Gowder, Shri Nanja
 Goyal, Shri Shri Chand
 Gudadinni, Shri B. K.
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
 Hari Krishna, Shri
 Hazarik, Shri J. N.
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Horo, Shri N. E.
 Jai Singh, Shri
 Joshi, Shri Jaggannath Rao
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Kamraj, Shri K.
 Karni Singh, Dr.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kedarla Shri C. M.
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal
 Kikar Singh, Shri
 Kothari, Shri S. S.
 Koushik, Shri K. M.
 Kripalani, Shri J. B.
 Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
 Kushwah, Shri Yashwant Singh
 Lobo Prabhu, Shri
 Madhok, Shri Bal Raj
 Majhi, Shri Mahendra
 Mandal, Shri B. P.
 Masani, Shri M. R.
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Meena, Shri Meetha Lal
 Mehta, Shri Ashoka
 Mehta, Shri P. M.
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mody, Shri Pilo
 Mohamed Imam, Shri J.
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati
 Mondal, Shri Jugal
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
 Mukne, Shri Yeshwantrao

Murti, Shri M. S.
 Muthusami, Shri C.
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.
 Naidu, Shri Chengalraya
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 @ Naik, Shri R. V.
 Nayar, Shri K. K.
 Nayar, Shrimati Shakuntala
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila
 Nirlep Kaur, Shrimati
 Onkar Singh, Shri
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Patel, Shri Baburao
 Patel, Shri Manubhai
 Patel, Shri N. N.
 Patel, Shri Pashabhai
 Patil Shri, S. K.
 Patodia, Shri D. N.
 Poonacha, Shri C. M.
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash
 Rajasekharan, Shri
 Rajni Devi, Shrimati
 @ Raju Dr. D. S.
 Rajyalakshmi, Shrimati Lalita
 Ram Charan, Shri
 Ram Dhani Das, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramamoorthy, Shri S. P.
 Rampur, Shri Mahadevappa
 Ranga, Shri
 @ Ranjeet Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Reddy, Shri R. D.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sanjiva
 Saboo, Shri Shri Gopal
 Sambasivam, Shri
 Sanji Rupji, Shri
 Santosham, Dr. M.
 Sapare, Shrimati Tara
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethuraman, Shri N.
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Shah, Shri Manabendra

Shah, Shri Shantilal
 Shah, Shri T. P.
 Shah, Shri Virendrakumar
 Shalwale, Shri Ram Gopal
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Sharma, Shri Beni Shanker
 Sharma, Shri Narayan Swaroop
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar
 Sharma, Shri Shiv
 @ Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt
 Shashi Ranjan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Shinkre, Shri
 Shiv Charan Lal, Shri
 @ Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri D. V.
 Singh, Shri J. B.
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Solanki, Shri P. N.
 Solanki, Shri S. M.
 Somani, Shri N. K.
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Shraj Bhan, Shri
 Tapuriah, Shri S. K.
 Tyagi, Shri Om Prakash
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
 Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra
 Vidyarthi, Shri Ram Swarup
 Vijaya Raje, Shrimati
 Yashpal Singh, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : The result * of the division is : Ayes—336 ; Noes—153.

Clause 3 is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

@ Vote recorded through Tellers only.

*The figures of the division announced were on the basis of the figures shown on the machine and votes recorded through Tellers. Subsequently, on usual check with the photograph it was found that the votes of Sarvashri P. L. Barupal, Chintamani Panigrahi, Molahu Prasad, Sivasankaran, Ishaq Sambhali and K. M. Madhukar who voted for Ayes through Tellers had already been recorded for Ayes by the machine. Therefore, the correct figures of the division are : Ayes 330 ; Noes 153.

श्री छटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आप से एक निवेदन करना है। यह जो वोट के आंकड़े आ रहे हैं यह ठीक हैं, इस के बारे में संदेह पैदा हो रहा है। अभी सत्तारूढ़ दल के पिछले मत विभाजन में 339 वोट आए थे। अब वह 336 रह गए। हम नहीं चाहते कि इन के वोट कम हों। यह ठीक नहीं है। मशीन अलग वोट बता रही है, आप अलग वोट बता रहे हैं। यह मशीन को क्या हो गया ?

New Clause 1A

MR. SPEAKER : Let the doors be opened. There is one amendment to insert new clause 1A. Is anybody moving it?... (*Interruptions.*) It is an ordinary amendment.

SHRI ABDUL GHANI DAR : I have every right to speak on this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER : I am speaking of clause 1A by Shri Patel and others.

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL : Mr. Speaker, Sir.

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR (Jhansi) : I have to say a few words.

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL : I move :

Page 1,—

after line 4, insert—

‘1A. For article 291 of the Constitution the following article shall be substituted, namely :—

“291. Nothing in article 363 or in article 131 shall apply to any dispute relating to any right accruing under or any liability or obligation arising out of any covenant or agreement or other similar instrument entered into by the Ruler of any Indian State before the

commencement of this Constitution for payment of any sum guaranteed or assured by the Government of the Dominion of India to any Ruler of such a State as privy purse.” (26)

MR. SPEAKER : I put amendment No. 26 which seeks to insert new clause 1A to the vote, because it has to be put before putting clause 1 to vote.

Amendment No. 26 was put and negatived.

Clause 1 (Short title)

MR. SPEAKER : We take up clause 1. There is an amendment by Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I move* :

Page 1,—

for lincs 3 and 4, substitute—

“Short title and 1. (1) This Act may be called the Constitution (Twenty-fourth Amendment) Act, 1970.

(2) It shall come into force on the 15th day of October, 1970.” (11)

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

Page 1,—

for lines 3 and 4, substitute—

“Short title and 1. (1) This Act may be called the Constitution (Twenty-fourth Amendment) Act, 1970.

(2) It shall come into force on the 15th day of October, 1970.” (11)

The motion was adopted.

* Moved with the recommendation of the President.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put clause 1, as amended, to vote. Let the Lobbies be cleared—the Lobbies have been cleared.

The question is :

“That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 17]

[18 hrs.

AYES

Abraham, Shri K. M.
 Achal Singh, Shri
 Adichan, Shri P. C.
 Aga, Shri Ahmed
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Ahmad, Dr. I.
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.
 Ahmed, Shri J.
 Amjad Ali, Shri Sardar
 Anbazhagan, Shri
 Anbuhezhan, Shri
 Anirudhan, Shri K.
 Ankineedu, Shri
 Anthony, Shri Frank
 Asghar Husain, Shri
 Atam Das, Shri
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
 Bakshi, Shri Ghulam Mohammad
 Banerjee, S. M.
 Barrow, Shri
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata
 Barua, Shri Hem
 Barua, Shri R.
 Barupal, Shri P. L.
 Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy
 Basu, Dr. Maitreyee
 Basumatari, Shri,
 Baswant, Shri
 Behera, Shri Baidhar
 Besra, Shri S. C.
 @ Bhadoria, Shri Arjun Singh
 Bhagaban Das, Shri
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.

Bhakt Darshan, Shri
 Bhandare, Shri R. D.
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
 Birla, Shri R. K.
 Bist, Shri J. B. S.
 Biwas, Shri J. M.
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
 Bose, Shri Amiyanath
 Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
 Buta Singh, Shri
 Chakrapani, C. K.
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
 Chavan, Shri D. R.
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.
 Chittybabu, Shri C.
 Choudhary, Shri Valmiki
 Choudhury, Shri J. K.
 Dalbir Singh, Shri
 Damani, Shri S. R.
 Dange, Shri S. A.
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
 Deiveekan, Shri
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Desai, Shri Dinkar
 Doshmukh, Shri B. D.
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
 Dhandapani, Shri
 Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
 Digamber Singh, Shri
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G. C.
 Durairasu, Shri
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
 Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
 Esthose, Shri P. P.
 Fernandes, Shri George
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 @ Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Gaviti, Shri Tukaram

Ghosh, Shri Ganesh	Kuchelar, Shri G.
Ghosh, Shri P. K.	Kundu, Shri S.
Ghosh, Shri Parimal	Kureel, Shri B. N.
Gopalan, Shri A. K.	@ Lakkappa, Shri K.
Gopalan, Shri P.	LakshmiKanthamma, Shrimati
Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela	Laskar, Shri N. R.
Gounder, Shri Muthu	Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Govind Das, Dr.	Limaye, Shri Madhu
Gowda, Shri M. H.	Lutfal Haque, Shri
Guha, Shri Samar	Madhukar, Shri K. M.
Gupta, Shri Indrajit	Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal	Mahajan, Shri Vikram Chand
Hajarnawis, Shri	Mahajan, Shri Yadav Shivram
Halder, Shri K.	Maharaj Singh, Shri
Hanumanthaiya, Shri	Mahato, Shri Bhajhari
Heerji Bhai, Shri	Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
Hem Raj, Shri	Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
Iqbal Singh, Shri	Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas	Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
Jadhav, Shri V. N.	Mane, Shri Shankarrao
Jaggiah, Shri K.	Manoharan, Shri
Jagjiwan Ram, Shri	Maran, Shri Murasoli
Jamir, Shri S. C.	Marandi, Shri
Jamna Lal, Shri	Master, Shri Bhola Nath
Janardhanan, Shri C.	Mayavan, Shri
Jha, Shri Bhogendra	Meghachandra, Shri M.
Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra	Melkote, Dr.
Jharkhande Rai, Shri	Menon, Shri Krishna
Joshi, Shri S. M.	Menon, Shri Vishwanatha
Kahandole, Shri Z. M.	Minimata Agam Dass Guru, Shrimati
Kalita, Shri Dhireswar	Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Kamalanathan, Shri	Mishra, Shri G. S.
Kamble, Shri	Mishra, Shri Janeshwar
Kameshwar Singh, Shri	Misra, Shri S. N.
Kamla Kumari, Kumari	Misra, Shri Srinibas
Kandappan, Shri S.	Modak, Shri B. K.
Karan Singh, Dr.	Mohammad Ismail, Shri
Kasture, Shri A. S.	Mohammad Yusuf, Shri
Kavade, Shri B. R.	Mohan.Swarup, Shri
Kedar Nath Singh, Shri	Mohsin, Shri
Kesri, Shri Sitaram	Molahu Prasad, Shri
Khadiikar, Shri R. K.	Muhammad Ismail, Shri M.
Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali	Muhammad Sheriff, Shri
Khan, Shri Latafat Ali	Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Khan, Shri M. A.	Mulla, Shri A. N.
Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali	Murthy, Shri B. S.
Khanna, Shri P. K.	Nahata, Shri Amrit
Kinder Lal, Shri	Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
Kisku, Shri A. K.	Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar	Nambiar, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.	Nanda, Shri
Krishna, Shri S. M.	Narayanan, Shri
Krishnamoorthi, Shri V.	@ Nath Pai, Shri
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.	Nayanar, Shri E. K.
Krishnappa, Shri M. V.	Nihal Singh, Shri

- @ Gberoi, Shri M. S.
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Palchoudhuri, Shrimati Ila
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Paokai Haokip, Shri
 Parmar, Shri D. R.
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri P.
 Paswan, Shri Kedar
 Patel, Shri Manibhaji J.
 Patil, Shri Anant Rao
 Patil, Shri C. A.
 Patil, Shri Deorao
 Patil, Shri N. R.
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Patil, Shri S. D.
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Pradhani, Shri K.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi
 Radhabai, Shrimati B.
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri
 @ Rajaram, Shri
 Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramabadrani, Shri T. D.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramani, Shri K.
 Ramji Ram, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rana, Shri M. B.
 Randhir Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Reddi, Shri G. S.
 Reddy, Shri Eswara
 Reddy, Shri Ganga
 @ Reddy, Shri M. N.
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony
 Reddy, Shri Surender
 Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Roy, Shri Chittaranjan
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman
 Saleem, Shri M. Yunus
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sambandhan, Shri S. K.
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
 Saminathan, Shri
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri
 Satya Narain Singh, Shri
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Sayyad Ali, Shri
 Sen, Shri A. K.
 Sen, Shri Deven
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
 Sen, Dr. Ranen
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Sezhiyan, Shri
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram
 Sharma, Shri Naval Kishore
 @ Sharma, Shri Yogendra
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Sher Singh, Shri
 Shinde, Shri Annasahib
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Shukla, Shri S. N.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddaya, Shri
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Sinha, Shri Mudrika
 Sinha, Shri R. K.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sivasankaran, Shri
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Somasundaram, Shri S. D.
 Sonar, Dr. A. G.
 Sonavane, Shri
 Sreedharan, Shri A.
 Subravelu, Shri
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Sursingh, Shri
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Swaran Singh, Shri

Swell, Shri
 Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
 Thakur, Shri Gunanad
 Thakur, Shri P. R.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tripathi, Shri K. D.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Uikey, Shri M. G.
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
 Umanath, Shri
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand
 Viswambhuran, Shri P.
 Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti
 Viswanthan, Shri G.
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
 Yadab, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet
 Yadav, Shri Jageshwar
 Yajnik, Shri

NOES

Agadi, Shri S. A.
 Amat, Shri D.
 Amin, Shri R. K.
 Anjanappa, Shri B.
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.
 Avedya Nath, Shri
 Ayarwal, Shri Ram Singh
 Badrudduja, Shri
 Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan
 Bansh Narain Singh, Shri
 Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Birua, Shri Kolai
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
 Brijendra Singh, Shri
 Burman, Shri Kirit Bikram Deb
 Chauhan, Shri Bharat Singh
 Dandekar, Shri N.
 Dar, Shri Abdul Ghani
 Das, Shri N. T.
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deb, Shri D. N.
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
 Deo, Shri P. K.
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
 Desai, Shri Moraji
 Devgun, Shri Hardayal
 @Dhrangadhra, Shai Sriraj Meghrajji

Dipa, Shri A
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti
 @Girja Kumari, Shrimati
 Gowd, Shri Gandilingana
 Gowder, Shri Nanja
 Goyal, Shri Shri Chand
 @ Gudadinni, Shri B. K.
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
 Hari Krishna, Shri
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Horo, Shri N. E.
 Jai Singh, Shri
 Joshi, Shri Jagannath Rao
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Kamaraj, Shri K.
 Karni Singh, Dr.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 @ Khan, Shri H. Ajmal
 Kikar Singh, Shri
 Kothari, Shri S. S.
 Koushik, Shri K. M.
 Kripalani, Shri J. B.
 Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
 Kushwah, Shri Yashwant Singh
 Lobo Prabhu, Shri
 Madhok, Shri Bal Raj
 Majhi, Shri Mahendra
 Mandal, Shri B. P.
 Masani, Shri M. R.
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Meena, Shri Meetha Lal
 Mehta, Shri Asoka
 Mehta, Shri P. M.
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mody, Shri Piloo
 Mohamed Imam, Shri J.
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati
 Monda, Shri Jugal
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
 Murti, Shri M. S.
 Muthusami, Shri C.
 Naghnoor, Shri M. N.
 Naidu, Shri Chengalraya
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Nailk, Shri R. V.
 Nayar, Shri K. K.
 Nayar, Shrimati Shakuntla
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila
 Nirlep Kaur, Shrimati
 Onkar Singh, Shri

Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Patel, Shri Baburao
 Patel, Shri Manubhai
 Patel, Shri N. N.
 Patel, Shri Pashabhai
 Patil, Shri S. K.
 Patodia, Shri D. N.
 @ Poonacha, Shri C. M.
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.
 Puri, Dr. Surya Prakash
 Rajasekharan, Shri
 Rajni Devi, Shrimati
 Raju, Dr. D. S.
 Rajyalakshmi, Shrimati Lalita
 Ram Charan, Shri
 Ram Dhani Das, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramamoorthy, Shri S. P.
 Rampur, Shri Mahadevappa
 Ranga, Shri
 Ranjeet Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Reddy, Shri R. D.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sanjiva
 Saboo, Shri Shri Gopal
 Sambasivam, Shri
 Sanji Rupji, Shri
 Santosham, Dr. M.
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethuraman, Shri N.
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Shah, Shri Manabendra
 Shah, Shri Shantilal
 Shah, Shri T. P.
 Shah, Shri Virendrakumar
 Shalwale, Shri Ram Gopal
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Sharma, Shri Beni Shanker
 Sharma, Shri Narayan Swaroop
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar
 Sharma, Shri Shiv

Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt
 Shashi Ranjan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Shinkre, Shri
 Shiv Charan Lal, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri D. V.
 Singh, Shri J. B.
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Solanki, Shri P. N.
 Solanki, Shri S. M.
 Somani, Shri N. K.
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Suraj Bhan, Shri
 Tapuriah, Shri S. K.
 Tyagi, Shri Om Prakash
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
 Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra
 Vidyarthi, Shri Ram Swarup
 Vijaya Raje, Shrimati
 Yashpal Singh, Shri

MR. SPEAKER: The result* of the division is : Ayes—338; Noes—152.

Clause 1, as amended, is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

“That the Enacting Formula and the title stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

@Vote recorded through Tellers only.

*The figures of the division announced were on the basis of the figures shown on the machine and votes recorded through Tellers. Subsequently, on usual check with the photograph it was found that the votes of Sarvashri Vidya Charan Shukla, P. L. Barupal, Chinta mani Panigrahi, Molahu Prasad, Sivasankaran Ishaq Sambhali, and K.M. Madhukar who voted for Ayes through Tellers had already been recorded for Ayes by the machine. Therefore, the correct figures of the division are : Ayes—331; Noes—152.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Sir,
I move :

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

श्री अब्दुल गनी डार : स्पीकर साहब, मैं बड़े भ्रदब के साथ इस बिल की मुखालफत करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ... इस तीसरे स्टेज पर मैं सारे हाउस की तबज्जह इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा मेरी बहन कहती है कि यह बड़ा तारीखी बिल है, इस से तारीखी नतायज पैदा होंगे..... (ब्यवधान)..... लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस से ऐसे नतायज भी पैदा हो सकते हैं जो देश के लिए तबाहकुन होंगे, क्योंकि अगर आज आप उन लोगों के साथ जो पियुपिलजवार की बात कहते हैं, उनके साथ मिल कर ब्रूट मेजोरिटी से इसको पास कर लेंगे तो कल माइनीरिटीज के साथ भी, जैसा मेरी बहन और इन के पिता जी के जमाने में मुसलमानों के साथ, हरिजनों के साथ, सिखों के साथ..... (ब्यवधान)..... बेइन्साफी हुई, वही हालत पैदा हो सकती है। ये कहती हैं कि यह ऐतिहासिक है, लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि ये इतिहास को मिटाने जा रही हैं। अपने बेटे संजय को छोटी कार का लाइसेंस दे कर उस को नया प्रिन्स बनाने जा रही हैं।... (ब्यवधान)...

अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर और फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर यह कहते हैं कि वे अपने वायदे पर कायम हैं कि वे राजाओं को ट्रांजीशनल पीरियड के लिए मबद देंगे, तो मैं उन को कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे इन की बातों में न आयें, वह सुप्रीम कोर्ट जरूर जाएं, सुप्रीम कोर्ट इस को जरूर चुनेगा। मैं ऐसी बात क्यों कहता हूँ—हमारे डांगे साहब ने बड़ी खूबसूरती से कहा, हमारे द्विवेदी जी ने भी इस को वाजा किया—

यह इतिहा है, कल को..... (ब्यवधान).....

कल को आप अपनी कोठी में नहीं रह सकेंगे, इस कुर्सी पर ये लोग आप को नहीं बैठने देंगे। इंदिरा बहन, इस बात को याद रखो, ये राममूर्ति, डांगे, जोशी, तुम्हारे सारे खानदान को तबाह कर के रहेंगे, ये उसी तरह से कत्ल होंगे जिस तरह से जार को लेनिन और स्टालिन ने खतम किया था.....

شرعی عبدالغنی ڈار - میں بڑے ادب کے ساتھ اس بل کی مخالفت کرنے کیلئے کھڑا ہوا ہوں۔ اس تیسرے سٹیج پر میں سارے ہاؤس کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ جیسا میری بہن کہتی ہے کہ یہ بڑا تاریخی بل ہے۔ اس سے ایسے نتائج بھی پیدا ہو سکتے ہیں جو دلش کے لئے تباہ کن ہوں گے کیونکہ اگر آج آپ ان لوگوں کے ساتھ جو پیوپلز وار کی بات کہتے ہیں ان کے ساتھ مل کر برڈ میجورٹی سے اس کو پاس کر لیں گے تو کل مائنورٹی کے ساتھ بھی جیسا میری بہن اور ان کے تاجی کے زمانے میں مسلمانوں کے ساتھ ہریجنوں کے ساتھ۔ شکوں کے ساتھ بے انصافی ہوئی وہی حالت پیدا ہو سکتی ہے۔

اگر پرائم منسٹر اور فائننس منسٹر یہ کہتے ہیں کہ وہ اپنے وعدہ پر قائم ہیں کہ وہ راجاؤں کو ٹرانزیشنل پریڈ کے لئے مدد دیں گے تو میں ان کو کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ ان کی باتوں میں نہ آئیں۔ وہ سپریم کورٹ میں ضرور جائیں۔ میں ایسی بات کیوں کہتا ہوں۔ ہمارے ڈانگے صاحب نے بڑی خوبصورتی سے کہا۔ ہمارے دو دیر جی جی نے بھی اس کو واضح کیا۔ یہ انتہا ہے۔ کل کو آپ اپنی کوٹھی میں نہیں رہ سکیں گے۔ اس کو پر یہ لوگ آپ کو نہیں سمجھنے دیں گے۔ اندرا بہن اس بات کو یاد رکھو۔ یہ رام سورتی۔ ڈانگے جو جی تمہارے سارے خاندان کو تباہ کر کے رہیں گے۔ یہ اس طرح سے قتل ہوئے جس طرح سے فرار کو لینن اور برٹلین نے ختم کیا تھا۔ [---]

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Now before I put the motion to vote, let the lobbies be cleared.

Order, order. Lobbies have been cleared.

The question is :

“That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 18]

[18.15 hrs.

AYES

Abraham, Shri K. M.
Achal Singh, Shri
Adichan, Shri P. C.
Aga, Shri Ahmed
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Ahmad, Dr. I.
Ahmed, Shri F. A.
Ahmed, Shri J.
Amjad Ali, Shri Sardar
Anbazhagan, Shri
Anbuhezhan, Shri
Anirudhan, Shri K.
Ankineedu, Shri
Anthony, Shri Frank
Asghar Husain, Shri
Atam Dass, Shri
Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Babunath Singh, Shri
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
Bakshi, Shri Ghulam Mohammad
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Barrow, Shri
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Barua, Shri Hem
Barua, Shri R.
Barupal, Shri P. L.
@ Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy
Basu, Dr. Maitreyee
Basumatari, Shri
Baswant, Shri
Behera, Shri Baidhar
Besra, Shri S. C.
Bhadoria, Shri Arjun Singh
Bhagaban Das, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakt Darshan, Shri

Bhandare, Shri R. D.
Bhargava, Shri B. N.
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Birla, Shri R. K.
Bist, Shri J. B. S.
Biswas, Shri J. M.
Bhora, Shri Onkarlal
Bose, Shri Amiyanath
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
Buta Singh, Shri
Chakrapani, Shri C. K.
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
Chandrika Prasad, Shri
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar
Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.
Chaudhry, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chaudhri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Chavan, Shri D. R.
Chavan, Shri Y. B.
Chittybabu, Shri C.
Choudhary, Shri Valmiki
Choudhury, Shri J. K.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Damani, Shri S. R.
Dange, Shri S. A.
Dasappa, Shri Tulsi Das
Daschoudhury, Shri B. K.
Deiveekan, Shri
Deoghare, Shri N. R.
Desai, Shri Dinkar
@Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
Dhandapani, Shri
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
Digamber Singh, Shri
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dixit, Shri G. C.
Durairasu, Shri
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Divedy, Shri Surendera Nath
Esthose, Shri P. P.
Fernandes, Shri George
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganesh, Shri K. R.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Gavit, Shri Tukaram
Gosh, Shri Ganesh

- Gosh, Shri P. K.
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal
 Gopalan, Shri A. K.
 Gopalan, Shri P.
 Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela
 @ Gounder, Shri Muthu
 Govind Das, Dr.
 Gowda, Shri M. H.
 Guha, Shri Samar
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal
 @ Gurcharan Singh, Shri
 Hazarnawis, Shri
 Halder, Shri K.
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri
 Heerjee Bhai, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Iqbal Singh, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri Tulshi das
 Jadhav, Shri V. N.
 Jaggaiah, Shri K.
 Jagjiwan Ram, Shri
 Jamir, Shri S. C.
 Jamna Lal, Shri
 @ Janardhanan, Shri C.
 Jha, Shri Bhogendra
 Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra
 Jharkhande Rai, Shri
 Joshi, Shri S. M.
 Kabandole, Shri Z. M.
 Kalita, Shri Dhireswar
 Kamalanathan, Shri
 Kamble, Shri
 Kameshwar Singh, Shri
 Kamala Kumari, Kumari
 Kandappan, Shri S.
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kasture, Shri A. S.
 Kavade, Shri B. R.
 Kedar Nath Singh, Shri
 Keshri, Shri Sitaram
 Khadilkar, Shri
 Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali
 Khan, Shri Latafat Ali
 Khan, Shri M. A.
 Khan, Shri Zulfiqar Ali
 Khanna, Shri P. K.
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kisku, Shri A. K.
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
 Krishna, Shri M. R.
 Krishna, S. M.
 Krishnamoorthi, Shri V.
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
 Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
 Kuchelar, Shri G.
 @ Kundu, Shri S.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Lakkappa, Shri K.
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
 Laskar, Shri N. R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Limaye, Shri Madhu
 Lutfal Haque, Shri
 Madhukar, Shri K. M.
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
 Mahajan, Shri Vikram Chand
 Mahajan, Shri Yadav Shivram
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 @ Mahato, Shri Bhajahari
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
 Malhotra, Shri Inder
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao
 Manoharan, Shri
 Maran, Shri Murasoli
 Marandi, Shri
 Master, Shri Bhola Nath
 Mayavan, Shri
 Meghachandra, Shri M.
 Melkote, Dr.
 Menon, Shri Krishna
 Menon, Shri Vishwanatha
 Minimata Agam Dass Guru, Shrimati
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Misra, Shri Janeshwar
 Misra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Shri Srinibas
 Modak, Shri B. K.
 Mohammad Ismail, Shri
 Mohammad Yusuf, Shri
 Mohan Swarup, Shri
 Mohsin, Shri
 Molahu Prasad, Shri
 Muhammad Ismail, Shri M.
 Muhammad Sheriff, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 Mulla, Shri A. N.
 Murthy, Shri B. S.
 Nahata, Shri Amrit
 Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
 Nair, Shri Vasudevan
 Nambiar, Shri
 Nanda, Shri
 Narayanan, Shri
 Nath Pai, Shri

- Nayanar, Shri E. K.
 Nihal Singh, Shri
 @ Oberoi, Shri M. S.
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Palchaudhuri, Shrimati Ila
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Paoki Haokip, Shri
 Parmar, Shri, D. R.
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri
 Paswan, Shri Kedar
 Patel, Shri Manibhai J.
 Patil, Shri Anantrao
 Patil, Shri C. A.
 Patil, Shri Deorao
 Patil, Shri N. R.
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Patil, Shri S. D.
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Pradhani, Shri K.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi
 Radhabai, Shrimati B.
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri
 Rajaram, Shri
 Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramabadrán, Shri T. D.
 Ramamurti, Shri P.
 Ramani, Shri K.
 Ramji Ram, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rana, Shri M. B.
 Randhir Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jaganath
 Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Reedi, Shri G. S.
 Reddy, Shri Eswara
 Reddy, Shri Ganga
 Reddy, Shri M. N.
 Reddy, Shri P. Antony
 Reddy, Shri Surender
 Rohargi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Roy, Shri Chittaranjan
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Sadhu Ram Shri
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman
 Saleem, Shri M. Yunus
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sambandhan, Shri S. K.
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
 Saminathan, Shri
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri
 @ Satya Narain Singh, Shri
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Sayyed Ali, Shri
 Sen, Shri A. K.
 Sen, Shri Deven
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayana
 Sen, Dr. Ranen
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Sezhiyan, Shri
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram
 Sharma, Shri Noval Kishore
 Sharma, Shri Yogendra
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri
 @ Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
 Shastri, Shri Ramavater
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Sher Singh, Shri
 Shinde, Shri Annasahib
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Shukla, Shri S. N.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddayya, Shri
 Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Sinha, Shri Mudrika
 Sinha, Shri R. K.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sivasankaran, Shri
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Somasundaram, Shri S. D.
 Sonar, Dr. A. G.
 Sonavane, Shri
 Sreedharan, Shri A.
 Subravelu, Shri
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Sursingh, Shri
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Swell, Shri

Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
 Thakur, Shri Gunanand
 Thakur, Shri P. R.
 Tiwari, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tripathi, Shri K. D.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Uikey, Shri M. G.
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
 Umanath, Shri
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand
 Viswambharan, Shri P.
 @Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti
 Viswanathan, Shri G.
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
 Yadab, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet
 Yadav, Shri Jageshwar
 Yajnik, Shri

NOES

Agadi, Shri S. A.
 Amat, Shri D.
 Amin, Shri R. K.
 Amin, Shri Ramchandra J.
 Anjanappa, Shri B.
 Arumugam, Shri R. S.
 Avedya Nath, Shri
 Ayarwal, Shri Ram Singh
 Badrudduja, Shri
 Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan
 Bansh Narain Singh, Shri
 Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Birua, Shri Kolai
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
 Brijendra Singh, Shri
 Burman, Shri Kirit Bikram Deb
 Chauhan, Shri Bharat Singh
 Dandeker, Shri N.
 Dar, Shri Abdul Ghani
 Das, Shri N. T.
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deb, Shri D. N.
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
 Deo, Shri P. K.
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
 Desai, Shri Morarji
 Devgun, Shri Harda yal
 Dhrangadhra, Shri Sriraj Meghrajji
 Dipa, Shri A.

Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti
 @Girja Kumari, Shrimati
 Gowd, Shri Gadilingana
 Gowder, Shri Nanja
 Goyal, Shri Shri Chand
 Gudadinni, Shri B. K.
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
 Hari Kishna, Shri
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Horo, Shri N. E.
 Jai Singh, Shri
 Joshi, Shri Jagannath Rao
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Kamaraj, Shri K.
 Karni Singh, Dr.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Khan, Shri H. Ajmal
 Kikar Singh, Shri
 Kothari, Shri S. S.
 Koushik, Shri K. M.
 Kripalani, Shri J. B.
 Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
 Kushwah, Shri Yashwant Singh
 Lobo Prabhu, Shri
 Madhok, Shri Bal Raj
 Majhi, Shri Mahendra
 Mandal, Shri B. P.
 Masani, Shri M. R.
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Meena, Shri Meetha Lal
 Mehta, Sri Asoka
 Mehta, Shri P. M.
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Mody, Shri Piloo
 Mohamed Imam, Shri J.
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati
 Mondal, Shri Jugal
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
 Mukene, Shri Yeshwantrao
 Murti, Shri M. S.
 Muthusami, Shri C.
 Nagnhoor, Shri M. N.
 Naidu, Shri Chengalraya
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Naik, Shri R. V.
 Nayar, Shri K. K.
 Nayar, Shrimati Shakuntla
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila
 Nirlep Kaur, Shrimati
 Onkar Singh, Shri

Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Vishva Nath
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Patel, Shri Baburao
 Patel, Shri Manubhai
 Patel, Shri N. N.
 Patel, Shri Pashabbhai
 Patil Shri S. K.
 Patodia, Shri D. N.
 Poonacha, Shri C. M.
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.
 Puri Dr. Surya Prakash
 Rajasekharan, Shri
 Raju, Dr. D. S.
 @Rajyalakshmi, Shrimati Lalita
 Ram Charan, Shri
 Ram Dhani Das, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramabadrn, Shri T. D.
 Rampur, Shri Mahadevappa
 Ranga, Shri
 Ranjeet Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Reddy, Shri R. D.
 Reddy, Shri N. Sanjiva
 Saboo, Shri Shri Gopal
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sambasivam, Shri
 Sanji Rupji, Shri
 Santosham, Dr. M.
 Sapre, Shrimati Tara
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethuraman, Shri N.
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Shah, Shri Manabendra
 Shah, Shri Shantilal
 Shah, Shri T. P.
 Shah, Shri Virendrakumar
 Shalwale, Shri Ram Gopal
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Sharma, Shri Beni Shanker
 Sharma, Shri Narayan Swaroop
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar
 Sharma, Shri Shiv
 Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt
 Shashi Ranjan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir

Sheo Narain, Shri
 Shinkre, Shri
 Shiv Charan Lal, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri D. V.
 @Singh, Shri J. B.
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Solanki, Shri P. N.
 Solonki Shri S. M.
 Somani, Shri N. K.
 Sondhi, Shri M. L.
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Suraj Bhan, Shri
 Tapuriah, Shri S.K.
 Tyagi, Shri Om Prakash
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari
 Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra
 Vidhyarthi, Shri Ram Swarup
 @Vijaya Raje, Shrimati
 Yaspal Singh, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : The result* of the division is : AYES—339: Noes—154.

The Bill, as amended, is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER : The Bill, as amended, is passed.

I would like to know the sense of the House whether we should proceed with the rest of the business.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : No.

MR. SPEAKER : Then, the House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18.20 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, September 3, 1970|Bhadra 12, 1982 (Saka).

@ Vote recorded through Tellers only.

*The figures of the division announced were on the basis of the figures shown on the machine and votes recorded through Tellers. Subsequently, on usual check with the photograph it was found that the vote of Servashri Vidya Charan Shukla, P. L. Barupal, Chintamani Panigrahi, Molahu Prasad, Sivarankaran, Ishaq Sambhali and K. M. Madhukar who voted for Ayes through Tellers had already been recorded for Ayes by the machine. Therefore the correct figures of the division are: Ayes—332; Noes—154.