

MR. SPEAKER: No, that was a consequential change. That has already been accepted.

Clause 12—(Amendment of section 21)

MR. SPEAKER: There are two amendments to this clause tabled by Shri R. N. Sharma. Is he moving them?

SHRI R. N. SHARMA: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. Minister accepting them?

SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN: Yes, I am accepting both of them.

Amendments made:

Page 6, line 19,—

for "six months" substitute "one year". (15)

Page 6, line 19 and 20,—

for "one thousand" substitute "five thousand". (16)

(Shri R. N. Sharma)

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 12, as amended, stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted

Clause 12, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 13 to 16 were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN: I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

श्री श्रीकान्त मोदी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा प्रपोजिशन है, मुझ से पूछा ही नहीं गया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : साथ को उठ कर मुझ से पूछिए।

The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

The motion was adopted

MR. SPEAKER: This Bill has taken a lot of time, almost double the time allotted for it.

13.05 hrs.

RULERS OF INDIAN STATES (ABOLITION OF PRIVILEGES) BILL

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we shall take up the Rulers of Indian States (Abolition of Privileges) Bill.

We have two other Bills also. The time allotted for the Rulers of Indian States (Abolition of Privileges) Bill is two hours. Then, we have another Bill for which 1 hour has been allotted and a third one also for which again 1 hour here has been allotted. We allotted one hour for each of them, just for the sake of allotting time; otherwise, they should not take so much time. But for the Bill relating to abolition of privileges of Indian Rulers, it was decided in the Business Advisory Committee to allot two hours. Now, the hon. Minister.

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE AND PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend certain enactments consequent on derecognition of Rulers of Indian States and abolition of privy purses, so as to abolish the privileges of Rulers and to make certain transitional provisions to enable the said Rulers to adjust progressively to the changed circumstances, be taken into consideration".

In December last, this House by an overwhelming majority endorsed the abolition of privy purses and the concept of Rulers. Consequent on

[Shri H. R. Gokhle]

the enactment of the Constitution (Twenty-Sixth) Amendment Bill, 1971, various administrative steps were taken to withdraw the privileges which were attached to the former Rulers by virtue of executive orders and statutory notifications.

Some of the privileges of these Rulers have been provided for by certain enactments. Since there were no Rulers, the relevant provisions of these enactments have also ceased to be generally applicable, though some technical argument in favour of the view that some of these provisions continue to be operative cannot be eliminated without a formal amendment of the enactments.

The Bill before the House seeks to complete the process which was set in motion by the enactment of the Constitution (Twenty-sixth Amendment) Act by making the necessary changes in the various enactments. While the concept of Rulership and Rulers as a privileged class has been done away with, the Bill does take into account the human problem which has resulted and seeks to make some provisions for this. As the Prime Minister pointed out, while moving the Constitution (Twenty-sixth Amendment) Bill in this House, there is no personal animus against any individual prince. Accordingly, as a transitional measure, to avoid undue hardship to the individuals concerned, certain concessions are sought to be given or continued to the ex-Rulers by the Bill. These, however, are extremely limited in scope and would apply only to those who were Rulers prior to the commencement of the Constitution (Twenty-sixth Amendment) Act. These provisions will spend themselves out in course of time.

I shall now explain briefly the provisions made in the Bill in respect of privileges available to former Rulers under the various enactments. These privileges fall into two categories: (i) the privileges under the procedural laws, namely, the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 and the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, and (ii) exemptions under the

taxation laws, namely the Wealth-tax Act, the Gift-tax Act and the Income-tax Act.

I shall now deal with the privileges under the procedural laws. Section 197A of the Code of Criminal Procedure provided for two privileges. In the first place, the previous sanction of the Government is necessary for taking cognizance of an offence alleged to have been committed by a Ruler of a former Indian State. In the second place, the Central Government has to determine the person by whom and the manner in which the offence or offences for which the prosecution of a Ruler of a former Indian State is to be conducted and that Government has also to specify the court before which the trial is to be held. By virtue of the amendment proposed in clause 2 of the Bill, these privileges will henceforth be available only in relation to offences committed before the commencement of the Constitution, that is, the 26th January, 1950, by a person recognised as a Ruler before such commencement.

Under section 87B of the Code of Civil Procedure, a former Ruler was immune from arrest under the Code. Except with the consent of the Central Government, a suit against a former Ruler could not be tried and a decree against a former Ruler could not be executed against the property of such Ruler.

Further, a Ruler may request the Central Government to appoint any person to prosecute or defend any suit on behalf of such Ruler. By virtue of the amendment proposed in clause 3 of the Bill, these provisions would be available only in respect of a suit based upon a cause of action which arose before the commencement of the Constitution or any proceeding arising out of such a suit and that too only in relation to persons recognised as Rulers before the commencement of the Constitution.

The continuance of the provisions of sec. 197A of the Cr. P.C. and section 87B of the Civil Procedure

Code in respect of pre-Constitution offences or acts will have very limited operation in action and practice, and is in accordance with the observation of the Supreme Court that broadly in the light of the basic principle of equality before the law, for past dealings and transactions, protection may justifiably be given to Rulers of former Indian States. As a consequence of the abolition of privileges under 197A of the Criminal Procedure Code and sec. 87B of the Civil Procedure Code in respect of offences or acts subsequent to the commencement of the Constitution, it is no longer necessary to retain sec. 168 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, which provides that the provisions of this section will not apply in relation to a Ruler who has been nominated for an election from the date of such nomination till the declaration of the result of the election and also in respect of certain offences alleged to have been committed at or in connection with such election. Hence that section is being omitted by clause 4 of the Bill.

I will now pass on to deal with the exemptions under taxation laws. The exemptions under the Income-tax Act in respect of privy purse and under the Gift Tax Act in respect of gifts made out of privy purse have virtually become otiose with the abolition of privy purses and the relevant provisions are being omitted. With a view to enabling the Rulers to adjust themselves progressively to the changed circumstances, it is proposed to continue the exemption under the Wealth Tax Act 1957 in respect of one official residence and heirloom jewellery of each former Ruler for his lifetime. The continuance of the exemption in respect of heirloom jewellery is also in the national interest because the exemption is subject to a number of restrictions which are designed to ensure that the heirloom jewellery is not converted, disposed of or sent out of India. Likewise, it is also proposed to provide for exemption of *ex-gratia* payments which may be made by the Central Government to the Rulers consequent on the abolition of the privy purses and to restrict the exemp-

tion in respect of palaces to one palace. If these *ex-gratia* payments are to serve the intended purpose of enabling the Rulers to adjust themselves to the changed circumstances, it is necessary to provide for exemption of the same. I commend the Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend certain enactments consequent on derecognition of Rulers of Indian States and abolition of privy purses, so as to abolish the privileges of Rulers and to make certain transitional provisions to enable the said Rulers to adjust progressively to the changed circumstances, be taken into consideration".

SHRI BIREN DUTTA (Tripura West): This is a Bill which actually expresses the hesitation of Government to do away with the princely privileges. The title of the Bill is very good. But if we go through the Bill, there are some provisions which are necessary, but what we find is that the ex-Rulers are so much in the heart of Government that even while abolishing the privy purses they are going to be given amounts to rehabilitate themselves in the changed circumstances. This seems to be a very serious problem for the Government to look after the Rulers whose privileges they are abolishing. But when the question of looking after the ordinary people comes even under this Bill, there is not a word of sympathy for them. There are thousands of employees of these Rulers. They have not been shown any sympathy in regard to rehabilitation. The Government are practically supporting the exploiting classes, the Rulers, monopolists and so on. The first consideration comes for the exploiters, not for the exploited. Why is it that not a word has been uttered for these unfortunate employees of the Rulers after the abolition of the privy purses, not a word about giving anything from these amounts to those who have served under the rulers? What will be their fate?

[Shri Biren Dutta]

We have seen in the Supplementary Demands that Rs. 10 crores is to be given to these ex-Rulers out of compassion to the Rulers and their family members as *ex-gratia* payments. All compassion flows for those sections of society who are not really the producers of any wealth, who are in the context of history practically are still maintaining a kind heart for the ex-Rulers and have demonstrated it by this *ex-gratia* payment to them.

At the time of the consideration of the abolition of the privy purses Bill, we demanded that no money should be given to the Rulers; if anything has to be given, it should be given to those who were the employees in the services of these Rulers. Here in this Bill, as I said, there is not a word about them. I request the Minister to consider this. If you have so much sympathy for the Rulers and their relatives, why not some sympathy for those who are employed by these Rulers? With these few words, I support the Bill.

*SHRI M. KATHAMUTHU: (Nagapattinam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, The Rulers of Indian States (Abolition of Privileges) Bill 1972 has been brought before this House as a result of persistent demand of Hon. Members of both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. This Bill purports to abolish certain privileges and immunities enjoyed by the former rulers.

While I extend my support to this Bill to the extent that it seeks to withdraw the exemptions granted to the ex-rulers under the Gift Tax Act and to revoke the immunities from Criminal Procedure Code. I cannot per force extend my whole hearted support to the remaining provisions of the Bill.

I cannot, for example, accept the proposed Amendment to Civil Procedure Code in this Bill. It is common knowledge that a large number of civil suits relating to the properties of the ex-rulers are pending before the courts. To give a classic example, the map of his plots and lands drawn up by the Gwalior Maharaja

in the year 1954 varied widely with the inventory prepared by him in 1948. Consequently, there are innumerable civil suits filed and pending in the Courts. Therefore, Sir, I am opposed even to limiting the immunity under the Civil Procedure Code to acts and omissions of the rulers before the commencement of the Constitution. Sir, you are aware of the noble concept of "Equality before Law". I am unable to reconcile myself to the discrimination sought to be perpetuated through this Bill in favour of former rulers. You will no doubt agree with my demand that the Civil Procedure Code should be applicable in a uniform manner to all the citizens of our country.

I want to bring to your kind attention another unsavoury and odious comparison of the ex-rulers with the rulers of a foreign state in the matter of enforcement of Civil Procedure Code. You will find this in clause 3(a) of the Bill. I consider this as totally unwarranted and unreasonable.

Similarly, this Bill provides for exempting the ex-rulers from prosecution under Criminal Procedure Code for offences committed before the commencement of the Constitution. What is the basis for such an exemption in the case of ex-rulers? If they had committed offences even before the commencement of the Constitution, they should be proceeded against in accordance with the law of the land.

In this introductory speech while moving the Bill, the hon. Minister stated that the exemptions under the Wealth tax are being limited for the life time of the ex-rulers. I feel that even this concession is not warranted. I would now refer to the exemption given under the Wealth Tax Act in respect of heirloom jewellery of ex-rulers. It is provided under clause 5(b) of the Bill that reasonable steps shall be taken for keeping the heirloom jewellery substantially on its original shape.

It may satisfy the conscience of the law-makers to have such a pro-

*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

vision. But the ex-rulers will have no compunction in circumventing this provision. The shape of the heirloom jewellery may remain in tact but not the contents. To quote an instance, Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer, who headed the Hindu Religions Endowments Commission in 1960-62, had stated in his report that though the Temple jewellery and other ornaments had maintained their original shape, their contents had been removed. In his introductory speech, the hon. Minister felt that these heirlooms jewellery are precious antiquities of our country and therefore they should be preserved if that were so, why should not they be removed from the possession of ex-rulers and kept in national museums?

Sir, I would now turn to another provision in the Bill. In anticipation of making *ex gratia* payments to the ex-rulers, a provision has been made in the Bill to grant exemption to such payments from the Income-Tax Act. The issue of *ex gratia* payments to ex-rulers has a long history. When the Constitution (26th Amendment) Bill was proposed, an attempt was made to provide for such *ex gratia* payments to ex-rulers. The hon. Members belonging to Opposition Parties opposed such a move. Again, when the President's Address, which carried a reference to transitional allowances to ex-rulers, came up for discussion in the House, we opposed the move again. Having abolished the privy purses now Government have decided to make *ex gratia* payments to the ex-rulers. Any one would have naturally expected that Parliament should first discuss the question of making such payments before giving approval to the Bill now before us. Merely because the ruling party has a big majority in the House, the Government have decided to pay Rs. 10.70 crores *ex gratia* to the ex-rulers. Sir, kindly note that this is an *ex gratia* payment but not compensation.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday, but for your kind intervention, the supplementary Demands providing for *ex gratia* payments would have been

passed by the House. Sir, I feel, because they have a huge majority in the House, Government are paying scant respect and regard to Parliamentary norms and propriety.

Sir, who are the persons to receive these *ex gratia* payments? It is the rulers to whom nearly Rs. 102.60 crores have been paid by way of privy purses during the last 25 years. From the newspaper reports, we find that *ex gratia* payments are being made to the rulers who have properties worth Rs 50 crores or Rs. 60 crores. Do we not know that Nizam, Mysore Maharaja, and patiala Maharaja have huge properties? As far as my party is concerned, we are totally opposed to the idea of making *ex gratia* payments to the ex-rulers. There is no justification at all for making such payments. I, therefore, request the hon. Minister to bring forward necessary amendments in the Bill.

Sir, the ruling party, at the time of Mid-Term Poll had given assurances to the people and to make *ex gratia* payments runs counter to the pledges given by the ruling party to the people. I regretfully say that there are political motives behind the decision to make *ex gratia* payments to ex-rulers.

Even before the principle of *ex gratia* payments has been accepted by the Parliament this Bill provides for an amendment to the Income-Tax Act for granting exemption from income tax for such payments.

Sir, I would request the hon. Minister to withdraw this Bill and after incorporating suitable amendments on the issues I have raised, this Bill may be re-introduced in the House.

With these words, I conclude.

*SHRI J MATHA GOWDER (Nilgiris): Mr Speaker, Sir on behalf of my party, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, I would like to say a few words on The Rulers of Indian States (Abolition of Privileges) Bill, 1972.

*The original speech who delivered in Tamil.

[Shri J. Matha Gowder]

Sir, I welcome this measure which seeks to abolish the exemptions and immunities enjoyed by the former rulers. But I am unable to appreciate the announcement of the Government that these former rulers would be given Rs 10.70 crores *ex gratia*. What for they should be paid this huge sum? These rulers have amassed wealth and riches and they have all their moneys in unidentified accounts in foreign banks. Do the Government want to add to their bloated wealth by giving this sum of Rs 10.70 crores? Sir, you will agree with me that it is not proper and just that these former rulers should be given Rs 10.70 crores.

Just when this Bill has been introduced in this House providing for the abolition of the privileges enjoyed by the ex-rulers, the announcement of *ex gratia* payment of Rs 10.70 crores appeared in the Press. It is just like giving chocolate to a crying child. It is quite undignified on the part of the Government to make such a declaration. Either they could have withheld this announcement of paying Rs. 10.70 crores *ex gratia* to the former rulers till this Bill is passed by the Parliament or they could have brought this Bill after paying Rs 10.70 crores to the ex-rulers. I suspect the sudden generosity of the Government and I would like to know whether there is any political motive in this move.

13.27 hrs.
[MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

The other day in the newspapers I came across a news item stating that the Deputy Minister of Railways, Shri Shafi Qureshi expressed the view-point that the award of one-man Tribunal which recommended the payment of night duty allowance to 13 lakhs of railway workers is not binding on the Government. When the payment of night duty allowance to the railway workers is recommended by the Tribunal set up by the Government, the Government shrinks. But this bounty of Rs 10.70 crores is being given to the ex-rulers. Similarly the Government is not coming to any definite decision in regard to payment of dearness allowance to its own employees who are in great distress on account

of soaring prices. Here, the Government in an unseemly hurry declares the payment of Rs 10.70 crores *ex gratia* to the ex-rulers.

If I say that the Government have not kept up at their plighted word during the mid-term poll, it might be said that the Member belonging to the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam has made an unwarranted criticism. But, the hon Member who preceded me, Shri Kathamuthu belonging to the Communist Party of India with whom the Ruling Party has a joint front, has made the charge that the Government have failed miserably in fulfilling the promises given to the people of the country during the mid-term poll.

The ruling party got this overwhelming majority mainly due to the propaganda of Government wanting to abolish the privy purses and other privileges of the former rulers. Now so soon after coming to power on this plank the Government are trying to squander the public money in paying Rs 10.70 crores to the former rulers.

The other day we had a discussion in this House on the drought situation prevailing in the country. There are reports of starvation deaths in the drought affected areas. The people are in great distress on account of price spiral. The majority of our population has not shelter has not been getting two square meals a day and the spectre of unemployment is looming large over the country. Could not this sum of Rs. 10.70 crores be used in removing at least to some extent the wide-spread poverty in the country and in wiping the hot tears of famished children of our country?

Just because the Prime Minister has decided on this question of paying Rs 10.70 crores to the former rulers, a provision has been made in this Bill to amend the Income-tax Act for giving exemption from payment of income-tax on such payment. This House has not been given an opportunity to discuss the issue. This House is faced with a fait accompli. Is this proper, Sir? Is this according to democratic norms and traditions?

The people of our country will give a fitting reply at the appropriate time and the Government will have to face that consequence. I would request the hon. Minister to withdraw this Bill. No exemption from income-tax should be allowed for such payments. This section should be suitably amended. In fact, I would request the hon. Minister to delete the provision which speaks of *ex gratia* payment to ex-rulers, which is repugnant, unjust and unwarranted.

I oppose this Bill on this score. It can be re-introduced after deleting this provision regarding *ex gratia* payment. With these words I conclude

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (राजापुर) .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राजा-महाराजाओं के प्रिवी पर्स समाप्त होने के बाद उन के विशेषाधिकार समाप्त करने का यह विधेयक जो आया है यह तो स्वाभाविक ही समझा जायगा। किन्तु जिम् बान को लेकर वह विधेयक आया और यह भ्रं आया है इस में यही कहा जा रहा है कि आज की बदलती हुई परिस्थिति में विशेषाधिकार कोई मतलब नहीं रखता। जैसे प्रिवी पर्स समाप्त करते समय सामान्य आदमी की हालत सुधारने की दृष्टि में और समाजवाद लाने की दृष्टि से यह सब बातें आवश्यक बताई गई उस के साथ में समझता हू कि कोई विरोध नहीं करेगा। किन्तु इस में एक राजनीति दिखती है। आज भी यह विशेषाधिकार समाप्त करते समय जो आश्वासन दिया जा रहा है बदलती हुई परिस्थिति के साथ वे खुद को सम्बद्ध करने में सुविधा अनुभव करें इस बात के लिए कुछ उनको मुझावजा मिलने वाला है, ट्राजीकनल एलाक्स के नाते और वह राशि 10 करोड़ 75 लाख की है। किन्तु किस आधार पर वह दिया जा रहा है? यहां तो बताया है कि बदलती हुई परिस्थिति के साथ वह अपने को, खुद डालें, यह तो ठीक हो गया, किन्तु हमका आधार कौन सा है? यानी सब से ज्यादा किन् कर प्रिवी पर्स मिलती थी उन को ट्राजीकनल एलाक्स आधार मिलेगा, उसी मात्रा

में मिलेगा, कौन सा प्रमाण है, कौन सी कसौटी है इस की यह जानने की मैंने कोशिश की लेकिन कुछ पता नहीं लगा। तो हम को तो ऐसा ही लगता है कि इस का भी उपयोग पोलिटिकल लिबर के नाते सब राजा-महाराजाओं को अपने साथ लेने और रखने की दृष्टि से ही किया जायगा, ऐसा मुझे बड़ा भारी शक है। क्योंकि मैसूर के जो भूतपूर्व महाराजा थे उन के राज-प्रसाद के बारे में भूतपूर्व जो कांग्रेसी मंत्री-मंडल था या मैसूर का उम ने ध्यान दि फ्लोर आफ दि हाउस यह बताया था कि वह सरकारी सम्पत्ति है। किन्तु आज ग्दली हुई परिस्थिति में बदली हुई नहीं कांग्रेस की जो सरकार मैसूर में आई है उन्होंने सदन में ही बताया है कि वह निजी सम्पत्ति है। अब यह समझ में नहीं आता और अखबार में तो खबर आई है कि वह राज-प्रसाद जो भूतपूर्व मैसूर के महाराजा का है उसे 15 करोड़ रुपये में सरकार खरीदना भी चाहती है। आखिर यह जो एक पोलिटिकल लिबर के नाते काम होता है, इस में समाजवाद को क्या डाला जाना है यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है। हम शुरु में कहने रहे हैं कि बुढ़िया मरती है इस का दुख नहीं है लेकिन मृत्यु ने दरवाजा देख लिया है इसका दुख है। इसलिए हम कोई भी बात करें तो सिद्धांत ठीक ढंग से ही होना चाहिए। व्हेन यू एन्टर इन टू काट्रेक्ट, कोई ऐग्रीमेंट, करार जब हम किया करते हैं तो उस का पालन होना चाहिए। जैसे गिमला ऐग्रीमेंट किया, जब पता चला कि उसको स्पिरिट और लैटर में फालो नहीं किया जा रहा है तो हम को उन के अधिकारियों को बुलाना पड़ा है पूछने के लिये कि भाई, इसका क्या मतलब है, यह बताया। यानी ऐग्रीमेंट यदि तोड़े जायेंगे तो आगे चल कर यह पद्धति और परम्परा ऐसी बनती चली जायगी . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How does the Simla agreement come in here?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : यह इसलिए है कि उनके साथ में एक ऐग्रीमेंट हुआ, वह

[श्री जय-नाथराव जोशी]

ऐग्रीमेंट जब तोड़ा जाता है तो ऐसी एक परम्परा बनती चली जाती है। हम भी जब कोई ऐग्रीमेंट किया करते हैं तो यह एकसेपेक्ट करते हैं कि दैट मुड बी आनर्ड।

इसलिए मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि उन के साथ मैं यह बाई-लेटरल ऐग्रीमेंट था तो हम ने यह सुझाव इसीलिए दिया था कि आप फिर बाई-लेटरली इस को करिए और कोई न कोई रास्ता निकालिए। आज भी जब विशेषाधिकार समाप्त करने की बात होती है तो आखिर उस की कसौटी क्या है? एक राजनैतिक दबाव के नाते राजा-महाराजाओं को अपने साथ खींचने का यह एक तरीका तो नहीं है?

दूसरी बात यह है कि बदलती हुई परिस्थिति की कुछ जिम्मेदारी भी है। जैसे मेरे मित्र ने स्वीकार किया था कि जब राजे-महाराजे के राज्य चले गए और उनकी जिम्मेदारी अपने शासन में ली तो उन के जो कर्मचारी थे उनकी दस-दस, पन्द्रह-पन्द्रह साल तक पेशन नहीं मिली। यह मैं स्वयं जानता हूँ। तो आज भी प्रिन्सी पर्स जब तक मिलता रहा तब तक उन के निजी काम काज देखने के लिये कुछ कर्मचारी उन के यहाँ रहे हैं। जब प्रिन्सी पर्स समाप्त हो जायगा तो उनका क्या होगा? उन को कहीं न कहीं रखेंगे या नहीं? उन के निवास की व्यवस्था जो है वह सरकार करेगी या नहीं अगर जो उनकी सेवा है उसके लिए निवृत्ति वेतन उन को मिलेगा या नहीं? इस की जिम्मेदारी कौन लेगा? या यह भी राजा-महाराजाओं पर छोड़ा जायेगा कि ट्रांजीशनल एलाबंस में से उन्हें दे? क्योंकि ट्रांजीशनल एलाबंस की जो दो बातें हैं उसमें एक तो यह है कि प्रिन्सी पर्स के अलावा जिन को मिलता था वह तो मिलता रहेगा किन्तु प्रिन्सी पर्स में से जो कुछ हिस्सा उन के क्लोज रिसेंस को दिया जाता था उन के लिए तो 5 लाख की राशि उन्होंने रखी है। इसलिए जो राजा-महाराजाओं पर अवलम्बित लोग हैं, सामान्य आदमी जो हैं, सामान्य कर्मचारी जो हैं उन की

व्यवस्था क्या है, उस के बारे में कुछ समझ में नहीं आता। उन के विशेषाधिकार तो चले गए, लेकिन सामान्य आदमी का भी दो बक्ल खाने का विशेषाधिकार तो है ही और समाजवाद इस को स्वीकार कर के चलता है। जीवन की आवश्यक वस्तुएं उन्हें प्राप्त हो, वह कपडा पहने, दो बक्ल रोटी खाय उस का प्रबन्ध क्या है? राजा-महाराजाओं के अधिकार समाप्त कर दिए किन्तु सामान्य आदमी के जो विशेषाधिकार हैं समाजवाद में जिस को स्वीकार दिया है उस अधिकार के बारे में इसमें कहीं जिक्र नहीं है।

हम चाहते हैं कि उसको इस में बढ़ाया जाए और वह सामान्य कर्मचारी जो इन पर निर्भर था उसको हवा में न छोड़ा जाए और यह भी एक राजनीतिक माध्यम बना कर राजा-महाराजाओं को फिर अपनी ओर रखने के लिए इसका उपयोग न किया जाए, मैंने देखा है प्रिन्सी पर्स एवालिशन के बाद कई इधर से उधर गए हैं और अभी भी मैं कह्यो को जाते हुए देखता हूँ। आखिर राजे-महाराजे यहाँ खराब हैं तो वहाँ भी खराब होते और यहाँ अच्छे हैं तो वहाँ भी अच्छे होने। तो यह तो कोई कसौटी नहीं होती है कि एक दम से 1942 में अंग्रेजों से जिसने झगड़ा किया वही अच्छे थे। ऐसे तो हमारे भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति जी भी हो गए जिन्होंने कभी आन्दोलन में हिस्सा नहीं लिया। तो यह कोई श्रद्धेटीरिया नहीं होता है। आखिर आदमी की कोई गुणवत्ता होती है, कर्तव्य होता है, कोई दूर बुद्धि होती है, कोई तपस्या भी होती है। सिर्फ यही कि वह जेल में चला जाए तो वह देशभक्त बन गया। ऐसा नहीं होता है। ऐसे ही पुराने राजे, सब खराब पुरानी बातें, सब खराब, अगर वही है तो वही राजे जब आपके पास जा कर बैठते हैं तो वही एक दम से अच्छे, दूध के धुले हुए जैसे हो जाते हैं यह समझ में नहीं आता है। इसलिए जो भी आपने ऐग्रीमेंट किया था जिन नी परिस्थिति में, सब उनको स्वीकार करके चलिए। आज की विशेषाधिकार समाप्त करने के बाद हम यही मान करते हैं कि राजनीतिक

दवाव के रूप में उनकी अपनी तरफ लेने के लिए इसका इस्तेमाल न किया जाये और उनके कर्मचारी जो विस्थापित हो जाएंगे उनकी क्या व्यवस्था है, इन दो बातों पर ध्यान प्रकाश डालें।

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai). This is only a consequential measure and therefore there is nothing substantive to be examined in it. Perhaps this measure was not necessary at all. There was a hint of this in the speech of the hon. Minister himself. It may be that due to the amendments that we had carried in December last many of these provisions and laws would have automatically been rendered infructuous. Even so, if by way of abundant caution Government had thought it fit to move these amendments, we could have no objection. But what intrigues us most is that in spite of the clear direction of the Chair yesterday we have not been given to understand what would be the basis of the *ex gratia* payment to be made to these ex-Rulers. We had raised this point in connection with the Supplementary Demands for Grant. We have not been told what would be the rationale behind this, what is the arithmetic behind this figure of Rs. 10.70 crores. When the hon. Minister spoke a little while ago, he did not give us any idea about it. If he has not done so, on technical grounds I cannot take objection because this Bill seeks only to give them a tax concession. But I thought this would be the opportunity for the Minister to enlighten the House about the basis on which they have demanded this amount.

Therefore, the whole thing remains mysterious. We have earlier held that there is something privy to the abolition of the privy purse. We have always taken objection to the hidden dimension of the abolition of the privy purse. Once I had occasion to say that in this increasingly sleeveless world the Prime Minister seemed to be lengthening her sleeves and keeping something up her sleeves. That remains the position even now. We really do not know what is going to be the basis for making this *ex gratia* payment of this huge order.

We are being asked to give tax concession to them, to make these payments completely tax-free. We really do not know for what purpose we are being asked to make it tax-free.

It is said that these payments are for a 'transitional period', transition to what? Then it is said that it is for helping them to adjust themselves to the new circumstances. Adjust, again, to what level? Had the Government applied its mind to the level to which it would like the princes to adjust themselves? We are kept in the dark about all these things. So, we really do not know what is exactly the concept of the transitional payment, what is exactly the concept of the adjustment to the new levels, because we do not know what these new levels are and how they have been conceived. One could have a different idea altogether about rehabilitating some of the small ex-rulers who get only paltry sums of money but this is not the occasion for me to elaborate on that. So, I would leave it here.

But the one point on which I would like to reinforce what has been said by the hon. Member Shri Joshi, is with regard to the palaces. Here we have got certain examples of how the government have treated these palaces in a mysterious manner. It has come to our notice that some of the palaces of the Maharaja of Mysore, the ex-Ruler of Mysore, which had been treated as State property, is now sought to be treated as private property of the ex-ruler. We have been maintaining these palaces at a huge cost of about Rs. 1 lakh annually and yet it is being urged that they are to be considered as private property. The other day we were told in the Consultative Committee by the Home Minister that this matter has been referred to the Attorney-General. May I say that earlier when this matter was considered by the Government of Mysore when Shri Veerendra Patil happened to be the Chief Minister, it was categorically stated on behalf of the State of Mysore that they could not treat this palace as private property. It was also held by Advocate-General of Mysore that they could not be treated as private pro-

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]
 perty. And yet the Central Government informed the State Government of Mysore only the other day that they might be treated as private property.

So, I would like to urge that these things, these palaces or, for that matter, even making these payments as tax-free, we are not able to comprehend them fully. If only one palace is to be given, then we must be furnished an inventory of all the palaces and told whether some palaces are going to be treated as State property, according to the merger agreements, or some other palaces are going to be treated as private property according to some agreements. These things have not been shared with us.

However, so far as this measure is concerned, I would like to say that we have absolutely no objection to the consequential amendments that have been proposed. But the implications of some of these amendments have not been clearly made out, and therein lies our objection. I hope during the reply the hon. Minister will try to enlighten us on these points.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: Sir, as I said in my opening speech, the Bill seeks to amend the provisions of various Acts which are there in view of the privileges which existed in favour of the former princes. The hon. Member, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra is quite right. As I said in the beginning, a view can be taken that after the abolition of articles 291 and 362, even though we might not delete the provisions, the privileges will not be available to the rulers. But in matters like this Government thought that the question should be put beyond doubt and, even if not necessary, at least these blots on the statutes books should be removed, and that is why these amendments have been proposed.

While all speakers who participated in the debate supported the measure, various questions have been raised which indeed are no doubt relevant. The first question that was raised by one hon. Member was with regard to the amendment of the Criminal Procedure Code. I have indi-

cated earlier that the situation after the abolition of the concept of the rulership is now so different that the protection which was given to the former rulers, who at one time claimed to be equivalent to foreign rulers, has no justification to remain on the statute book. For example, no prosecution can be launched without the prior approval of the Central Government. If they have to prosecute, or defend any suit in a court of law, the Central Government should provide them assistance. These are matters which are clearly out of date after the abolition of articles 292, 362 and so on. One hon. Member said that even for offences which took place prior to 26th January 1950, prior to the commencement of the Constitution, the immunity should not remain. In other words, after nearly 25 years have gone, if somebody wants to launch a prosecution for some alleged offence which may or may not have been committed prior to that date, he should have complete freedom to prosecute the ruler like any other citizen. Apart from the fact that even in respect of ordinary citizens such a stale prosecution will normally not be entertained by any criminal court, it was thought desirable that while the immunity lasted and did last, whether rightly or wrongly, till the Constitution came into force, for acts or omissions which were committed prior to the Constitution coming into force the immunity should remain and it should not become a handle in the hands of some people who might have a grievance for one reason or another against an individual prince to take the matter to a criminal court for a 25-years old dispute in a criminal matter. But it is quite clear that after the 26th January 1950 there is no protection. So, if an offence is alleged after that date, it can be taken to a criminal court by any citizen and the rulers will be dealt with as any other individual citizen would be dealt with in a criminal court, after the passing of this amendment.

With regard to the Civil Procedure Code some reference was made and some instances were also pointed out. If there are disputes pending, I am sure they must have been pend-

ing after the appropriate approval of the Central Government was obtained under the relevant provisions of the Civil Procedure Code and those disputes will certainly go to a civil court. The question is if for 25 years or so no proceeding in a civil court has at all been instituted till now, should we or should we not continue the immunity in respect of cause of action which arose prior to 26th January 1950.

The provision makes quite clear that if there is a cause of action after the passing of the Constitution and, of course, subject to the law of limitation of the land, there is no bar now, there is no immunity now, for any such civil suits being filed against any former ruler. The courts are open. Every litigant will be free to go against a ruler for any cause of action after the Constitution came into force and for that matter against any one. The immunity from arrest is also taken away. There is no such immunity.

Then, a reference was made to certain other provisions like the amendment to the Income-tax Act, the amendment to the Gift Tax Act and the amendment to the Wealth Tax Act. As I have pointed out earlier, before the passing of the proposed Bill, the provision is that certain palaces were exempt from wealth tax. Now, what is done in respect of a former ruler who was recognised before is this. After the amendment of the relevant definition in the Constitution, article 366, there is no question of recognising a new heir or a successor to such of those who are alive and who have ceased to be rulers after the passing of the Twenty-Sixth Constitution Amendment Act. In respect of them, only one residential house has been exempted from the levy of wealth tax. This too has been made applicable during the life-time of the ruler. There is no new ruler now. Such as those who are living will be having a house and that will be subject to exemption from the wealth tax. There is no question of recognising a successor now. There is no question of anybody taking his place hereafter.

With regard to the Gift Tax Act, the provision is the same. There is no exemption from Gift Tax. Formerly, if any gift was made from the privy purse amount, may be to his relative or to his friend, that gift was free from gift tax. Now, no gift made from any *ex-gratia* payment is free from gift tax and no gift made from arrears of privy purse amount which might have been paid is free from gift tax. That exemption is altogether taken away.

With regard to Income-Tax, the provision is two-fold. There really a question arise as to the *ex-gratia* payment. Let me make it clear that the present Bill does not authorise *ex-gratia* payments. The authority for payment is not derived from this Bill. The authority for payment will come only when the Demands are considered by the House. The argument was that the House is not consulted. The House will certainly be consulted. Unless the House passes the Demands, no payment can be made at all. Therefore, there is no question of making any payment without consulting the House.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: But the House must be able to comprehend the demand.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I entirely agree with you. The question comes when the demand comes for consideration.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Before that.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: Whether it is for Rs. 10 crores or whatever it is, certainly, the hon. Member will be entitled to ask the Finance Minister as to whether there is any rational basis or, if he wants to say that the basis is irrational, certainly, he will be entitled to say that. So far as the present Bill is concerned, there is no authority to pay. All that it says is, in the event of a payment being sanctioned in the appropriate way by Parliament, then the *ex-gratia* payments will be free from Income-tax.

Now, it was said why this exemption from tax. What is the basic objective? If there is a difference

[Shri H. R. Gokhale] opinion on that, then that is a different matter. The word "princes" is such that everybody conceives that they are very big rulers. But the reality is that all the rulers are not big rulers. There are quite a few who are really small rulers. The privy purse payments were also very small. That is why, even at the time when the Bill was moved in the House for amending the Constitution, the Prime Minister said that we would look at this question not with any animus against individual princes. In fact, while it was left to me to pilot the Bill as subsequent stages, at that time, I had also said that particularly for the smaller princes, the Government will have to take into consideration as to whether some transitional payments should be made or not. This position was not left in any doubt.

Now, the question is, if this payment is to be made, if it is sanctioned by the Parliament, then there is no point in making the payment if it is subject to tax. The idea is to enable particularly the smaller rulers to rehabilitate themselves during the transitional period and to adjust themselves to the changed circumstances. The payment should not be in the nature of an eye-wash. Then, there is no point. If the payment is made and substantial percentage of it is taken away by the Government, it is only a payment in name. It is not a payment in fact to the ruler concerned and it does not serve the purpose for which the payment is sought to be made. That is why only in the event of an appropriate grant being approved by the House and a situation arising when a payment has to be made, then the particular clause relating to exemption from tax so far as these *ex-gratia* payments are concerned will operate.

It has also been said that while so much has been done and so much has been said about rulers for rehabilitating them or for enabling them to adjust to changed circumstances, nothing has been said in this Bill with regard to the number of employees of the ex-rulers. Let me make it quite clear at the outset that the Government is not behind anybody in their concern and in

their sympathy for the employees of the ex-rulers or at least for such of those as are likely to lose their jobs in the changed circumstances. I am in a position to say that the matter is under consideration of the Government. In fact, the State Governments have been approached and attempts are being made to see that as many of them as possible are absorbed in Government service in their appropriate places, according to their position, ability and so on and so forth. But it is not understandable how a provision with regard to absorption can be brought in this Bill. The Bill deals with the abolition of privileges. An unfortunate consequence is likely to occur of which the Government is aware and the Government is thinking of the matter and is taking precautions to see that some adequate steps are taken, that the State Governments do consider the matter sympathetically. Whether it is a question of unemployment of the employees of the former rulers or for that matter other unemployed persons, it is always the concern of the Government and the question of the employees of former rulers cannot escape the attention of the Government.

Something was also said with regard to heirloom jewellery. What was said was that this should not have been done. The provision which obtains before the passing of this Bill is that prior to the passing of the Wealth-tax Act, the heirloom jewellery of a very few rulers was recognised by the Central Government and the same was made the basis for exemption from Wealth Tax Act. When the Wealth Tax Act came, the provision was that the Central Board of Direct Taxes under the rules as framed by the Central Government would be entitled to control the use, utilisation, disposal, etc. of the heirloom jewellery and, subject to these rules, subject to these controls, the heirloom jewellery of some of the other rulers might be recognised. Nearly 25 rulers had applied and the cases of only those who had applied were considered by the Central Board of Direct Taxes. In their cases, on conditions which were imposed and which have been laid down by appropriate rules by the

Central Board of Direct Taxes, the heirloom jewellery was recognised as free from wealth tax.

The present Bill goes a step further. It wants to impose, in the case of heirloom jewellery recognised by the Central Government, similar conditions or, may I say, to a certain extent, more stringent than the rules framed by the Central Board of Direct Taxes under which heirloom jewellery has been recognised and exempted from wealth-tax. The result is that all rulers who had been claiming exemption from wealth tax now will be entitled to the exemption subject to the provisions of this Bill only if they abide by the conditions and terms which are given in one of the clauses of the proposed Bill. For example, there is control on the disposal, control on the substantial variations in the nature of jewellery and control over taking out their jewellery outside the country and so on and so forth.

There can be no ruler, after the passing of this Bill, who can be having heirloom jewellery without any kind of control imposed by the Government. Somebody suggested that these were antiquities and that Government could take them over. I might mention that the Antiquities Bill has been passed only recently, in this Session. 'Heirloom' itself means an article which has come down from generation to generation; that is the dictionary meaning of heirloom. If such jewellery is there and if it is over 100 years old as the Antiquities law provides, in appropriate cases, it is still open to the Government to consider whether it should be taken over or not. The provision here does not prevent the Government from taking it over; if it is heirloom which falls within the definition of 'antiquity' under the relevant Act passed by the House.

14 hrs.

I would assure the House that the Bill is in terms of what Government had stated when the Constitution (Twenty-sixth Amendment) Bill had been passed. It was made clear even at that time that, while it

was true that the anachronism of maintaining in this country a privileged class who went on getting privy purses without a corresponding functional responsibility should be abolished, Government did not want to vindictive, did not want to use its powers to attack the princes who really deserved some consideration and who were required to adjust themselves to changed circumstances. Therefore, the Bill which has been brought before the House is in keeping with the policy of the Government which has been stated before the House earlier also.

I am sure, when the question of authorising any payment in the nature of *ex-gratia* comes before the House, the members are bound to raise questions and Government is bound to give clarifications.

With these clarifications, I commend that the Bill be taken into consideration.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Mr Deputy-Speaker, may we seek your guidance now? Yesterday it was thought that if the discussion on this Bill preceded the discussion on the Supplementary Demands, then probably we would be in a position to comprehend the Demands with which we would be confronted. Now as the hon. Minister has said, this measure would apply only after the Supplementary Demand has been passed. Of course, the position is like that.

We do not know whether this should have preceded the Supplementary Demand or the Supplementary Demand should have preceded this measure in order to make us better informed about this matter. We really do not know. How are we going to understand the Demand fully? Do you want us to know from the Finance Minister when the Supplementary Demand comes up for discussion or would you like us to be equipped with information before we come to discuss the Supplementary Demand?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no conflict. The present Bill says that, in case there is *ex-gratia* payment, that payment will be exempted from income-tax.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: It would have been more logical to have the Supplementary Demand first.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In case there is any *ex-gratia* payment, whether the House should agree to a particular amount for this purpose, that will be taken up when the Demand comes before the House.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: We were promised yesterday that, during the course of the discussion of this measure, we would be able to know about the rationale behind the Supplementary Demand. But that promise is not being fulfilled.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not know who has made that commitment. As far as I can see, there is no conflict whatever. This is only an enabling provision. In case there is *ex-gratia* payment, that payment would be exempted from income-tax; if there is no *ex-gratia* payment, the question will not arise. The question of *ex-gratia* payment can be taken up when the Supplementary Demands are brought before the House.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What about the request of the House to the Chair that the House must be informed about the basis of the Supplementary Demand?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am sorry, I cannot enlighten you on this, under what circumstances that commitment was made. As far as I am concerned—and I am concerned with this Bill now—I see no conflict whatsoever.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Suppose tomorrow they come up with a Supplementary Demand for Rs. 250 crores as *ex-gratia* payment to these princes; then this Bill will permit that amount free of tax? Are we, as legislators, going to accept that?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is the meaning of this Bill.

The question is:

“That the Bill further to amend certain enactments, conse-

quent on derecognition of Rulers of Indian States and abolition of privy purses, so as to abolish the privileges of Rulers and to make certain transitional provisions to enable the said Rulers to adjust progressively to the changed circumstances, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up clause-by-clause consideration. There is no amendment to Clause 2.

The question is

“That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3—(Amendment of Act 5 of 1908)

SHRI M. KATHAMUTHU (Nagapattinam): I beg to move:

Page 2.

for lines 7 to 23, substitute—
“sub-section (1) shall be omitted.” (1)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall now put Amendment No 1 by Shri M. Kathamuthu to Clause 3, to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now I will put Clauses 3 and 4, to which there are no amendments to the vote of the House.

The question is:

“That Clauses 3 and 4 stand part of the Bill”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 3 and 4 were added to the Bill.

Clause 5—(Amendment of Act 27 of 1957.)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is one amendment to Clause 5 by Shri M. Kathamuthu.

SHRI M. KATHAMUTHU: I beg to move:

Pages 2 and 3,—

for lines 35 to 44 and 1 to 24, substitute—“(b) clause (xiv) shall be omitted.” (2)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The amendment given notice of by Shri Annasaheb Gotkhinde is barred by article 117(1) of the Constitution.

SHRI ANNASAHEB GOTKHINDE (Sangh): Why, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your amendment involves recommendation of President under article 117(1) of the Constitution which has not been received. Therefore, it cannot be moved.

SHRI ANNASAHEB GOTKHINDE: I have asked for it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It has not been received.

SHRI ANNASAHEB GOTKHINDE: Am I to be blamed for it?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not know. I am to run the House. That recommendation has not been received. It is not before me. I cannot say anything more.

I shall now put Amendment No 2 by Shri Kathamuthu to Clause 5 to the vote of the House

Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

“That Clause 5 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clause 7—(Amendment of Act 43 of 1961.)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is an amendment, No. 3, by Shri M. Kathamuthu.

SHRI M. KATHAMUTHU: I beg to move;

Page 3,—

omit lines 29 to 32. (3)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Gotkhinde, for the same reason mentioned by me earlier, your Amendment No. 5 cannot be moved: the same applies to your Amendments Nos. 7, 8 and 10. Your Amendment No. 6 can be moved.

SHRI ANNASAHEB GOTKHINDE: I beg to move:

Page 3, line 39,—

for “palace” substitute “building”. (6)

My Amendment No. 8 is like Amendment No. 6 . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your amendment involves some alteration in the tax-structure and it cannot be moved unless the President's recommendation to that effect is received.

SHRI ANNASAHEB GOTKHINDE: My submission is this. As you have stated, my Amendment No. 6 . . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That does not attract article 117(1) of the Constitution.

SHRI ANNASAHEB GOTKHINDE: Amendment No. 8 is a consequential amendment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I cannot argue with you on this.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I have not heard what was his submission.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The decision to accept an amendment or not to accept is for the Chair and the Chair is not to explain why, at least in the House.

SHRI PILOO MODY: My only submission is that the Chair is not intelligible. If he has a submission, it must be listened to. That is my submission.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I will put amendment No. 3 of Shri Kathamuthu to clause 7 to vote.

Amendment No. 3 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I will put amendment No. 6 to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 6 was put and negatived.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Sir, there is a split in the Congress:

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If Mr. Piloo Mody sometimes derives pleasure from that, I do not want to deny him that.

Now, the question is:

"That clause 7 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Clause 8 (New)

SHRI R. V. BADE (Khargone): I beg to move:

Page 4,—

after line 18, add—

"8. The Central Government shall provide maintenance allowance to the servants of the Ruler of the State and shall continue to give the same pay and allowances to the servants and staff of the Ruler and shall give pension after their retirement and all servants and the staff of a Ruler shall be treated as Government servants and this amount shall not be deducted from the *ex-gratia* payment of the Ruler." (11)

Now, that the Minister has said that the interests of the employees will be looked after, after the passing of the Bill, I am not pressing my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member have the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

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

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed".

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Bill is passed.

14.14 hrs.

SEEDS (AMENDMENT) BILL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we take up the Seeds (Amendment) Bill.

SHRI SURENDRA MOHANTY (Kendrapara): Sir, there is no quorum in the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung . . . Now there is quorum. The hon. Minister.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHAB P. SHINDE): I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to amend the Seeds Act, 1966, be taken into consideration."

Seeds constitute a very important input in agricultural production and to a very large measure the success in agricultural production in the last

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.