

## (iv) DELAY IN ARBITRATION ON NARMADA WATER DISPUTE

**SHRI P. M. MEHTA (Bhavnagar) :** With your permission, Sir, I bring a matter of public importance under Rule 377 to the notice of the House.

A very disturbing news has appeared in the press today in *Times of India* regarding Narmada Water award. The delay over the Prime Minister's award on the Narmada water dispute has now caused anxiety in official circles also.

Before ten months or so, the Chief Ministers of the four States, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Rajasthan shifted the Narmada Water dispute from the Tribuna and referred it to the hon. Prime Minister for arbitration. It was initially stated that the Prime Minister would give her award before 15th August, 1972. But for the reasons best known to the Government, the award is delayed and nobody is sure when the award will be given.

Now, as reported, the Irrigation Ministry has taken a decision to appoint an additional assessor on the Narmada Water Tribunal which was dealing with the matter before the reference to the Prime Minister. It is now feared that again the Narmada water dispute will be referred to the Tribunal.

The inordinate delay over the Prime Minister's award had already created doubts in the minds of the people of Gujarat and people are agitated. This reported news that again it will be referred to the Tribunal will further create anxiety and unrest in Gujarat.

Under these circumstances, I request the hon. Minister for Irrigation and Power to make a statement clarifying the whole position about the Narmada water dispute.

## (v) MALTREATMENT OF HARIJANS IN IZATNAGAR RAILWAY WORKSHOP

**श्री सरजू पांडे (गाजीपुर) :** अभी अध्यक्ष, महोदय, मुझे सूचना मिली है कि इज्जतनगर रेलवे कारखाने में चार दिनों से हरिजनों को मारा जा रहा है। जो हरिजन उस में काम करते हैं और गवर्नमेंट के एम्प्लोई हैं उन को मारा जा रहा है। सबणों की ओर से हरिजन मारो अभियान चलाया जा रहा है।

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

तो मैं रेलवे मंत्रालय का ध्यान इस ओर आकृष्ट करता हूँ। मंत्री महोदय फौरन इस के ऊपर ध्यान दें और वहाँ यह जो मारपीट की कार्यवाही चल रही है उसे बन्द करे।

12.38 hrs.

## CONSTITUTION (THIRTY-FIRST AMENDMENT) BILL

**MR. SPEAKER :** Before I call the Minister, may I tell you that the time fixed is 6 hours for the Bill? But later on it stood amended that the Minister will reply to the debate at 4 O'Clock.

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH) :** After the Minister finished his reply, the voting will take place, because this is a constitutional amendment Bill.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) :** Today, there are the elections to the three Parliamentary Committees. The prescribed time for the elections is from 11.30 A.M. to 4.30 P.M. Our Members have to be present here for voting on the Constitution amendment Bill. So, the voting on this should be after 4.30 P.M. Anybody who wants to cast his vote in the Committee elections should be free to do so upto 4.30 P.M. That margin should be allowed.

**MR. SPEAKER :** The Minister will start replying at 4 O'Clock and the voting will take place at 4.30 P.M. or so. That is all right. The hon. Minister.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) :** Sir, before you call upon the hon. Minister to speak I have just one submission to make. I had drawn your attention to a very serious issue.....

**MR. SPEAKER :** Don't do it like that without being permitted by me.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :** With your permission, I have stood up.

**MR. SPEAKER :** I did not permit you. I have already called the Minister.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI NITIRAJ-SINGH CHAUDHARY) :** Sir, I beg to move.\*

[Shri Nitiraj Singh Chaudhary]

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

At the outset, I would briefly mention the genesis of this Bill. The former Chief Election Commissioner had made various alternative proposals for increasing the strength of the House of the people.

Clause (a) of article 81 of the Constitution provides that the House of the people shall consist of not more than 500 members to be chosen by direct election from territorial constituencies in the States and not more than 25 members to represent the Union territories, chosen in such manner as parliament may, by law, provide. As a result of the enactment of the North-Eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Act, 1971 (81 of 1971), the total number of seats in the Lok Sabha allotted to the States has increased to 506, six more than the limit of 500 under article 81. For the present this increase is permissible under article 4 of the Constitution as a supplemental, incidental and consequential provision on account of reorganisation.

Clause (2) of article 81 of the Constitution lays down that, for the purposes of sub-clause (a) of clause (1), there shall be allotted to each State a number of seats in the House of the people in such manner that the ratio between that number and the population of the State is, so far as practicable, the same for all States and that each State shall be divided into territorial constituencies in such manner that the ratio between the population of each constituency and the number of seats allotted to it is, so far as practicable, the same throughout the State. Under Clause (3) of article 81, the expression "population" means the population as ascertained in the last preceding census of which the relevant figures have been published. Article 82 provides that, on the completion of each census, the allocation of seats in the House of the people to the States and the division of each State into territorial constituencies shall be readjusted by such authority and in such manner as parliament may, by law, determine.

It may be noted that the scheme of article 81 and 82 of the Constitution envisages as authority constituted by parliament, namely, the Delimitation Commission, undertaking

the readjustment of the constituencies and re-allocation of seats having regard to the basic criterion of equitable distribution provided in clause (2) of article 81. The direct consequence of the task of delimitation as envisaged by the relevant provisions of the Constitution would be an adverse impact on the number of seats allocated to the States in the House of the People at present, if the strength of the Lok Sabha is maintained at the present level.

In pursuance of Article 82, Parliament has enacted the Delimitation Act, 1972 and the Delimitation Commission has been constituted. It will be noticed that adherence to the principles laid down in clause (2) of Article 81 by the Delimitation Commission in undertaking readjustment on the basis of the 1971 census figures may have the effect of affecting the number of seats allotted to the States in the House of the People. It is felt that it would be better to ensure that any readjustment and consequent allocation of seats do not adversely affect the existing number of seats allotted to each State in the House of the people and to achieve this purpose it would be necessary to increase the strength of the Lok Sabha suitably.

In order to ensure that there is no reduction in the existing representation in the House of the People in respect of any of the States, Clause (2) of the Bill seeks to amend Article 81 so as to increase the upper limit for representation of the States from 500 to 525. The opportunity is taken to increase the limit for the Union Territories from 25 to 20, as the existing representation for Union Territories is only 16. The Government also considers it necessary to make an amendment in clause (2) of Article 81 to provide that the provisions of sub-clause (a) of clause (2) of Article 81 shall not be applicable to any State so long as its population does not exceed six millions. This is to ensure that the existing representation in the Lok Sabha is maintained for the smaller State of Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Tripura, each of which has a population of less than six millions.

Article 330 of the Constitution relates to reservation of seats in the Lok Sabha for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes,

The provisions of this article have, however, been made inapplicable to the State of Nagaland on the ground that it has a predominantly tribal population. According to the 1971 census, 88.6 per cent of Nagaland's population belong to the Scheduled Tribes. The corresponding figures for the State of Meghalaya and the Union Territories of Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram are 80.5 per cent, 79.0 per cent and 94.3 per cent, respectively. The Government, therefore, consider that the provisions of Article 330 should not apply also to the predominantly tribal units of Meghalaya, Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram. Similarly, it is considered that, as in the case of Nagaland, there need be no reservation of seats for Scheduled Tribes in the Legislative Assembly of the State of Meghalaya and that Article 33 of the Constitution may be amended suitably. Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill seek to achieve these objects.

Thus, the Constitution (Thirty-first Amendment) Bill, 1973 seeks to amend Articles 81, 330 and 332 of the Constitution. It is necessary that the amendment to Article 81 is passed and the process of ratification concluded early to enable the Delimitation Commission to undertake its task having regard to the increased size of the Lok Sabha, namely 545 (525 for the States and 20 for Union Territories) as against the present 525 (500 for the States and 25 for Union Territories).

From the foregoing it will be appreciated that while the present Bill seeks to ensure that by reason of readjustment of constituencies and re-allocation of seats consequent thereto by the Delimitation Commission set up under the Delimitation Act, 1972 there shall not be any adverse effect on the seats now allocated to the States in the Lok Sabha, which has gone up to 506, it avoids an automatic acceptance of the principles that an increase in the population should necessarily mean an increase in the strength of the Lok Sabha. In other words, the Bill has a limited objective.

I, therefore, commend the Bill for the consideration of the House and its acceptance and adoption.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : But the Minister has not explained as to where will the Members sit. What will be the

seating arrangements? That should also be explained.

MR. SPEAKER : That I will have to see. You need not worry about it. At least we would not change your seat.

Motion moved :

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

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan) : This is the third amendment of Art. 81 of the Constitution. In 1956 and also in 1969 we have had amendments. The hon. Minister has said that this Bill seeks to achieve a limited objective, to increase the number of representatives in the Lok Sabha, consequent upon increase in population; from 500 it is made 525 and the representation from territories is being reduced from 25 to 20. If you see the Statement of Objects and Reasons you will find that weightage is given in two forms. One is to the effect that representation to the States will not be reduced even if there is reduction in the population. I read from the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it says :

It will be noticed that adherence to the principles laid down in cl. (2) of Art. 81 by the Delimitation Commission in undertaking readjustment as enjoined by art. 82 on the basis of the 1971 census figures may have the effect of affecting the number of seats allotted to the States in the House of the People. It is felt that it would be better to ensure that any readjustment and consequent allocation of seats does not adversely affect the existing no. of seats allotted to each State in the House of the People and to achieve this purpose it would be necessary to increase the strength of the Lok Sabha suitably.

Therefore, this is one type of weightage that is being given. The other type is in the proposed proviso to clause (2) of Article 81. It is stated there—

In clause (2), after sub-clause (b), the following proviso shall be inserted, namely, —

"Provided that the provisions of sub-clause (a) of this clause shall not be applicable for the purpose of allot-

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

ment of seats in the House of the People to any State so long as the population of that State does not exceed 6 millions."

I would like to know on what basis this figure of 525 was arrived at. Was it on an *ad hoc* basis? Or has it got any relation to the census figures and so on? On what basis has this computation been arrived at, I would like to know. How long are we to go on changing the strength of the House to keep pace with increase in population?

12:53 hrs.

[SHRI N. K. P. SALVE *in the Chair*].

Some basis will have to be evolved for limiting the strength of this House. The Constitution, as you will see, does not envisage any alteration or amendment of Article 81 periodically depending upon census figures.

Article 82 provides the following :—

"Upon the completion of each census, the allocation of seats in the House of the People to the States and the division of each State into territorial constituencies shall be readjusted by such authority and in such manner as Parliament may by law determine."

Parliament has passed the Delimitation Bill of 1972 after the last census. Section 8 of the Delimitation Act says that the Delimitation Commission shall, on the basis of several provisions of the Constitution, statutorily determine the number of seats in the House of the People to be allocated to each State. So, the first task of the Delimitation Commission is to decide which State will have how many seats. Section 9 of the present Act then says : after the determination of seats is made in relation to each State then the constituencies have to be determined according to certain principles laid down. Now, kindly see what is sought to be done. In the proposed amendment the proviso is that the provisions of sub-clause (a) of Article 81 shall not apply to smaller States whose population does not exceed six millions. Therefore, in respect of those States whose population does not exceed six million Section 8 of the Delimitation

Act does not make any provision. The result would be that so far as those States are concerned whose population does not exceed six million no standard or guideline is sought to be laid down. The position will be that so far as other States are concerned Article 81 (2)(a) will be applicable which says that as far as practicable the same ratio between the number of seats and the population has to be maintained but this sub-article is not made applicable to smaller States. On what basis will there be determination of number of seats in the smaller States. Section 8 of the Delimitation Act requires the Commission to fix the number of seats for each State including small States but you say the Delimitation Commission shall not refer to the principles laid down in Article 81(2)(a) of the Constitution. How will the Delimitation Commission fix the number of seats in respect of those smaller States? I believe this is a legislative lacuna. Therefore, it is essential that along with the amendment of the Constitution you should think of amendment of the Delimitation Act also. I do not know whether Government is giving thought to this problem but this is a matter which should not be ignored; otherwise there will be a serious lacuna.

There is the other aspect of the matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the House namely at what point of time a limit is to be put on the representation in the House of the People. We are not enamoured of a particular figure of say 525,530 or 545. What I wish to emphasise is that a mere increase in the number of seats in the House will not bring about certain desired changes for which there is a considerable body of opinion. There was a committee formed of the Members of this House for going into the question of electoral reforms. They were also asked to suggest alterations and amendments to the Representation of the People Act. The Committee went into this matter and made recommendations. I would like to know how far Government are going to take or have taken steps to implement those recommendations.

13:00 hrs.

One of the very important things which we have been pressing for is a change in the very system of election, namely from

direct election into election on a proportional representation basis. Otherwise, we do not get the real choice of the people reflected in the results of the elections. This is a matter which should agitate the mind of Government as it does agitate the minds of the people. Merely increasing the number of Members of Lok Sabha will not solve the problem.

Another very important thing is to bring about necessary electoral reforms, in regard to the election expenditure, the methods that are being adopted in the elections and so on. We have been complaining about the manner in which election has been held. In the last general elections in West Bengal in 1972, there have been serious charges of rigging. Even in the last by-election held at Howrah in West Bengal, serious charges have been made. Government seem to be completely oblivious of this for the simple reason that that they take it up in a completely partisan spirit; and no proper approach is being made to these charges, and no inquiries are being held, and I am very sorry to say that the Election Commission has become one of those sets of committed persons who are trying to help the Government. Merely bringing forward periodical amendment to the Constitution in order to increase the number of Members of the House will not solve the problem at all and will not achieve the desired objectives.

I would like to point out one other aspect in regard to the working of the Delimitation Commission. In the last report of the Delimitation Commission it had been pointed out that they were facing serious handicaps in carrying out their activities. Maps had not been given to them, and data had not been given to them, and they did not even have road maps. Although the Act says that the constituencies have to be delimited on the basis of geographically compact areas, they do not even get the relevant data to carry out their obligation. The real situation is this that this Government has no faith in holding elections on the proper basis. They have no faith in the democratic norms. That is why in this country, even though the highest court in the land, namely the Supreme Court, had struck down the MISA, the persons arrested under that draconian

law which has been struck down are being rearrested; persons who have never been held guilty of the commission of any offence are being handcuffed, and with ropes tied round their waists, they are being brought back to the jails. This is their faith in the democratic norms.

Therefore, I would submit that the serious lacunae in the Act should be taken note of and necessary amendments should be brought forward to the Delimitation Act to make it work properly.

**SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Chattrapur) :**  
 This Bill seeks to amend article 81 with a view to raise the strength of the Lok Sabha from 523 to 545. The basis for doing so seems to be that there is an increase in population, and, therefore, there should be an increase in the number of seats.

The original principle that was adopted at the time of the framing of the Constitution was that at least a million people should have one representative in the House of the People. Accordingly, each State was divided into certain territorial constituencies, and the ratio between the number of seats allotted to each State with regard to the population of the State was taken into consideration and seats were allotted. Now, there is a rise in population, and, therefore, it seems to be necessary to increase the number of seats. But putting the limit at 545 is something arbitrary, which is not based on any principle or reason. If the idea is to give larger representation to States because there is an increase in population, there will be no limit. What is the need for giving larger representation to the States because there is an increase in population? Let us not forget that ours is a federal structure. Every State has a Legislative Assembly which is autonomous. It functions within the powers conferred on each State and each Legislature under the Constitution. If the Government want to increase the number of seats, let them first think of the Assemblies. Suppose there is an increase in population in any State of 10, 20 or 40 lakhs let the seats in the Assembly of the State concerned be increased subject to a maximum of 500 as per art. 170 which says that the strength of a Legislative Assembly shall not exceed 500. The strength of the U.P. Assembly is 425 and that of Orissa Assembly

[Shri Jagannath Rao]

140. In Orissa, our population was 1.7 crores or so. Now it is 2.24 crores. I can understand if the strength of the State Assemblies is increased consistent with the rise in population. Ours being a federal structure, I do not see any why the Lok Sabha should have increased representation simply because there is an increase in population.

In U. K. the House of Commons has a strength of 630. In Italy, the House of Deputies is 630 strong. In the U.S. the House of representatives has a strength of 435. In our case, we have fixed 500 as a *via medea* taking into consideration the population. If one member can represent one million, I do not see any reason why he cannot represent 1.2 or 1.3 million.

Secondly, art. 82 of the Constitution does not give power to increase the number of seats. The Delimitation Act passed under art. 82 does not give to the Delimitation Commission power to increase the number of seats. The strength of the Assembly and Parliament is fixed under the Constitution. Art. 81 fixes the number of seats for the Lok Sabha and art. 170 fixes the maximum strength of the Assembly. Within that maximum, if at all Government want to increase representation, let the strength of the Legislative Assemblies be increased.

It may be argued that the electorate will be unwieldy and it will not be possible for the candidates to tour the whole constituency to canvass for the election. I do not think that is a valid objection. If a candidate can deal with one million people, there is no reason why he cannot take on 1.2 million because of the improved transport facilities, communications etc.

Now we sit in the Lok Sabha. If the strength is increased, we will be jammed and we will be packed like sardines. Physical difficulties are also there apart from the additional expenditure. Then we may have to have a bigger building for the Lok Sabha. Why should we incur so much more expenditure? I do not see any reason why there should be any thinking about increasing the number of seats for the Lok Sabha simply on the ground that the population has increased.

Does it mean that after ten years, there will again be an increase in the strength of the Lok Sabha from 445 to 600? The only principle involved in this article is that one number should represent one million. If there is an addition to that number in the States, the strength of the Legislative Assemblies in States could be increased subjects to a limit of 500. I do not see any reason why the Lok Sabha should have greater representation simply on the ground of increase in population.

Sometime ago the Election Commission had made a proposal for giving one more seat in the Lok Sabha for Orissa. At present, we have only 20 seats. But if you take the increase in population, it is nearly 44 to 46 lakhs. You give the representation to the Assembly. Then the difficulty would be, if there are four million people by way of increase in population, we should get four Lok Sabha seats, as, for one million there is one Lok Sabha seat. Therefore, this arbitrary fixing of one extra Lok Sabha seat to Orissa. I cannot appreciate. On the other hand, I would prefer instead of giving one extra seat here, let there be 20 seats or 30 seats, according to the increase in population, given to the Orissa Assembly.

Therefore, I am not very much enthused over this Bill, and I do not see any reason why this Bill should be brought at all. I can appreciate these Union territories or States which are having their representation should not suffer but I do not think any State will suffer if the population goes on increasing uniformly in all the States. The Union territories' strength, the number of seats they have today, should be retained. I am not for reducing the number of seats for any State or Union territory. But I do not see any reason why the Government should be anxious to come forward with legislation to increase the strength of the Lok Sabha, because, there will be practical and physical difficulties which we will be experiencing in 1976 to seat a larger number of members. Even now, we are finding difficult, apart from the financial commitments.

Therefore, while I do not oppose the Bill, I do not see any need for the Bill.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, before introducing this Bill before the

House, the Prime Minister had a discussion with the representatives of the Opposition parties, and I do not think any consensus was arrived at. But, on the whole, everybody felt that something should be done to reduce the burden of election expenses of the candidate. You are aware that in every constituency of the Lok Sabha, except Delhi and the small Union territories, the minimum number of voters is from five lakhs to nearly seven and a half lakhs. It is almost impossible for the candidate to contact the voters without spending a huge amount. I am fortunate to contest the election from Kanpur city where I can move in a vehicle ; even on a cycle rickshaw I can cover the whole city. But what happens to these who have to contact their voters within a radius of 60,70 or 80 miles (*Interruption*) or even 100 Miles as my colleague, Mr. Jagannathrao Joshi says ? He is a bachelor and he can do it, but other people may not be able to do it. In that case, it becomes difficult, and now, when the new census figures are available, and the population has increased despite our family planning, the minimum number of voters will be about a million and a half in some places and not less than a million practically in all other places. Is it feasible to contact so many voters and will it be possible for any MP to confine himself within the limits of the election expenses of Rs. 35,000 for a Lok Sabha seat ?

A committee of this House was set up, including the members of the other House also, to consider some of the recommendations made by the Chief Election Commissioner as to how the election expenses could be reduced and what amendments could be made in the Representation of the People Act. Fortunately, I was a member of that committee which spent months, and with great difficulty, some of the recommendations were made unanimously. We were told that those recommendations would be brought before the Government and the Representation of the People Act would be amended to suit the convenience of those who fight the elections. There were many suggestions as to how the election expenses could be reduced. But I am surprised that that report has not been laid on the Table of the House nor has it seen the light of the day. I want to know from the hon. Minister what happened to

that report. We were told that this could not be brought in as a piece of legislation but notifications and Government orders would be issued and thus the recommendations might be implemented. None of the recommendations have been implemented as yet. I want to know the fate of these recommendations ; my hon. friend Shri Somnath Chatterjee has also mentioned about this.

It has been mentioned in the Statement of Objects and reasons :

"In pursuance of article 82, Parliament has enacted the Delimitation Act, 1972 and the Delimitation Commission has been constituted to undertake the necessary task of the readjustment envisaged in article 82....."

Delimitation work has already started. I should say I am a victim of delimitation. I invite any Member of this House to visit Kanpur and see with his own eyes whether areas like Karanpura where there are three ordnance factories, another suburb which has three cinema houses, and Shastri Nagar which has one of the largest number of labour colonies with a population of 15,000 to 20,000 mill workers, whether these are rural areas or urban areas because this entire area has been declared to be rural area. An area which has three ordnance factories, three cinema houses and 50-60,000 or even about a lakh of persons has been declared rural area. Not a blade of grass grows there. No rice or paddy is grown there. Bastis are for the convenience of Congress candidates. This area has been taken away from my constituency and declared as rural area. What is the Urban area today in Kanpur ? Kanpur city. I have been given about 134 villages and I have been told : be consoled with this as an urban area. I invite the Delimitation Commission and the hon. Law Minister to come and see.

श्री मधु सिन्घे (बांका) : सभापति महोदय, मेरा ब्यबस्था का प्रश्न है। आप को याद होगा कि जब यह बिल पेश किया गया, तो उस समय नियम के अनुसार मैंने अपने आक्षेप पेश किये थे। तब सभापति महोदय ने फ़रमाया था—और कानून मंत्री ने भी कहा था—कि जब इस कानून पर विचार करने के

[श्री मधु लिमये]

लिए प्रस्ताव पेश किया जायेगा, तो उस समय मैं बोलू और मुझे तभी जवाब दिया जायगा। लेकिन आश्चर्य की बात है कि कबीना के मंत्री सदन में उपस्थित ही नहीं हैं। हमारे द्वारा जो मुद्दे उपस्थित किये जायेंगे, उन का जवाब कौन देगा। वह क्या कर रहे हैं। इसना महत्वपूर्ण बिल है और कानून मंत्री गायब है।

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH : Unfortunately the Law Minister was taken suddenly ill this morning ; he is now hospitalised and he has been advised rest. Therefore the Minister of State in the Ministry, Mr. Nitiraj Singh, will handle the Bill. He has just gone out temporarily for a human purpose.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : What I was trying to explain was this. The Delimitation Commission should have come to the conclusion after the objective consideration of the representations from the various candidates. I have nothing against my hon. friend, the Deputy Minister for Finance Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi, who has been given the best area of my seat.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha) : You should not grudge for the hon. lady member.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I have no grudge against her. The question is this. If an inquiry is made into this, it will reveal that in Kanpur where there are three Ordnance Factories—this has 60,000 population—and four cinema houses and there are other areas where no rice is grown, why was this considered a rural area and 134 villages only have become an urban area. If this is the way of declaring any area as urban area then I have nothing to say. I would request the Law Minister that he should study the position first and I should be convinced or those members who are suffering because of this should also be convinced. The constituency should not be changed because of the need of somebody or because of the need of the ruling party.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI (Kokrajhar) : All parties interfere with this—not only the ruling party.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please do not have a dialogue.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI : I say so because I happened to be a Member of the Delimitation Commission.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : If you were a Member of the delimitation Commission then it is still worse. That is the most unfortunate part of it. When this is a question of increasing the number of seats in the Lok Sabha, I do not agree with what the hon. Member Shri Jaganath Rao said about that. What do you say to the seating arrangement here ? Previously, an objection was raised as to why this should be increased. Later on it was found out that it was necessary to raise the number to 525. I do not know what is the mechanism for accommodating more number of them. I am told that the House of Commons, all Members do not attend the session. Their system of voting is quite different. In our country there is an automatic voting system. All of us must be present there in their seats at the time of voting. In the House of Commons the number of seats is less than the number of Members. I want to know what is going to be the mechanism here in case it happens that all Members are present in the House and if you are going to increase the seats, are you going to have another Lok Sabha building ? If not, may I suggest that we may have a double shift—morning and night shifts—or else there should be a system by which some members should not be asked to attend the session so that the Members could be accommodated within the number of seats provided for. I do not know how you are going to accommodate if the number is going to be increased in the Lok Sabha. My objection is this. Is it at all necessary to reduce the seats in Union Territories ? Union Territories are places where people from different parts of the country come and settle down. Backwardness of the area is removed as a result of that. Once they represent in the Lok Sabha, they can possibly highlight the problems of the persons living here. I have a feeling that this should not be reduced so far as seats in the Union Territories are concerned.

Coming to the Bill proper, for example, it has been stated as follows:-

“3(1) In article 330 of the Constitution in sub-clause (b) of clause (1),

for the words "except the Scheduled Tribes in the tribal areas of Assam and in Nagaland; and"; the following shall substituted, namely:-

"except the Scheduled Tribes—

- (i) in the tribal areas of Assam;
- (ii) in Nagaland;
- (iii) in Meghalaya;
- (iv) in Arunachal Pradesh, and
- (v) in Mizoram; and".

I think this is a good suggestion and we should accept that. My suggestion will be that before the recommendations of the Delimitation Commission are implemented, the report of the Election Commission on some of the important recommendations should also be studied. We should be definitely told why that report has not been implemented. Secondly, the Delimitation Commission should review all the past cases where injustice has been or is alleged to have been done. Thirdly, about this number 525, how are these members to be accommodated.

I want the maximum representation for the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes in this House. They form the backbone of the country. In the meeting convened by the Prime Minister, we supported this only on the assumption that more and more representation will be given to those who are at the lowest levels of society. These are the people on whom depends the entire country. They are only patted on the back for their good work but never rewarded. If they come here, then this will become the real Parliament. People from the peasantry and the working classes should come here. Once upon a time Parliament was meant only for the sophisticated intellectuals. Once Pandit Nehru was angry in this House and said, "This House has been converted into a market" Dr. Lohia, who was alive—Mr. Limaye will bear me out—said laughingly:

मुझ को ख़ुशी है आज कि यह दरबार से आज बाज़ार तो बना है, लोग चर्चा तो करते हैं ।

I am also of the same opinion. People may talk rudely here and may not observe sophisticated decorous procedures. But they actually come from the masses and

they are the real representatives. Once they are elected to this House, they will work for real socialism and democracy. Without imputing motives to anyone, I will say, the sophisticated intellectuals only fight for quorum and decorum and not for the substance, the bread and butter of the toiling masses.

With these words, I support the Bill. My observations should be considered objectively and dispassionately and then replied to by the minister.

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN (Kangra) Sir, this Bill aims at increasing the strength of Lok Sabha and reducing the number of seats for Union Territories. There is provision also for keeping the representation of the smaller States intact with a population of less than 6 million. The principle enunciated here is that as there is rise in population, so it is necessary to increase the number of seats. On the face of it, it looks all right but it has many deeper implications. After every census, after every 10 years, will the number of seats in Lok Sabha go up by 25 or 30? Will you reward the States who have not implemented the family planning programme on which huge amounts of national money have been spent by the Central Government? In the fourth plan, Rs 300 crores were spent on family planning. Yet, this very Bill tries to reward those States which have failed to implement those programmes and penalises those States which have implemented these programmes. This is a contradiction. On the one hand, we are trying to limit the rise in population and, on the other hand, we are rewarding those States which have not implemented the family planning programmes. In fact, this Bill should have aimed at penalising the States, and representatives of those States, which have failed to implement the national policies. We should examine in the wider perspective the proposal whether the number of seats for each State should not be fixed permanently, irrespective of the increase or decrease in population. In that case, those States which have failed to implement the national policy on family planning will be penalised in the sense that their representatives will have to represent a larger number of people. Then they will

[Shri Vikram Mahajan]

be more careful in the future and ensure that the population in their State does not go up.

There is no principle involved in raising the number of seats with every rise in population. If we follow that principle, by 2,000 AD we will have to raise the number of seats to 700 or 800. How can we accommodate that much members in this House? Probably, we will be forced to build another chamber for the Lok Sabha where there will be seating arrangements for 700 to 800 members.

Shri Jaganatha Rao Made the suggestion that Parliament should have only a fixed number of seats and, in case there is increase in population we can think of increasing the number of seats in the State Legislatures. Though there is some substance in what he has suggested, I do not think it is a workable proposition. Because, in the case of State Legislatures also the difficulty about seating accommodation will arise. So, while we may accept what has been suggested for the present occasion, in future we should not increase the seats in the legislatures according to the population. Each State should have a fixed number of seats, irrespective of increase or decrease in population.

I would say that this Bill should have been referred to a Select Committee to find out whether there are other systems prevailing in other countries to meet contingencies of this nature.

Coming to the Union Territories, I think the time has come when the Union Territories should be abolished and they should be given the status of States. They should not be allowed to remain "colonies", a term which I used in the case of Himachal Pradesh before it was granted Statehood. I think every Union Territory should have the right to decide about itself. The argument advanced usually is that they are politically undeveloped. I think after 25 years of independence there is hardly any region of the country which can be deemed as politically undeveloped. Therefore, there should be some re-organisation Commission solely to look into the problems of the Union Territories. It is high time that the Union Territories were abolished and replaced by full-fledged States.

With these suggestions, I support the Bill with the proviso that this should be the last time when the number of seats would be increased. In future, the increase in population should not be the criterion for increasing the number of seats in the legislatures.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (शाजापुर) : सभापति महोदय, इस सदन की संख्या बढ़ाने की दृष्टि से 31वां संशोधन विधेयक पेश किया गया है। इस सन्दर्भ में कुछ बातें ध्यान में रखना बहुत आवश्यक है। इस संख्या को बढ़ाने के दो कारण बताये गये हैं—एक तो यह कि यहां पर हर दस साल के बाद जनगणना होती है, उस के हिसाब से कुछ संख्या बढ़ानी पड़ी है और दूसरे—ईस्टर्न रिजन में जो राज्यों का रीऑर्गेनिजेशन हुआ है, उस की वजह से सदन की संख्या जो पहले 500 निश्चित की गई थी, अब 506 हो गई है। मेरे पूर्ववक्ता ने जन-गणना के सम्बन्ध में अपने जो विचार रखे हैं—मैं उनसे सहमत हूँ, क्योंकि जब कमेटी में यह विषय आया था तब भी मैंने कहा था कि यदि एक बार इस सिद्धांत को स्वीकार कर लिया कि 'जैसे-जैसे जनसंख्या बढ़ेगी तो प्रतिनिधियों की संख्या भी बढ़ेगी तो उस का नतीजा यह होगा कि हमारा फीमिली प्लानिंग का जो कार्यक्रम है, वह उल्टी दिशा में चलने लगेगा। जैसे तामिलनाडु की संख्या 41 है, लेकिन अब इस के अन्तर्गत 39 हो जायगी, तो उन को महसूस होने लगा है कि यह हम से गलती हुई है, हमारी संख्या घटने लगी है। अगर संख्या के आधार पर प्रतिनिधित्व रहा तो आगे चल कर जो पैसा परिवार नियोजन पर खर्च होगा, उस का परिणाम अच्छा नहीं निकलेगा।

हमारे संविधान निर्माताओं के सामने संविधान बनाते हुए जो कल्पना थी, उस के हिसाब से उन्होंने 500 की संख्या रखी थी और संविधान की धारा 81 और 82 में भी उन्होंने रीएडजस्टमेंट की बात की है, बढ़ाने की बात नहीं की है। धारा 170 के अनुसार उन्होंने असेम्बली के लिये 60 से लेकर 500 तक की

मर्यादा शाली है, किसी भी छोटी स्टेट के लिये कम से कम 60 और अधिक से अधिक 500 हो और जहां तक मुझे मालूम है किसी भी प्रदेश की असेम्बली में 500 तक संख्या नहीं पहुंची है। उत्तर प्रदेश में भी 425 संख्या है। इस लिये यदि इस में संख्या के अनुसार ही प्रतिनिधित्व बढ़ायेंगे तो इस की कोई मर्यादा नहीं रहेगी।

इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार एक निर्णय पर पहुंचें कि यह जो अब 525 की संख्या की है—कम से कम यह लक्ष्य रखा मान ली जाये, आगे इस संख्या को नहीं बढ़ायेंगे, क्योंकि 500 के शून्य अच्छे नहीं लगते हैं, इस के आगे कुछ रखना चाहिये, इस लिये 525 संख्या अच्छी है—लेकिन अब आगे के लिये यह लक्ष्य रखा मानी जायेगी।

दूसरी बात मुझे रीआर्गेनिजेशन के सम्बन्ध में कहना है—यह जो ईस्टर्न रिजन में स्टेट्स बनी हैं—एक प्रकार से सिद्धान्तहीन प्रदेश बनते चले जा रहे हैं। प्रदेश के लिये संख्या 60 हो—इस को तो माना जा सकता है, लेकिन कितनी संख्या का प्रदेश बने, इस का कोई सिद्धांत नहीं है। मनमाने ढंग से प्रदेश बनते जाते हैं—कैसे बनते हैं, क्यों बनते हैं, किसी को समझ में नहीं आता है। दादरा व नागरहवेली को वे लीजिये, यह पहले पुर्तगाल, हिस्सा था, 1954 में आजाद हो गया, आजाद हुआ तो आज तक आजाद है, न बम्बई प्रदेश में शामिल किया गया, न गुजरात में शामिल किया गया और न पुराने गोआ में शामिल किया गया—गोआ भी अलग है और यह प्रदेश भी अलग है। किस आधार पर बनाया जाता है, कुछ समझ में नहीं आता है। अंग्रेजों के जमाने में धीरे-धीरे अधिकार देने की बात होती थी, कुछ केन्द्र में अधिकार देते थे, कुछ प्रदेशों में देते थे, लेकिन हमारे यहां तो अधिकारों की मूल श्रोत जनता है। चाहे पंचायत का चुनाव हो या पार्लियामेंट का चुनाव हो, सब में जनता भाग लेती है। जिस समय संविधान बना था, उस समय

ए०, बी०, सी०, डी०, चार प्रकार के प्रदेशों की कल्पना की गई थी। लेकिन उस के बाद जब रीआर्गेनिजेशन कमीशन बँठा तो उस समय ऐसा तय किया गया कि सिर्फ ए क्लास स्टेट्स रहेंगी, कुछ युनियन टैरिटरीज रहेंगी। लेकिन आज फिर बड़ी स्टेट्स छोटी स्टेट्स और युनियन टैरिटरीज बन रही हैं। मैं पूछता हूँ कि हिमाचल प्रदेश, मणिपुर, त्रिपुरा—इन प्रदेशों को बनाते समय किन सिद्धांतों को सामने रख कर बनाया गया। हिमाचल प्रदेश बना, सब ने बड़ा समर्थन किया, लेकिन दिल्ली प्रदेश वाले लगातार मांग कर रहे हैं, वहाँ कोई भी ऐसी पार्टी नहीं है जो समर्थन नहीं कर रही है, इन्क्यूबिंग कांग्रेस पार्टी, सब कहते हैं कि दिल्ली का अलग प्रदेश बनना चाहिये—क्यों नहीं बनता है ? जब हम सिद्धान्तहीन बातें करते हैं तो उस में ऐसी गड़बड़ होती है—ईस्टर्न रिजन को प्रतिनिधित्व दे दिया, लेकिन दिल्ली को नहीं देना चाहते। सब को प्रतिनिधित्व मिलना चाहिये। इस के लिये दो मत नहीं हैं। किन्तु हमारे ही एक प्रतिनिधि ने यहाँ पर एक बिल पेश किया था उस में एक मामूली सी मांग की गयी थी कि हरिजन और बनवासी जो हैं उन को अपनी संख्या के अनुपात में प्रतिनिधित्व दिया जाय। जितनी उन की संख्या है उस के अनुपात में प्रतिनिधित्व दिया जाय। समझ में नहीं आता कि उस को क्यों ठुकरा दिया गया। शायद उन की संख्या के अनुपात से अगर प्रतिनिधित्व देते तो सम्भव है कि एक, दो सीटें बढ़ जातीं। लेकिन उस को नहीं माना गया। आज आप 500 से 525 तक इस सदन की सदस्य संख्या बढ़ा रहे हैं। तो कम से कम इस पर ध्यान दे कर हरिजन और बनवासी लोगों के लिये उन की संख्या के अनुपात में, यदि पिछली जनगणना के अनुपात में बढ़ा रहे हैं, तो उन के लिये भी संख्या के अनुपात में उन का भी प्रतिनिधित्व बढ़ाने की बात करते तो एक अच्छी बात होती। मैं चाहूँगा कि इस पर ध्यान दिया जाय।

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

हमारी बात यह है कि जितनी स्मालर स्टेट्स हैं उन की सख्या भी कितनी रखनी चाहिये, क्योंकि 60 तक बिल्कुल सर्वैधानिक है, रखनी चाहिये। इस लिये जनगणना के बाद यदि आप को कुछ ज्यादा अलाटमेंट करना है तो लोक सभा की करने के बजाय यदि विधान सभाओं के लिये करते तो अच्छा रहता, क्यों कि वहा गुजायश है 60 से से कर 500 तक बढ़ाने की गुजायश दी हुई है। इसलिये वहा सख्या बढ़ाते। यहा सख्या नही बढ़ानी चाहिये थी। यहा जब सख्या बढा रहे थे तो कमेटी में यह कहा गया था कि लोक सभा का क्षेत्र बहुत बडा होता है, 10 लाख लोगो से मिलना, उन से सम्पर्क बनाये रखना, मुश्किल हो जाता है। यह बात मही है। आप को अगर देखना ही है, तो अनग ढग से हम को देखे कि चुनाव कैसे सस्ता और सुलभ हो, साधन कैसे उपलब्ध हो, इम दृष्टि में देखे। जो व्यक्ति 7 लाख लोगो से जा कर मिल सवना है वह 10 लाख लोगो के पास भी जा कर मिल सकता है, सिवाय उन लोगो को छोड कर जिन के पाम जीपे नही होनी। मेरे लिये एक लाख लोगो से मिलना भी बडा मुश्किल है क्योंकि मेरे पास जीप नही है। भोपाल मे मेरे क्षेत्र को जाने मे 6, 6 घंटे लगते है। हम ने चाहा कि हमको जीप मिले ताकि क्षेत्र के लोगो मे सीधे सम्पर्क रहे। इसलिये लोक सभा की सख्या बढा कर वह काम नही चलेगा, सोचना यह चाहिये कि चुनाव कैसे सुलभ हो, और व्यक्तिगत सम्पर्क कैसे बढे, इस दृष्टि से इस को सोचे। और जो मुझाव इलेक्टोरल रिफार्स कमेटी ने दिया था उस पर फिर आप एक बार ध्यान दे। और जैसा माननीय सोमनाथ चटर्जी ने कहा था कि डीनिमिडेशन एक्ट में, जो छोटी-छोटी स्टेट्स बनी हैं, जिम को बेटेज दिया है, इस के लिये कोई सिद्धांत निश्चित नही है, यह एक लैकुना है जो माननीय चटर्जी ने बताया था, उस से मैं सहमत हू। वरना सरकार मनमाने ढग से प्रदेश बनाती जाय तो सख्या जरूर बढने

वाली है। इसलिये आगे चल कर ऐसा न हो, सिधधान बनाने वालो के सामने निश्चित सख्या विधान सभाओं और लोक सभा की थी, उस सख्या को सिर्फ जनगणना के आधार पर बढ़ाने की कोशिश न करे। आज जो आप 525 तक लोक सभा के सदस्यो की सख्या बढा रहे हैं, मैं चाहूंगा कि इस को आप लक्ष्मण रेखा के रूप में स्वीकार करे।

युनियन टेरिटरी को ग्रहण 25 दिया था, किन्तु उन्होंने कहा 16 ही है, जिस को अब शायद 20 किया है। मैं चाहूंगा कि जब तक दिल्ली में असेम्बली न हो तब तक दिल्ली से लोक सभा के सदस्यो की सख्या बढा कर 7 के बजाय 8 कर दे। इस बात पर मंत्री महोदय जरा बिचार करे, यह मेरा अनुरोध है।

इन शब्दो के साथ मैं इम का समर्थन करता हू।

श्री चन्नु लाल चन्नाकर (दुर्ग) : मान्यवर, यह जो विधेयक आज आया है यह इसलिये लाया गया है कि हमारे देश की आजादी में वृद्धि हो गयी है। अब इस वक्त लोक सभा के सदस्यो की सख्या 500 से 525 बढ़ायी जा रही है। जिस तरह से अभी पुर्ववक्ताओं ने बताया कि आबादी की सख्या में वृद्धि होती जायेगी उसी अनुपात से सदस्यो की सख्या बढ़ती जायगी, तो पता नही आगे चल कर कितनी सख्या हो जायगी। मैं से एक दफा ब्रिटेन में यही हुआ था कि वहा की आबादी के अनुपात से अपनी लोक सभा के सदस्यो की सख्या बढ़ाना शुरू की और वहा के हाउस आफ कामन्स की सदस्य सख्या एकबार 810 तक बढ गयी। उस के बाद उन्होंने यह निर्णय लिया कि अगर आबादी के आधार पर हमेशा सख्या बढ़नी जायगी तो पता नही 1,000 तक हो जाये। इसलिये अन्त में, आ कर उन्होंने 600 की सीलिंग अधिकतम सख्या फिक्स कर दी। इसलिये मेरा सरकार तथा माननीय सदस्यो से अनुरोध है कि अब 525 पर सीलिंग फिक्स कर दी जाये, क्यों कि अगर ऐसा नही किया गया तो इस से कई

राज्यों में जैसा पहले लोगों ने बताया, आबादी बढ़ाने की दौड़ हो सकती है। इसलिये प्रत्येक दृष्टि से यही उचित है कि अब यह सीलिंग स्थायी रूप से 525 पर हो जानी चाहिये। इसके अनिश्चित केन्द्र शासित क्षेत्रों के सदस्यों की संख्या 20 होगी। इसी तरह से यदि राज्यों की विधान सभाओं में भी सीलिंग निश्चित कर दी जाय तो ज्यादा अच्छा हो।

हम यहाँ इस बात पर विचार कर रहे हैं कि सदन की संख्या कितनी हो, और कितने सदस्य निम्न राज्य में आये। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा यह अनुग्रह है कि इस बात पर गम्भीरता से विचार करें और सदन की गरिमा भी इसी में है कि यहाँ निर्वाचित सदस्य ही आये अभी हमारे सविधान में एक यह व्यवस्था है आर्टिकल 331 में कि एक सम्प्रदाय क दो व्यक्ति लोक सभा सदस्य के रूप में नाम जद ह। मगर कहना है कि इस सदन में किसी सम्प्रदाय की नामजदगी नहीं होनी चाहिये। उस व्यवस्था को समाप्त किया जाये। इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने एक मसौदा दिय था, लेकिन उस उचित नहीं ठहराया गया। अब अगर इस विधेयक में इस प्रकार का मसौदा लाना उचित न हो तो सरकार में मेरा अनुरोध है कि वह निकट भविष्य में ऐसा विधेयक लाये जिस का परिणाम यह हो कि इस सदन के जितने भी सदस्य हों वह केवल निर्वाचित ही हों। यहाँ नामजद सदस्य किसी भी कम्प्यूनिटी के नहीं होने चाहिये। अगर किसी का प्रतिनिधित्व न हो तो उस की नामजदगी राज्य सभा में हो, न कि लोक सभा में। जिस समय देश आजाद हुआ था उस समय एक सम्प्रदाय के लिये कहा गया था कि उन लोगों का प्रतिनिधित्व चुना जाना मुश्किल है इस लिये व्यवस्था कर दी गयी क्योंकि उस समय का वातावरण उस किस्म का था। लेकिन आज स्थिति बदल गयी है। अब यह आवश्यक है कि इस सदन में केवल निर्वाचित सदस्य, और जिस सम्प्रदाय

को अभी लोक सभा में दो स्थान मिले हैं, उस को राज्य सभा के नामजद सदस्यों में जोड़ दिया जाये।

तीसरी बात यह है कि अभी इस सदन में सदस्यों की संख्या किस आधार पर निर्धारित की गयी है? अभी जो बढ़ायी गयी है उस का एक कारण है कि किसी राज्य में जैसे सदस्यों की संख्या को अगर नहीं बढ़ाते तो किसी में कम करना पड़ता और किसी में ज्यादा। रेशनलाइज करने के उद्देश्य से किसी राज्य में सदस्यों को घटाना पड़ता, जैसे उड़ीसा बर्गरह में, इसी लिये इस समय यह 525 की संख्या बढ़ायी गयी है। लेकिन मेरा सरकार से निवेदन है कि यह अन्तिम रूप से मान लिया जाये इस के बाद सदन की संख्या बढ़ाने का अगर ऐसा कोई विधेयक नहीं लायेगा।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contd.) I  
rise to oppose this Constitution (Amendment) Bill

This Bill seems to me not only unprincipled but also it is in violation of the consensus that was arrived at the meeting of the Opposition Leaders. There was a long discussion held on the basis of a note sent by Shri Sen Veirma wherein he had suggested that the present strength of the Lok Sabha should be increased to 545 and the note was circulated to all the Members of the opposition Parties as also to the members belonging to the Congress Party. A long discussion was held. There were two opinions. The majority view was that there was no reason whatsoever to increase the strength of the Lok Sabha. There was another opinion that the strength of the Lok Sabha should be increased proportionately to the increase in the population. When this point was discussed, it came out that if we take that the strength of the Lok Sabha should be increased according to the growth of population, then it will not only be unwieldy after 20 years or 25 years, but it will be impossible to increase the strength of Lok Sabha any further. It will be then a sort of *mela* or a *bazaar*. Therefore, that should not be the case.

[Shri Samar Guha]

It is with this aim in view that the founding fathers of our Constitution decided in the Constituent Assembly to the effect that the strength of the Lok Sabha should not be equated or should not be proportionate, if I may say so, to the growth of the population. They set certain optimum limit under certain circumstances, after certain consideration, after taking into account certain basis, and certain principles. Ours is a vast country and as such they felt it was not possible for us to relate the strength of seats of Lok Sabha to the growth of population and therefore the number was fixed at 500. Some of our friends suggested that this should be increased according to the population. I say, this will be unwieldy and this will be impossible for the Lok Sabha to manage its affairs. It may so happen that our population will double itself in 20 years or 30 years or 40 years. It may even reach 100 crores after some years. Are we to bound our future generations by this act or ours? It is a problem for the future generations to solve. Let them decide for the future what is best for themselves. Let them go into it and let them tackle it. May be, the whole question will have to be treated in a different way or changed radically by changing the basis of electoral College for Lok Sabha. Even if they want an indirect election from a future date, they may think on those lines, if the population goes up to 100 crores or more. That is the problem for the future generation to decide.

13-52 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

The former Election Commissioner Mr. Sen-Verma quoted instances from America, Russia, UK, France etc. in regard to size of constituencies. Our constituency is peculiar in the sense that our constituency is four times or five times bigger than the biggest constituency of say, USSR or USA., what to speak of U.K. There a Constituency's size range from 15,000 to 1 lakh or so and not more than that. In our country according to the 1961 census, it was on the basis of a population of about 8 lakhs and now, after the 1971 census, it will be 10.7 lakhs. That will be the average strength of a constituency. This is a problem that we have to face and some

of the difficulties that we have to face can be obviated if the days of electioneering in those hill terrains and hill areas could be extended. In the urban area the period for all the process, right from the date of submission of nomination papers etc. till the date of election, may be shorter. The consensus in our meeting was that there would be no need for the increase in the strength of Lok Sabha from 500 to any number. What is the limit after all? In the next 5 years there will be increase of population. That will be more so, after the next 5 years following. Are we to go on increasing this *ad hoc* basis of increasing Lok Sabha seats every five years? That is why this optimum size of the Lok Sabha was decided finally, after much of deliberation and discussion in the Constituent Assembly. There is no principle involved in putting it at an arbitrary figure of 525 or some such figure. It is absolutely unprincipled and arbitrary. The future generation will say what type of these people were? They did not lay down any principle, but arbitrarily they increased the number from 525 to 545.

Sir, if a little bit of rationalisation in fixing quantum for Constituencies is done the new States can be accommodated. Jammu and Kashmir, on the basis of 10 lakh average, is entitled for 4 seats but six seats have been given to it, likewise Himachal on the basis of this principle is entitled for 3 seats but 4 seats have been given. Tripura is entitled for one but 2 have been given. Manipur is also entitled for 1 but two seats have been given. Meghalaya is also entitled for one but two seats have been given. There is no reason why certain extra privileges should be given to union territories. According to the population of Delhi if we take 10 lakh as the base number, then Delhi can get only four seats but Delhi has got seven seats. There is no reason why Delhi should get seven seats. At the most it can get four seats. In the case of Goa, Daman and Diu it cannot even get more than one seat but it is given two seats.

So, there is no reason whatsoever of increasing the strength of Lok Sabha. Just a little bit of rationalisation is required to read just seats for new

States. Those States which enjoyed the status of Union territory but are now having the status of full-fledged States there is no reason why they should be given extra weightage. By a little bit of rationalisation we can find out certain seats for a new State. In the case of Delhi there is no reason why it should get seven seats. At the most it should get four seats. We can get three seats from Delhi. If we can have proper distribution of the seats. How long will this tiny separate Units of Pondicherry, Laccadive Island, Goa Daman and Diu remain? This distinctiveness should go. We are all Indians.

14-00 hrs

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA: (Barmer):  
Except Bengalees.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It was Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Swami Vivekanand, who taught nationalism. It is the sacrifice of the Bengalees that contributed much to attainment of our freedom and for that they have lost their home. Do not talk of Parochialism in the case of Bengalees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not talk across the Bench Please address the Chair.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is so provocative and I think the Member should refresh his memory by going through the history of India. It will be seen that it were the two Bengalees who gave the National Songs, not for Bengal, but for the whole of India. He is wrong when he says that Bengalees have a parochial outlook.

I want to add one word that seats are going to be increased for 'limited and conspiratorial purpose'. When you increase the strength, that means you are going to break the existing constituencies. You are going to reallocate the existing constituencies. We have an apprehension that this party in power, with absolute power in their grip, are not satisfied. They want to readjust constituencies in such a way that the opposition should not be able to have their voice in the national forum of this country. Therefore, I repeat that this is a conspiratorial Bill to weaken the strength of the opposition by re-adjusting, re-allocating, and re-organising different constituencies.

8—M418LSS/73

This Bill has no guiding principle. This Bill does not say why the seats should be increased from 500 to 525. As I have said it is possible to adjust it in different States by a little bit of rationalisation of the seats, I find no reason why we should support this Bill. I strongly oppose this Bill, as I repeat, that this Bill is imprinced, arbitrary, without any reason and to a certain extent it is partisan and conspiratorial in purpose.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI (Kokrajhar):  
Mr. Chairman, Sir, I strongly support this Bill. I support my friend Mr. Rao who said that the number of seats in the House of the People may be allotted in such manner that the ratio between that number and the population is the same. Therefore, the people should not be deprived of that. I wish that the number of seats should be increased on the population basis in the State Assemblies also. I wish that amendment should be moved in that direction.

By amendment of Article 332, they have taken out the reservation of the seats for Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and also Meghalaya on the ground that the population has become very high in percentage. In Mizoram, it has gone up to 94 per cent, in Meghalaya to about 80 per cent and in Arunachal Pradesh it has gone up to about 79 per cent. So, there is no meaning in having reservation of seats for these tribals. I quite agree with this and I also think that there is no meaning, in just reserving seats for people who have got such high percentage. Therefore, I support this.

But I fail to understand why there is no mention about the Scheduled Tribes of the two autonomous districts of the Mikir Hills and the North Cachar Hills. These two hill areas had unreserved seats when the new territory was constituted as Meghalaya which is now a full-fledged State. May I ask whether the people who do not agitate should lose their rights? The people who thought of greater interest of State and did not support those who wanted separation should suffer? As for instance, the people of Arunachal Pradesh are getting less seats on the population basis than what they are entitled to. The Scheduled Tribes of these two auto-

[Shri Samar Guha]

nomous districts of Assam, namely the Mikir and the North Cachar Hills, have not been mentioned in the amendment.

A paper has been circulated to us as associate members of the Delimitation Commission, by the Election Commission, and I find therefrom that the reserved one seat allocated for the Mikir and North Cachar Hills has been taken out and only one reserved seat for a population of about 3.45 lakhs for the tribals in plains, but seats have not been reserved for the people in the North Cachar Hills and the Mikir Hills on the ground that the population in these districts does not justify which is only 2,62,622. But is it not injustice to deprive these two districts of their legitimate rights? We find that Chandigarh has got one seat for 2,56,969, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands has got one seat for a population of 1,15,090, Dadra and Nagar Haveli has got one seat for 74,165 and the Laccadive and the Minicoy and the Aminidive Islands has got one seat for 31,798. Therefore, would not it cause heart-burning in the minds of the people of these two hill districts, if they are deprived of their rights, especially when they had supported the greater cause of the unification of Assam and were in favour of a larger State? Should they now suffer? May I ask the Government whether those people who are docile and who support the greater interests of the country should be deprived of their rights? If this is the attitude of the Government, then those tribes also may start demanding a separate State. Just as there are many tribal areas which have been constituted into a separate State, they may also make a demand for a separate State.

For instance, even in the State of Madhya Pradesh from which Shri Nitiraj Singh Chaudhary comes, there are tribals in Bastar and Jhabua, for instance, in good concentration, but they are not demanding a separate State, because they might get their rights. I am very glad that the Madhya Pradesh Government is doing Justice to them. Therefore, they are not making any such demand. There is a sense of fellow-feeling and sympathy from the other people for these tribals. But if you deprive the tribals of their legitimate rights not giving them seats, then I am

afraid they would try to have a separate State. Already, reactionary people are starting agitations just to have separate State for these two districts of North Cachar and Mikir Hills. We should not add fuel to the fire by not reserving seats for these people. But what do we find in article 330, as it is sought to be amended?

I see that in article 330(1), only sub-clause (b) is being amended. Am I to understand that sub-clause (c) remains as it is? If sub-clause (c) remains as it is, I should say the North Cachar and Mikir Hills should be added. The wording of (c) is 'The Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts of Assam'. Instead of 'Assam', it should be 'Mikir Hills and North Cachar Hills of Assam'. There should also be a seat reserved for them.

According to the Delimitation Commission, we have been given 14 seats in Assam. In one of the articles, there is a contingent reserve of one. That should be allotted to Assam. Assam is a problem State. Therefore, its seats should not be decreased by reserving one seat for these tribals. The tribals should have the sympathy of the whole including you, Mr. Chairman. Therefore, I hope the House will not grudge giving this contingent reserve seat for these tribals so that the number of 14 seats remains as it is.

I have been told by my colleagues that if out of these 14 seats, we keep one reserved for these tribals, we will be blamed by the people of Assam. Therefore, I request the Minister to see that the number of seats is not decreased on the ground of reservation of one seat for the tribals of these two districts comprising more than 2 lakhs of people (*Interruptions*).

As regards the increase of seats on an all-India basis, though I cannot support what Shri Joshi said, from my side I should say that since the population of the tribals has increased, the number of seats should also be increased for them.

Another point is that the tribal people are not getting justice under the Constitution. Justice has not been done to them on the ground of demarcation and on the ground of schedulisation of the areas. On the basis of schedulisation, there are 68 lakh tribals. But outside the scheduled areas, half the tribals are not getting any

benefit. They are deprived of any facilities. So is the case in Bihar, Orissa and so on.

You know there are two Schedules, the Fifth and the Sixth, in the Constitution. The Fifth Schedule is applicable every where except to Assam. The Sixth Schedule is applicable only to Assam. Except these two districts which I mentioned, the others in that State have been constituted into separate States like Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, Meghalaya, Nagaland and what not. Therefore, the tribals in the un-scheduled areas are deprived of all facilities. I hope our Law Minister will see that wherever there is concentration of tribals, seats should be reserved for them also. If this is possible to be done without amending the Constitution, I request it may be done. If it is not possible to do without amending the Constitution, I request that it may be done. What I mean to say is that the area restriction be removed forthwith so that the tribals may have a fair deal as the scheduled castes are getting on the population basis, which the tribals are not getting. On the ground of demarcation or schedulisation, should they be deprived of all facilities? You can say that in the un-scheduled areas of Assam which are newly constituted into States they are very highly developed economically. At the same time, educationally they are most highly developed; more highly developed than the Brahmins as a whole and other advanced communities, because they have got the facilities of the missionary schools and all that. They have been imparted good education with the good teachers that are available and all that. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister to see that justice is done to those people who are outside the Scheduled Area.

With these wards, I support the Bill.

श्री मधु लियये (बाँका) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी मन्त्री महोदय से प्रार्थना है कि अपने पासबी बहुमत के आधार पर इस विधेयक को जबर्दस्ती पास करने का प्रयास करने के बजाय मेरी बातों को गौर से सुनने के बाद वह इस विधेयक को वापस ले और हमारे मुद्दों पर सोच समझ कर एक नया विधेयक सदन के सामने ले आए जिन में

मेरे द्वारा उठाए गए मुद्दों पर विचार कर के कुछ और प्रावधान रखे गए हों। मुझे लगता है कि यह विधेयक बिलकुल सिद्धांत विहित विधेयक है। इस का जो ज्ञान है उद्देश्य और कारण वाला उस में एक भी उन्होंने कारण नहीं बताया कि लोक सभा को सदस्य-संख्या यह क्यों बढ़ाने जा रहे हैं। केवल उन्होंने इतना ही बताया है कि राज्यों की जो वर्तमान संख्या है उस में परिवर्तन करने की जरूरत पड़ेगी मर्डूमशुमारी के चलते और यह काम हम करना नहीं चाहते हैं क्योंकि लोक नाराज हो जाएंगे और इसी लिए यह विधेयक ले कर आए हैं। और एक भी कारण बताया हो तो हम को वह समझाए। इस लिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ सिद्धांतों को ले कर इस बारे में विधेयक ले आएँ।

पहले तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहना हूँ कि लोक सभा समूचे राष्ट्र को पंचायत है और उस में देश की जनता का प्रतिनिधित्व होता है किसी राज्य का या प्रदेश का नहीं। इस लिए इस में प्रतिनिधित्व समानता के आधार पर होना चाहिए। संविधान की चौदहवीं धारा आप देख लीजिए जिस में कहा गया है कि राज्य इनकार नहीं करेगा कि कानून के सामने सब समान हों। तो हर नागरिक को यह अधिकार है कि उस को समान प्रतिनिधित्व लोक सभा में मिले। आज का जो प्रतिनिधित्व है उस में दो दोष मैं पाता हूँ जिस में संविधान की धारा 14 का भी हनन होता है और संविधान की धारा 81 का भी हनन होता है।

नम्बर(1) बात में यह कहना चाहना हूँ कि वर्तमान जो चुनाव क्षेत्र हैं उन में मैं देखना हूँ कि कुछ चुनाव क्षेत्र ऐसे हैं—मैं नहीं जनगणना जो हुई है उन को चर्चा नहीं कर रहा हूँ, 1961 की जनगणना के आधार पर बोल रहा हूँ—उन में कुछ क्षेत्र हैं। मैं उन क्षेत्रों का नाम नहीं बताऊँगा क्योंकि वे राज्या का भाग नहीं हैं। मैं उन क्षेत्रों का नाम नहीं बताऊँगा मे कुछ क्षेत्र एन वी के तिन में मनशाताआ

[ श्री मधु लिमये ]

की संख्या थी साढ़े तीन लाख, इस के बारे में मैंने एक विधेयक पेश किया था पिछली लोक सभा में, और कुछ ऐसे भी चुनाव क्षेत्र हैं जिन में मतदाताओं की संख्या साढ़े 6 लाख और सात लाख थी। तो आप की 81 धारा क्या है? इस में यह कहा गया है कि चुनाव क्षेत्रों का इस तरह से बटवारा हो हर राज्य में प्रतिनिधित्व लोक संख्या के अनुपात में हो। . . . .

सभापति महोदय : जहाँ तक हो सके।

श्री मधु लिमये : जहाँ तक हो सके मगर साढ़े तीन और सात लाख का फर्क दस हजार, पन्द्रह हजार, 20 हजार तक में सुविधा के लिए समझ सकता हूँ। लेकिन दो दो तीन-तीन लाख का फर्क, यह पहले से ही मैं समानता का जो सिद्धांत है उस का हनन करना है। एक उदाहरण मैं देता हूँ, मुझे याद है 1962 में जिस चुनाव क्षेत्र से कृपालानी जी और कृष्णामेनन जी खड़े हुए थे उस के मतदाताओं की संख्या साढ़े सात लाख थी और कुछ क्षेत्र ऐसे थे कि जिन में तीन, चार या साढ़े चार लाख तक मतदाता थे।

दूसरी बात यह है कि छोटे राज्यों और केन्द्र शासित इलाके का न्यूनतम प्रतिनिधित्व एक होना चाहिए, यह तो मैं मानता हूँ चाहे मिजोरम हो चाहे और कोई केन्द्र शासिता इलाका हो या राज्य हो। कम से कम एक प्रतिनिधि उन का इस राष्ट्र की पंचायत में आ कर बैठे। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि लोक सभा में उन को एक से अधिक प्रतिनिधि देने का क्या मतलब है जब उनकी आबादी इतनी कम है। इस की जगह पर मेरा सुझाव है—यह संघ राज्य है, संघ राज्य का मतलब है कि संघ राज्य का जो छोटा सदन होता है, यह जनता का सीधा प्रतिनिधित्व करता है और जो बड़ा सदन या वरिष्ठ सदन होता है, जैसे अपने यहाँ राज्य सभा है, वह राज्यों का और केन्द्र शासित इलाकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करता है। मैं देखता हूँ कि राज्य सभा में भी तकरीबन आबादी के आधार पर

प्रतिनिधित्व दिया है। जैसे उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार, महाराष्ट्र, आन्ध्र प्रदेश, बड़े-बड़े राज्य हैं, उन को आप लोक-संख्या के आधार पर बहुत ज्यादा प्रतिनिधित्व देते हैं, संघ राज्य में ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। मेरा सुझाव है कि लोक सभा में पूर्ण समानता के आधार पर जनता का प्रतिनिधित्व हो और छोटे राज्य और केन्द्र शासित प्रदेशों में उन को न्यूनतम एक प्रतिनिधि मिले। लेकिन राज्य सभा में बड़े राज्यों का प्रतिनिधित्व आप घटाइये और छोटे राज्यों का प्रतिनिधित्व बढ़ाइये ताकि राज्यों के अधिकारों पर जब वहाँ चर्चा हो तो राज्यों के प्रतिनिधि, चाहे कितना भी छोटा राज्य क्यों न हों, ताकत के साथ अपनी बात रख सके। अगर सरकार मेरा सुझाव मानेगी तो संघ राज्य का जो ढांचा होता है उस की रक्षा होगी और राज्य सभा की जो गरिमा हमारे देश में नहीं है—वह बढ़ जायगी।

दूसरी बात मैं राज्य सभा के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ—अमरीका जैसे देश को लीजिये। न्यूयार्क और कैलिफोर्निया जैसे राज्यों की आबादी बहुत ज्यादा है और हवाई तथा अलास्का जैसे राज्यों की आबादी कम है। लेकिन, सभापति महोदय, सीनेट में कैलिफोर्निया और न्यूयार्क के दो-दो प्रतिनिधि बैठते हैं और एलास्का व हवाई के भी दो-दो प्रतिनिधि बैठते हैं। यदि इतनी समानता आप राज्यों के बीच नहीं लाना चाहते हैं तो कुछ ऐसा प्रयास कीजिये जिस से छोटे राज्यों और केन्द्र शासित इलाकों को राज्य सभा में अधिक प्रतिनिधित्व मिल सके।

सभापति महोदय, संघ राज्य की एकात्मता, उस की अक्षुण्णता टिके, मजबूत बने, इस कारण से मैं यह सुझाव दे रहा हूँ। पाकिस्तान में हुए विघटन से हम लोगों को सबक लेना चाहिए और हमारा प्रयास होना चाहिये कि हमारे देश में जो विभिन्न प्रदेश हैं, चाहे कितने भी छोटे क्यों न हों, उन को अधिक से अधिक प्रतिनिधित्व राज्य सभा में मिले।

सभापति महोदय, एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ—राज्य सभा का चुनाव अप्रत्यक्ष मतदान प्रणाली से होता है यानी राज्यों की जो विधान सभायें होती हैं, वे राज्य सभा के प्रतिनिधियों को चुनती हैं नतीजा यह होता है कि राज्य सभा के सदस्यों का जनता से कोई सम्पर्क नहीं रहता है, मैं तो ऐसा मानता हूँ कि वे जनता से कटे हुए रहते हैं और एक मायने में उपहार-वितरण के लिये, डिस्ट्री-ब्यूशन आफ पैट्रोनेज के लिये आज राज्य सभा के टिकिट दिये जाते हैं। वे 30-32 विधायकों के आधार पर राज्य सभा में चुनाव जीत कर आ जाते हैं। यह भी आप को मालूम है कि आज कल इस में पैसा भी चलने लगा है। एक-दो मामले अदालत के सामने आये थे, बक्से भी खोल दिये गये थे। इस लिये 32 लोगों को खरीदना आसान है, लेकिन 5-6 लाख लोगों को कौन खरीदेगा, पैसा बांट कर मतों को खरीदना मुश्किल हो जायेगा।

SHRI BISWANARAYAN SHASTRI  
(Lakhimpur) : Is it relevant ?

सभापति महोदय : आप बोलते रहिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि राज्य सभा के प्रतिनिधि सही मायनों में जनता और राज्य का प्रतिनिधित्व कर सकें, इस लिये उन का चुनाव भी सीधा हो, जैसे अमरीका की मीनेट में होता है। इसलिये राज्य सभा और लोक सभा की पुनर्चना करने वाला मुकम्मिल विधेयक लाइये।

मेरा एक मुद्दा और है। मेरे जैसे जो लोक सभा के सदस्य हैं, जो आराम करने के लिये नहीं, बल्कि कुछ काम करने के लिये यहाँ आते हैं, मेरे जैसे उधर भी हैं और इधर भी हैं, उन के मामले बहुत मारी दिक्कतें हैं। आज हम लोग जिम स्थिति में काम करते हैं और अमरीका में जो कांग्रेस के सदस्य हैं, वे जिस स्थिति में काम करते हैं, इसमें बहुत ज्यादा फर्क है। मैं संसद सदस्यों के लिये कोई भत्ते आदि का विशेषाधिकार नहीं चाहता हूँ

और ऐसा भी कोई अधिकार नहीं चाहता हूँ जिस का जनता की सेवा से सम्बन्ध न हो। लेकिन क्या, सभापति महोदय, आप नहीं समझते हैं कि मेरे जैसे एक व्यक्ति को यदि कोई कार्यालय मिल जाये, कोई सचिव मिल जाय, कोई स्टैनोग्राफर हिन्दी, अंग्रेजी या दूसरी भाषाओं में मिल जाय तो आज जितना काम करता हूँ, उस से कई गुना अधिक काम कर सकता हूँ। आप कह सकते हैं। कि हर एक सुविधा का दुरुपयोग भी किया जा सकता है।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डे (राजन्दगाव) :  
वे सुविधायें मिलनी चाहिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : दुरुपयोग हो सकता है—मैं उस की चर्चा नहीं करूँगा। आप को मालूम है कि पिछली लोक सभा में संसद के सदस्यों को ट्रैक्टर देने का सुझाव आया था और इसी सदन में मैंने कहा था—क्या ट्रैक्टर पर बैठ कर संसद सदस्य पार्लियामेंट के लान्ब में खेती के प्रयोग करेंगे? हमारे मराठी में एक कहावत है :—

उटा बरचे शहाणे !

तो फिर कहना पड़ता ट्रैक्टर बरचे शहाणे (स्याने)

ट्रैक्टर पर चढ़ कर हम स्याने होने वाले हैं! तब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि यह चर्चा बन्द होनी चाहिये और ट्रैक्टर वगैरहा नहीं दिया जायगा। हम लोगो में कोई कृषि विशारद हो सकते हैं, लेकिन लाखों किसान क्यू में खड़े हैं और हम लोग संसद की सदस्यता का दुरुपयोग कर के इस प्रकार की सुविधायें प्राप्त करें, यह ठीक नहीं है। अभी बताया गया है कि इस में कुछ खर्च बढ़ेगा, कितना खर्च बढ़ेगा, शायद 6 लाख रुपया। तो 6 लाख सदस्यों की सख्या बढ़ाने पर खर्च करने के बजाय हम चाहते हैं कि इसी संसद भवन में जो एनेक्स बने, उस में सदस्यों को कार्यालय दिये जाय, सचिव की सुविधा दी जायें। यह जो अतिरिक्त खर्च करने जा रहे हैं उस के बजाय वर्तमान सख्या के आधार पर जो

[श्री मधु लिमये]

सदस्य बुने जायेंगे उन को ये सुविधायें दी जायें। तब निश्चित रूप से जनता की सेवा संसद सदस्य अधिक अच्छे ढंग से कर पायेंगे। मैं जानता हूँ आप का दो-तिहाई बहुमत है, हमारे कहने का कोई मतलब नहीं है। आप जो भी पास करना चाहें, कर सकते लेकिन अगर मंत्री महोदय मेरी बातों को ठीक समझते हैं तो अपनी सरकार से, प्रधान मंत्री जी से और दूसरे लोगों से बान करे और उस के बाद हम विधेयक को यहाँ लायें। अगर आप का विधेयक ठीक सिद्धांतों के ऊपर आधारित होगा तो हम लोग भी समर्थन करेंगे, लेकिन वर्तमान विधेयक तो अवसरवादी लगता है, जिसे घबराहट के चलते तुरन्त ले आये हैं—इस लिये मैं इस का विरोध करना हूँ।

SHRI BISWANARAYAN SHASTRI (Lakhimpur). Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Bill is very simple and its scope is very limited. The Bill seeks to raise the number of seats in the Lok Sabha to 545 from its present strength.

It was 500 for the States and 25 for the Union Territories. Now, it has been increased to 525 for the States and decreased to 20 for the Union Territories. It is a good proposition, no doubt. But, there is some misgiving in my mind that there is some element of discrimination between the States and small States which have less than 6 million population. This is a new conception incorporated in the Bill and I may, in future, percolate to other sphere as well and may create discrimination between States and States. I do not know where it will rest. Therefore, this is not a good conception to my mind.

The term 'Union Territories' is not a good one. Unless there is compulsion or absolute necessity, these territories should be either converted into Separate States or merged with the neighbouring States.

An hon. member spoke against the presence of nominated members in the House of the People. I agree with him. This is the House of the People where people are represented by their elected representatives. So, the very nomenclature 'nominated member' is a misfit here. If there is any necessity for nominated

members, let them be in the Rajya Sabha not in the House of the People. It is not good that the House of the People should have nominated members who are not responsible to any electorate or anybody else except perhaps to their wives or husbands. Therefore, I would suggest that this Bill should be suitably amended or a new Bill be brought forward abolishing the provision for nominated members once and for all.

Some members have suggested that membership of this House should remain static and should not be changed with the growth of population. I do not agree with this view. We do not believe in static conditions; we believe in changes. So, there must be change along with the growth of population. If necessary the strength may go up to 600 in course of time, or it may be restricted to 545.

About Assam, Mr. Basumatari has suggested certain changes. In the Bill it has been provided that for the tribal areas of Assam, there will be no reservation. I have just received a copy of an amendment circulated in the name of the Minister of State. It reads:

"Notwithstanding anything contained in clause 2, the number of seats reserved in the House of the People for the scheduled tribes in the autonomous districts of Assam shall bear to the total number of seats allotted to this State a proportion not less than the population of the scheduled tribes in the said autonomous districts bears to the total population of the State".

This is clothed in very legalistic language and I do not fully understand its implications. Perhaps it wants to provide that there will be reservations. There were autonomous districts in the State of Assam after independence. Since then Nagaland, which was an autonomous district, was made into a Separate State. Garo Hills and Khasi-Jaintia Hills which were autonomous districts were made a separate State. Mizoram, another autonomous district was made a Union Territory. Mikir Hills and North Cachar Hills are the only autonomous districts now left in Assam according to the 6th schedule of the Constitution. But the population of these two districts is

roughly 4 lakhs or less. Therefore, for these people something has to be done. After the formation of Meghalaya and Mizoram, one member was elected from these two districts under a special provision. But after the passing of this Constitution (Amendment) Bill, if there is no such provision, it will be a heart-burning for them. I think by this amendment the safeguard is going to be given to them. Therefore, I do not want to go into this aspect.

So far as the number of representatives to the House of the People from the different State is concerned, as far as possible, the ratio of members to the population should be uniform. While that may be the general consideration, there are some small States where, if this criterion is applied, they will be able to return only one or two members. Since there is provision for backward areas, there should be consideration for those States which are backward and where the population is small. So, the uniform standard cannot be applied to the Union Territories also.

So far as the condition for allotment of seats to different States is concerned, it is not mentioned in the Bill. Perhaps it is not necessary as this function is allotted to the Delimitation Commission, which will allot seats to the States and Union Territories according to population or whatever other criteria they may think necessary.

It has been mentioned that according to the tentative distribution of seats one seat will remain additional. I would like to suggest that this additional seat should go to the State of Assam. This will also fit in with the suggestion that there should be one reserved seat for the Autonomous Districts where the population is not sufficient.

So far as the amenities to the Members of Parliament are concerned, I have to state that the Members have to function under straitened conditions. They have to contact a number of people, a number of electors and other agencies to keep in contact with the day-to-day happenings. They have to stay in Delhi for more than six or seven months and go back to their constituency in between. Speaking for myself, it will take me four days by train and two days

by plane to reach my constituency. The difficulty can well be imagined. Therefore, there should be more amenities for the Members of Parliament.

The constituency is so divided that two parts of it are on two sides of the mighty river Brahmaputra. Unless one travels by air, one can do cross the river and go to the other part of the constituency. Though this is not strictly relevant to this Bill, I hope the Delimitation Commission will take into consideration this factor also while delimiting the constituencies.

With these words, I support the Bill.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Bogusarai): Mr Chairman, to my mind this Bill has its birth in the confusion of ideas of the Government. There seems to be no principle behind this Bill. There is no perspective extending over years, nor is there any concept of optimality of the size of the constituency or of the electorate. Therefore, there is no assurance that after every census we would not require the amendment of the Constitution. If this is going to be the fate of the Constitution, or if there is going to be uncertainty all the time about the size of the constituency or of the electorate, it would be mainly because of the lack of clarity in the minds of the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a tragedy of our democracy that we do not seem to have given much thought to the growing unwieldiness and unmanageability of the size of the constituencies. In fact the elections have already become a matter of money power and at the rate at which election expenses are increasing in every election, it seems that it is going to be a black Money democracy. There must be some restraint on this at some point of time. I think this aspect of the size of the constituencies, and indeed of the elections on the whole, should be the concern of all those who are genuinely interested in the building up and strengthening of democracy.

Now, the hon. Minister himself said that the objective behind this Bill is very limited and is one of eliminating the adverse impact of the new population figures on some States, and of seeing that the existing number of seats of States will not be affected. But, he has not been good enough

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]  
to quantify the degree of the adverse impact, so that, we do not know as to what is the size of the problem with which we are really grappling. Therefore, we are not in a position to judge whether the remedy suggested is going to be a proper one or whether it is going to be equal to the size of the problem. He has not placed before us the exact nature of the size of the problem, nor has he indicated as to how the increase in the number of seats is going to be distributed amongst the States. It is going to be left entirely to the Delimitation Commission, I think, it would not redound to the credit of Parliament. Parliament must give some guidelines so far as the Delimitation Commission is concerned, in the matter of distributing the increase in the number of seats. It is also not clear whether Government has given some thought to making the basis of representation as far as possible equal throughout the country. One does not, however, suggest that Laccadives or Dadra and Nagar Haveli should have the same basis for their representation as in other areas.

Certain things are very partly unjust and unequal. Take for example the case of Haryana and Delhi. Haryana has a population which is twice that of Delhi. But, the number of seats in Haryana is 9, whereas the number of seats in Delhi is 7. Although the population of Haryana is twice that of Delhi, the difference in the number of seats is only of the order of 2. If there was some thinking in the Government to make the representation in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution, as far as possible, equal or equitable, then, the Government should have shared it with us.

May I say that there is one aspect of the matter which has not received the consideration of the House yet, and which appears to me again very unjust. Take for example, the weight that attaches to every Member of the Assembly in the Presidential Election. A Member of UP has a different weight attaching to him from a Member in Bihar or a Member in Haryana. But, in the Presidential and Vice-Presidential Elections, every Member of Parliament has got the same weight. Although one Member of Parliament might represent only one lakh or 1.1 lakh, and another Member might represent about 7 to 8 lakhs,

all Members are equal. That anomaly is not a just basis for representation. If that anomaly is corrected in the case of the Members of the Legislative Assemblies, in the Presidential election, because different weights attach to the Members of Assemblies in the various States, then, even in the Presidential and Vice-Presidential election, different weights should attach to Members of Parliament coming from different areas having different basis of representation. I think I am quite clear on this point. To repeat, a Member of the Assembly has got a different weight—it is 167 in Uttar Pradesh and in another State, it is only 100. There are degrees of difference and so on. If that anomaly is corrected in the case of the Presidential Election so that every Member of the Assembly Coming from different States is not allowed to have the same weight, then by the same, in the case of Members of Parliament, every Member of Parliament must not have the same weight. It is rather unfair that a Member who represents about 8 lakhs of population should have the same weight as a Member who represents only 1 lakh of population. Then, again, I am not suggesting that you should have something very arbitrary about this and make it look absolutely unfair to the areas of a smaller size. This is a point which ought to be considered by us when we are thinking of the basis of representation.

We are, therefore, confronted with a situation in which one Member is more representative in Parliament than the other quantitatively and another Member more representative than the other intensively.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) :  
and qualitatively.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :  
Of course, that is different matter. That depends upon the quality of the electorate which elects him. But in one case, one Member quantitatively represents more than the other and another Member intensively represents more than the other. This anomaly in the basis of representation ought to have been eliminated; the Government should have given more thought to it.

These are some of the ideas which occurred to me while thinking about certain provisions

of this measure. I am very sorry that when the Government had an opportunity of going into some of the basic aspects, it has, indeed, not done so. Thus it has not done the duty which, naturally, devolved upon it after 10 years.

**SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati) :** Mr. Chairman, Sir, though I may not see eye to eye with many of the observations that have come from the Members of the Opposition, particularly,

Mr. Madhu Limaya, I feel, he has raised some very basic questions in this House.

It is time that we should once more have a fresh look at the entire position of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. Instead of making *ad hoc* arrangements from time to time, we should make a more comprehensive arrangement for the future. I entirely agree with him when he says that the Rajya Sabha being a representative of the States should have equal representation because in other countries, where there is a dual chamber, the Upper House is given equal representation. In the Constitution, we have not made any differentiation in respect of States because one State has a smaller size than another State. In fact, already I have tabled an amendment about the composition of the Rajya Sabha that in the Rajya Sabha, all States should have equal representation. I feel, this is a matter which deserves special consideration.

I am also in agreement with many of the Members of the Opposition that while moving the Constitution (Thirty-First) Amendment Bill, I think, not much serious attention has been given or not a very comprehensive view of the whole thing has been taken, because, from the entire reading of the Bill, we do not find as to why this figure of 525 has been fixed. Of course, I am sure, the hon. Law Minister will try to explain this position.

But as regards some of the arguments which were advanced, that is, smaller States should have only the minimum representation, like, one only as the case of Nagaland or some of the States which were mentioned, I feel, we should not determine this question on mathematical accuracy.

After all, in this House, to take effective part in deliberations, some amount of expertise is necessary. It is not that one

member can make his contribution in all the subjects that come before the House. With a certain amount of authority I can say that there are certain basic problems inherent in the smaller States or Union territories, particularly in the north-eastern region, about which the other Members may not have a very correct idea. When I say this, I do not blame any one. The entire geographical location is such, the communication difficulty has been such that, about the cultural background and other things of States like Nagaland and Union territories like Mizoram and Arunachal Pradesh, we do not have really a proper grasp. Therefore it is to much to expect that a solitary member who is representing that State or Union territory can, in all matters, make an effective contribution. From that point of view, I do not agree with some of the submissions made in this House that the smaller States should have the minimum representation possible.

Shri Madhu Limaya made one point which I consider to be irrelevant for purposes of this discussion. He said that, in the case of Rajya Sabha, the election should be direct and not indirect. For the purpose of record, I would like to say that I am not in agreement with him here because the Rajya Sabha represents the States and, therefore, it is not that people should elect the members of Rajya Sabha, it is the States which should elect the members of Rajya Sabha. So, I do not agree with him in his suggestion that election of members to Rajya Sabha should be on a direct basis as in the Lok Sabha. That will only mean duplication of the House which we have here.

It will be apparent from reading the Bill that not much care has been taken in drafting the Bill or at any rate I have not been able to come to any conclusion or gather any meaning from Clause 3(1) of this Bill. I would request the hon. Minister to explain this position. It seems that, while Constitutional Amendments were made constituting the north-eastern region, due care was not taken. With the result that we find a lot of lacunae. If you see article 330 as it stands today, you will find that Seats shall be reserved in the House of the People for Scheduled Tribes except the Scheduled Tribes in the tribal areas of Assam. Article 330(1)(b) clearly says

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]  
that seats shall be reserved in the House of the People for

"the Scheduled Tribes except the Scheduled Tribes in the tribal areas of Assam."

Article 330(1) (c) says that seats shall be reserved in the House of the people for

"the Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts of Assam"

While article 330(1)(b) says that there will be no reservations for Scheduled Tribes in the tribal areas of Assam, article 330(1)(c) says that there will be reservations for the Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts of Assam. 'Autonomous districts of Assam' and 'the tribal areas of Assam' are the same thing. After the reorganisation of the north-eastern region, the autonomous districts in Assam are the tribal areas in Assam. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict in the article itself which I have not been able to resolve.

The same thing has been maintained in this Bill also, because you have said in Clause 3(1) of the Bill that there will be no reservation for Scheduled Tribes in the tribal areas of Assam. And you are not amending Article 330(1)(c) - you are maintaining that. After this Amendment, article 330(1)(b) will say that there will be no reservation for Scheduled Tribes in the tribal areas of Assam. At the same time you are maintaining article 330(1)(c) which says that there will be reservations for Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts of Assam. As I have said, 'tribal areas of Assam' and 'the autonomous districts of Assam' are the same thing. Therefore, I have not been able to understand what really you want to do by this Amendment.

The hon. Minister has submitted and amendment. To me it smacks of a peculiarity in the drafting. I cannot understand this sort of drafting in a Constitution. In clause 3(1) you have said that there will be no reservation for the tribal areas of Assam. You have not left any reservation. If you look to clause 3(1) it says:

"In article-330 of the Constitution, in sub-clause(b) of clause (1) for the words "except the Scheduled Tribes

in the tribal areas of Assam and in Nagaland; and", the following shall be substituted, namely:-

"except the Scheduled Tribes...."

Therefore, except the Scheduled Tribes, in the Tribal areas of Assam there will be no reservation. Then you have said in an amendment;

"Notwithstanding anything contained in clause (2), the number of seats reserved in the House of the People for the Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts of Assam shall bear to the total number of seats allotted to that State a proportion not less than the population of the Scheduled Tribes in the said autonomous districts bears to the total population of the State."

Where have you reserved it? You want to make a reservation of a certain thing by a not withstanding clause. I have yet to hear of a constitution-drafting where in the substantive Article you do not make any reservation but in the proviso you want to make the reservation. This is a peculiarity which I have never seen in constitution-drafting. Probably, when you have been confronted with a particular political situation, you have come out with a particular drafting because the only tribal areas in Assam to-day are the North Cachar and Mihar Hills. The people there are the Scheduled Tribes. The districts are also the autonomous districts. Therefore, instead of keeping any reservation for the Autonomous districts you want to keep a reservation in the notwithstanding clause. Instead of that, a simple drafting can be made. In fact I am submitting an amendment. Why should you not say that after clause 3 you may delete the tribal areas of Assam and, thereafter, you may say:

"Provided that the number of seats reserved in the House of People for the Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts of Assam shall bear to the total number of seats allotted to that State a proportion not less than the population of the Scheduled Tribes in the said autonomous districts bear to the total population of the State. Such reservation shall be for an above the number of seats the State of Assam is entitled to now"..

I entirely support this amendment because by this amendment a seat is sought to be kept apart for the north Cachar and Mihar Hills. Now it will be apparent from the Statement of Objects and Reasons that now there will be no reservation for the Scheduled Tribes whether it is Meghalaya or Nagaland or Mizoram and the purpose is that these territories being predominantly Scheduled Tribes areas, no reservation is therefore necessary. But it is not the same thing with regard to North Cachar and Mihar Hills, the only autonomous districts in Assam to-day because in the total population of Assam the percentage of Scheduled Tribes population is very low. But the North Cachar and Mihar Hills have a substantial amount of tribal population but their population does not qualify for one seat. Therefore, unless one seat is kept for them, Mr Biren Engti who is elected from that District will lose representation. Not only individually, he will lose representation, but it will have an adverse impact on the areas as such because the tribal people are a very sensitive people and they may feel that a right which had accrued to them has been taken away and it will have strong and adverse political repercussions in the State itself.

I feel that while giving them an additional representation on compassionate or political ground, the representation to which the people of Assam are entitled should not be taken away or should not be curtailed. After all, as I see from the amendment, while granting this additional seat to the Scheduled Districts of North Cachar and Mihar Hills, there is no mention that it will not be from the quota of Assam. Assam has a very poor representation in this House. It has only 14 members and we do not have also a Member of the stature of Mr Pilo Mody who can make effective contribution in the House.

Therefore, I feel that the existing representation of Assam should not be taken away while granting representation to North Cachar and Mihar Hills. I emphatically say that North Cachar and Mihar Hills should be granted representation. They have got one representative here. That should not be curtailed. Because, if that is curtailed, it will have adverse effect on the entire north-eastern region particularly

in Assam. So I would suggest that specific seat should be earmarked for North Cachar Mihar Hills. The existing representation of Assam should not be diminished. The amendment has not made it clear. I hope that the hon Minister will, while replying to the Debate, clear up this matter and assure the House that the existing number of seats for Assam will be maintained and an additional seat will be granted to North Cachar and Mihar Hills. With these words I support the Bill.

(15.00 Hours)

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): I endorse the views expressed by my friend Shri Shyamandan Mishra and I also congratulate my friend Mr. Goswami who has made a very substantial contribution to this Debate and to this Bill. I have a few views which I would like to place before the honourable House. I tend to be somewhat ruthless when it comes to representation. I believe that basically the representation to the House of the People should be strictly in accordance with the population. We have to bear in mind that one is indivisible, as far as human beings are concerned. Those areas which do not have a representation would have a minimum of one Member. Other than that I would very much like to say that the House of the People is to be in direct proportion to the population of the country. Some of the friends of the DMK and the hon. Member from the Socialist Party may think that it is a disservice to family planning but I do not think that in creating representation, one can consider this as a disservice to family planning. So, I would say that I ruthlessly adhere to the principle of equal representation.

I would go one step further and say that the constituency should be so created that as far as reasonably possible the size of the constituency should be wherever possible more or less equal so that we have States with equal advantages and equal disadvantages.

Having said this, I would say that in many of the smaller States where the population is less than 6 million, certainly some special provisions have been made. I don't think, by virtue of a territory having smaller population or having sparsely populated area, its strength in the House should increase, or whether it will in any way contribute to better Government either of those

[Shri Piloo Mody]

territories or of the Centre. I would certainly like this matter to be examined in terms of what will bring about greater representative Government over here.

It is an absolute fact that there are certain areas of the country which are economically and socially not as well developed as the rest of the country. The first charge on our responsibility should be that such areas should be brought up to the general level as fast as possible. One way of doing it, is to see that those particular areas which can be defined under this category, could be given additional representation. Having been ruthless on the one hand, I now suggest that on the other hand, special provision should be made on a temporary basis for giving additional representation to certain tracts of our country, not based on caste, communal or creed basis, but only on the basis of certain tracts of this country which can be termed economically and socially backward. And this is one way of seeing to it that by increasing their representation here you get their voice better heard and you find legislation coming out which will pay more attention to the problems of these backward tracts. This is one way to cure the regional imbalances in a short period.

Then, Sir, this Bill seems to me to be some sort of shock to somebody else. In other words, this Bill lacks the genuineness of effort. It shows that there is perhaps something other than merely a desire to set things right. There is some motivation in this Bill, however, negligible it may be. There is certain motivation. That is why I feel this Bill is not a good one and I would certainly like to request the hon. Minister if there is any such motivation by the amending process he will make sure that this Bill emerges as the same Bill which has been designed to cure a certain anomaly. But on the principle of equal representation and on the principle of not increasing the size of this House I have very firm views. I do not think the size of this House should be increased any further and that, if anything the re-adjustments that have to be made and particularly the clause which seeks to protect areas which have lost population should be deleted altogether.

**SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) :**  
Mr. Chairman, Sir, many hon. Members have surprisingly said that if this is the

manner in which we go about increasing the strength of this Parliament after every census we do not know where we shall end. But, Sir, it is a simple fact of history that after this Constitution of ours was proclaimed and adopted, three censuses have taken place, namely, in 1951, 1961 and 1971 and that the strength of this Parliament is sought to be increased for the first time. So, one cannot draw the conclusion that after every census we are going to increase the strength of this House. To link the question of the size of this House with programme of Family Planning is rather far-fetched, if not, absurd. Wherever population is concerned, to connect it with Family Planning is unrealistic. The hon. Member from the Jan Sangh, said, and Mr. Piloo Mody has also hinted, 'here and no more'. Let us increase the size for once and no more. Mr. Joshi said, "Let us draw a 'Lakshman Rekha'." It seems he has been sent by some divine power to decide for all generations to come what will be the size of this House. Sir, no generation can legislate for the next generation. We are here to grapple with the problem which confronts us today and, therefore, to give any element of finality to what we decide is not correct and should not be correct. I am inclined to agree with the very sound principle propounded by my friend Shri Madhu Limaya that by and large the population should be the basis for representation to this House. This is the House of the Lok, the people of India. We represent the whole country. We do not represent any State or any territory or any region and to re-establish more firmly the federal principle of our country, it is the other House, the Rajya Sabha, as its very name connotes, which represents the States of India. I would not go to the extent of agreeing that we should have equal representation from all States to the Rajya Sabha. That would not be realistic. That would not reflect the conditions in our country today. I certainly agree, since representation in the Rajya Sabha is based on the States, every State—big or small—must be assured of a fairly sizeable representation in that House, if not equally. A small State should have a big sizeable representation and big States' representation may be reduced. As far as this House is concerned, the population should be by and large the criterion. I am entirely in agreement with Shri Samar

Guha that there is no ponderable, plausible reason for having seven Members of the Lok Sabha from Delhi just because Delhi happens to be a Centrally Administered State or a Union Territory.

I would also like the hon. Minister and you Sir, and the whole House to sympathise with me personally. Geography is as important as human population. If one million is going to be the population to determine a constituency, the area of my constituency would be three times that of Karala State and double that of the Haryana State. It means a man of ripe age like you Sir, any or other revered old man can never contest election from such a vast constituency.

Here in Western Rajasthan nothing can move during the three months of the year, nor even a jeep, not even a camel. Temperature is 48 degree. During these three months you can not move in that constituency. Nothing can move. For six months the member is supposed to attend the Parliament. It takes one year to cover the constituency. Not to talk of nursing the constituency, he can not maintain contact with the people, which he must maintain. After all, Geography will have to be taken into consideration—no transport, no communications, no roads, no telephones, camels do not move during the day. The Minister says that no telephone can be provided there as commercially it is not possible.

There are no post offices and no roads. So, how can anyone nurse such a large constituency? Either you should provide that the election expenses will be borne by the state or atleast you should have some of consideration for the size of the territory also. Population by and large is a sound principle, but physical factors also should be taken into consideration and some balance will have to be struck.

Of course, if a constituency is very small in terms of population and area there is a danger that petty issues or minor issues will predominate the elections and the larger national issues would be lost sight of. I entirely agree there because relations, neighbourhood, legal squabbles and personal disputes etc. all come into play in such small constituencies. But at the same time if the constituency is very large one, with

a very large population or a very large area, then in actual practice, it amounts to disenfranchisement. It means that a large section of the population would be deprived in actual practice of the right to vote. So, a balance will have to be struck between the very small areas and the very big areas. At the same time, a balance will also have to be struck between population and area. In large cities, people can contest elections by canvassing on cycles, or on foot they can contact their elector physically. But in vast areas like deserts or the hill areas like these of Himachal Pradesh or other States, where the population is very thin and sparse and scanty and scattered the area must also be taken into consideration so that the Members who contest the elections to represent the people could do justice to their electorate.

SHRI VASANT SATHI (Akola) : I would like to take up some of the points raised by my hon. friends on the opposite side while they tried to criticise the Bill. In fact, this is a simple Bill, and one need not read too much into it as if it is going to open the floodgates for all posterity and after every census we are going to increase the strength of the Lok Sabha and by the turn of the country we might reach a population of about 100 crore, at the rate at which we have grown now, the membership of the Lok Sabha may be about 1000 or so, and we may be required to go to the Central Hall or some where else. This fear is without any basis for the simple reason that even when we put the figure at 500 at the time the constitution was made we had a substantially large population in comparison with the UK or the USA or the USSR and yet trying to find a balance, we decided that an optimum number of 500 should be maintained.

Although we now have 25 to represent Union territories, this number is being reduced now to 20. Here we are going to add 25, so that in effect, we are going to add only 20. Therefore, it is not such a substantial addition to the number of Lok Sabha Members.

The basic object is that during delimitation certain adjustments of constituencies have to be made, and that adjustment will be beneficial to one and all. There is no question of party or any such thing in this. There

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

is to be a uniform basis for representation of population in a particular place. Tomorrow Shri Piloo Mody's party may be very popular in particular region and they may have the advantage ?

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** We do not believe in regionalism, but throughout India.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE :** Or it may be Jan Sangh or any other party which may be popular and they may have the advantage. If Shri Piloo Mody does not want it, I can not help it. But I am willing to give a fair chance democratically to every political party.

The basic point that had been raised was that this amendment had no principle. I would submit that the principle is the same; there is no change in the principle which was there originally when we made the constitution. My hon. friend wanted a Rajya Sabha which would consist of directly elected representatives on the basis of equal representation for all States.

I can appreciate the point of equal representation in the Rajya Sabha to all States, but not on the basis of the direct election, but on the basis of State election, because this is the House of the people and that is the House representing the States. Therefore, essentially people who come there must represent the States; they are not representing the people directly. Hence I can understand the principle that there the representation should be given on the basis of State, just like it is in the Senate of the US.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) :** States containing people.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE :** Yes. But the people should be represented here directly. We come here as elected representatives of the people; they come there as elected by the States. Therefore, if there is equal representation in Rajya Sabha, there we will have proper representation. Even a small State will be properly represented. But I cannot appreciate the suggestion made. Then you will have two Lok Sabha. If they are directly elected, then his whole idea of not increasing the membership here will be defeated, for there will be parallel Lok Sabha working in the other place. Therefore, I see no substance in the argument advanced by Shri Madhu Limye.

Then Shri Shyamandan Mishra was very critical of what he called black money democracy. He said that today everything is done and run by money power and election costs a lot. Who was responsible for this black money ?

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** You.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE :** Men like Shri Piloo Mody, men like Shri Mishra himself who all these years has supported the existence of a capitalist economy in this country. (Interruption) When any effort was made to curb the power of these capitalists, when any attempt was made to prevent accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few, with the rich growing richer, they criticised that move. When they were in the United Congress, these people who are today in the Congress O, the syndicate-men and reactionaries supported the capitalist class and the vested interests and there by frustrated any march on the road to socialism in spite of what Pandit Nehru and others did.

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** I think his statement has to be corrected by one rider : the most amount of money has been spent by the socialists in their election except for the communists who spent even more.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE :** Except for Shri Piloo Mody and the Swatantraites who spent the most of the black money because most of the black money is with them.

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** With the Treasury Benches.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE :** With the 100 houses, not with the Treasury benches. He need not expose himself.

Then I come to Shri Piloo Mody.

**SHRI C. M. STPLILN :** The Bill is about the amendment of the constitution.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE :** He said he ruthlessly adhered to the principle of representation on the basis of population. Further, he was surprised that there was a motivation, some malicious motivation, in this Bill. But he conceded I have no proof, I have not studied the document..

**SHRI PILOO MODY** : I said it is very minor thing, it is not going to make any difference. He is misquoting me.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE** : This sounded very much like Hegde who said 'I have no proof but I have a hunch that the Prime Minister is against me because I decided an election petition against her'. Both of them belong to the same tribe.

**SHRI PILOO MODY** : Class.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE** : Class and tribe both.

Therefore, When people talk without study, what can you do, This Bill is for a readjustment of the seats in accordance with the Delimitation Act that had been passed in 1972. With new census we do not want any injustice done to a State where due to delimitation, even some reduction may take place in the number of seats.

If in a particular case, there is less population—(Interruptions)

**MR. CHAIRMAN** : Address the chair only.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE** : Even though vanquished he can argue still. So, what can I do with him ?

Therefore, Sir as far as this Bill is concerned, I entirely support the Bill, but I would only like to utter a note of warning. I support also the suggestion made by my friend Shri Goswami. There, I think you are making a mistake. Your amendment is not in keeping with the constitutional provision. Kindly study it and have it properly examined so that the amendment may be completely in tune with the Constitution. Merely saying "notwithstanding such and such" is not proper. This way of amending the Constitution is considered a very defective and wrong method of amending the Constitution. If you think that a particular provision is to be amended properly, make an amendment in the original section or article itself. Do not let the article remain as it is and then quietly say "notwithstanding." What do you mean by saying "notwithstanding"? Do you mean to say you cannot withstand that provision there ? If you want change it, change it honestly.

Therefore, I entirely support what has been suggested by Mr. Goswami. Please make that change in the original article itself and not bring about such an amendment like "notwithstanding" etc. With these I support the Bill and I hope it will receive the support from the entire House and even the Opposition.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN** (Muvattupuzha) : Mr. Chairman, Sir I rise to support this Bill. The speeches that some of the hon. Members of the House were making have made it appear as though something drastic is being attempted by the introduction of this Bill. The principle as to how high the strength of membership of this House can go, the principle as to how large a constituency can possibly be—unless these principles are determined, any amendment of article 81 is not permissible, and that was the line of argument that some of my learned friends have been putting forward.

But to me it appears that these fundamental questions are not involved in the Bill that we are now considering. This has been made amply clear in the Statement of Objects and Reasons given as an appendix to this Bill. The Statement of Objects and Reasons says :

It will be noticed that adherence to the principles laid down in clause (2) of the article 81 by the Delimitation Commission in undertaking readjustment as enjoined by article 82 on the basis of the 1971-census figures may have the effect of the affecting number of seats allotted to the States in the House of the People. It is felt that it would be better to ensure that any readjustment and consequent allocation of seats does not adversely affect the existing number of seats allotted to each State in the House of the people and to achieve this purpose it would be necessary to increase the strength of the Lok Sabha suitably."

So, the purpose of the Bill is not to get the increase in the population reflected in the House. That is not the purpose of the Bill. If that was the purpose of the Bill, and amendment should have come before the House long long ago, because in 1951, when we started, the population of this country was only 30 crores; it has now gone up to 53 or 55 crores.

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

If it was contemplated that the increase in the population must get automatically reflected in the strength of the House, The amendment should have come for earlier. From 1957 onwards the strength of the House has been more or less the same.

Far from that, the purpose of this Bill as I could understand, is to do justice to the sentiments of the people whenever delimitation is taking place.

There are large States and small States. Small States like Himachal Pradesh, Tripura, Manipur, Maghalaya, Jammu and Kashmir and Nagaland have together got 17 seats. The larger states have got 498 seats. When delimitation takes place and when new House is reconstituted, no State should feel that its membership has gone down; particularly the small states should not be made to feel that their membership has gone down. Without this amendment inevitably, their number will go down. The position is that 11 lakhs of people will have one representative in the House. If that principle is applied, the small States will get less than 17 seats which they are now getting. Even with respect to larger States, because of the fluctuation in the matter of population, it so happens that some States will get less than what they are getting. For instance if the population figure is taken as the criterion, Tamilnadu will be getting less number of seats than it has at present. U. P. also which is now getting 85 will get only 81 on the basis of the population figures. There are some States like that. If there is reduction in the number of seats that these States have in Parliament it will adversely affect the sentiments of those States.

Therefore, we begin with this principle that when delimitation takes place no State shall get less number of seats that it had in the former House. This amendment is absolutely inevitable. Because proportionate increase in representation will have to be assured to the other States where the population has gone up. On this basis you will come to the figure of 525, that is the purpose of the bill as far as I can understand. Article 81(2) is also amended by insertion of a sub-clause. The purpose is to ensure that the small States whose population is less than six million get the seats which they were getting formerly.

If the principle is applied to them, then those small States which I have enumerated, will be getting less number of seats than they were getting before.

This is a very salutary principle which will have to be observed. Merely because in a particular State the population is not kept up with the explosive characteristic of population of the other States, this should not happen that they will have their representation shrunk in this House. It need not be that we should keep pace with the rest of the States. At least the number of seats which these States were getting in this House should be maintained. That is the principal involved in this Bill. Therefore, the question before the House is whether the principle is a valid one or not. The question is whether, in proportion to the increase in the population the membership of this House also must increase or not. To this there is absolutely no answer.

As far as this Bill is concerned, that answer is not attendant at all. As against 30 crores the population has now gone up to 52 crores. Nevertheless the figure in this House is remaining as it was. The principle is that as far as possible the membership of this House shall not increase. If it is to be increased it should be done in such a manner that even the present figure of 525 should remain as it is. If you take the House of Commons, their total membership is 600 or 620 or something like that. But the characteristic of the number differs from country to country. Here we shall not increase because this country's Parliament does not have the seating capacity. In the House of Commons, even though, it does not have the seating capacity, still they are able to carry on their deliberations. That is not an inhibiting character. But, still the question remains namely whether, in a House which has got about 1,000 Members, it would be possible for the members to carry on their deliberations properly or not. That is a very important matter. Anyway, we are not discussing that aspect at all here. The only Principle involved here is the seating capacity. After the States, reorganisation small States emerged whereby a situation is created. Some States feel that because of certain circumstances which are good from the national point of view, namely,

ammunition of the population, their representation must stand curtailed. That feeling is inculcated in them. That is a good feeling. I am very clear on one thing. In my view the answer to that question will be to put an end to that sentimentality. For that, proper amendment of the Constitution is the only way out. Therefore this amendment is an inescapable must apart from the board principles involved in this Bill. From this point of view, I support this Bill and I commend it to the acceptance of the House.

**श्री राम सहाय पांडे (राजनंदगांव) :**  
सभापति महोदय, 31वें संविधान संशोधन की प्रक्रिया में जो विधेयक आया है वह बड़ा सीधा-सादा और सरल है तथा मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

अब अगले चुनाव में इस सदन की सदस्य संख्या 545 होगी। जिन परिस्थितियों में यह संख्या बढ़ी है उस में जन-संख्या का प्राधान्य नहीं है, और न इस का यही अर्थ है कि जैसे जैसे हमारे देश की जन-संख्या बढ़ती जायेगी वैसे वैसे हम लोक सभा का प्रतिनिधित्व भी बढ़ाते जायेंगे। इस का अभिप्राय यह भी नहीं है कि 545 सदस्यों के सदन में बैठने के लिये स्थानाभाव है। अभी हाउस आफ कामन्स के छोटे में स्थान का वर्णन किया गया और बतलाया गया कि वहाँ गैलरी में लोग बैठते हैं।

मैं तो यह चाहता था कि जहाँ पर यह संख्या वृद्धि की बात कही गई है वहाँ कोई ऐसा भी अवसर आता सदन में कि हम एक बार तमाम चुनाव, समूह की सदस्य संख्या, उन के आचरण, उन के कर्तव्य, बोटिंग, पोलिंग, प्रबन्ध खर्च आदि सब बातों पर एक सिद्धान्तलोकन करते। हमारा देश गरीब है और हम सब चुनाव लड़ कर आते हैं तथा जानते हैं कि वह कितना खर्चीला है। हम जनता को जो भी आश्वासन देते हैं, जो भी प्रस्तावना करते हैं, जो चुनाव घोषणापत्र रखते हैं, जो भी बातें मतदाताओं से कह कर आते हैं, उन को कार्यान्वित करने की प्रक्रिया

में हम चाहते हैं कि सदन के माध्यम से हम अपनी पात्रता को अक्षुण्ण रखें।

मध्यावधि चुनाव के बाद पहली बार यह अनुभव भी हुआ देश के लोगों को कि संसद्-सदस्य का भी कोई महत्व है। इस का कारण यह है कि इस बार मतदाता मंडल से हमारा सीधा सीधा सम्पर्क हुआ। इस में पहले हम पर चार्ज लगाया जाता था कि हम विधान सभा के सदस्यों के कंधों पर बैठ कर यहाँ आ जाते हैं। उस समय हमारा कोई पृथक अस्तित्व नहीं था, डायरेक्ट कमिटमेंट नहीं था, योजनाओं और विकास में हमारा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था।

इस चुनाव के अवसर पर जनता ने पहली बार यह भी अनुभव किया कि केन्द्र में एक ऐसा शासन होना चाहिए, जिस का पर्याप्त बहुमत हो और इस देश में एक स्टेबल गवर्नमेंट हो। इस नाते श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी अपने मैनिफेस्टो, अपने आदर्श और अपने सगठन के साथ जब मतदाता मंडल के सामने उपस्थित हुई, तो देश ने बड़े विश्वास और भरोसे के साथ उन का समर्थन किया। अब हम पर यह जिम्मेदारी आती है कि हम ने जनता के साथ जो वादे किये हैं, हम उन को पूरा करने का प्रयत्न करें।

जनता ने तो अपना काम पूरा कर दिया है। हमारा लोभतत्र मारे समार में सब से बड़ा है। 22 करोड़ मतदाता किसी देश में नहीं हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने बड़े अनुशासन, शालीनता और स्वस्थ परम्पराओं के अन्तर्गत वोट किया। जिन जनता को हम इन्लिट्टिट और अनपढ़ कहते हैं, उन को चुनाव और राजनीति के तत्व-दर्शन का पूरा ज्ञान है।

लेकिन जिन परिस्थितियों और प्रक्रियाओं से हम गुजरते हैं, उन पर भी ध्यान देना आवश्यक होगा। इस लिए मैं चाहता था कि सदन में इस विषय पर सम्पूर्ण रूप से चर्चा होती। हम को संसद् के तीन सत्रों

[श्री राम सहाय पांडे]

में छः महीने के करीब दिल्ली में रहना पड़ता है। श्री मधुलिमये ने, या किसी अन्य सदस्य ने, कहा है कि हमारे पास कोई साधन नहीं है। मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि हमारा वेतन 500 रुपये से बढ़ा कर 700 रुपये या 1000 रुपये कर दिया जाये, या हमारा डेली एलाउंस बढ़ा दिया जाये। सम्भव है कि इस बारे में मतदाता मंडल की प्रक्रिया बुरी हो।

लेकिन हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे क्षेत्र से हमारे पास जो दस, पंद्रह, बीस पत्र आते हैं, हम उन का उत्तर देने की स्थिति में तो हों। पत्रों के उत्तर देने के लिए, प्रश्न, बिल और प्रस्ताव आदि प्रस्तुत करने के लिए, जो हम सोचते हैं, उस को साकार रूप देने के लिए हमारे पास कोई सहायक होना चाहिए। इस के अलावा पोस्टेज के सम्बन्ध में भी कुछ सुविधा दी जानी चाहिए। सरकार ने यह सीमा लगा दी है कि संसद्-सदस्य के लिए इतने टेलीफोन काल्ब फ्री हैं। लेकिन यह बात भुला दी गई है कि केवल हम ही टेलीफोन नहीं करते हैं। हमारे क्षेत्र से जो कोई कार्य कर्त्ता हमारे पास आता है, उस की भी कुछ आवश्यकताये होती हैं। पहले तो हम उस का आतिथ्य-सत्कार करते हैं, ताकि वह प्रसन्न हो कर जाये। फिर वह बम्बई और जयपुर आदि डायरेक्ट डायरलिंग वाले नगरों के लिए टेलीफोन घुमाता है। इस तरह दो दो हजार रुपये का खर्च हो जाता है। इस का क्या इलाज है ?

मैं नहीं चाहता कि टेलीफोन काल्ब फ्री कर दी जायें, या जो काल्ब बाहर की जाती हैं, उन का पैसा भी सरकार दे। लेकिन सरकार को कम से कम इतना तो करना चाहिए कि हमें कोई सहायक, क्लर्क या स्टेनोग्राफर दिया जायें, पोस्टेज थोड़ी फ्री होनी चाहिए और अगर हो सके, तो बिजली की भी सुविधा मिलनी चाहिए।

सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि हम अपनी कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी में कैसे जायें। श्री नाहटा

ने कहा है कि अगर हम ऊंट पर भी जायें, तो रात को चलना पड़ता है। उस से क्या फायदा है ? इतना बड़ा क्षेत्र होता है, लेकिन कोई सवारी नहीं है। सभापति महोदय, आप बहुत पुराने संसद्-सदस्य हैं। आप देख सकते हैं कि हम अपने क्षेत्र में कैसे जायें। अपने चुनाव-क्षेत्र के लोगों से सम्पर्क रखना हमारे संसदीय जीवन का एक अभिन्न अंग है। इस लिए संसद्-सदस्यों के लिए कम से कम एक जीप का इन्तजाम होना चाहिए।

एक माननीय सदस्य : हैलिकाप्टर का।

श्री राम सहाय पांडे : आप के मुंह में घी भक्कर। अगर हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति इतनी अच्छी हो जाये, अगर हम इतने एफ्नु-एण्ट हो जायें कि संसद्-सदस्यों के लिए हैलिकाप्टर की व्यवस्था की जा सके, तो बड़ा अच्छा है। लेकिन इस समय तो हमें कम से कम जीप ही दी जाये। उस से हम अपने मतदाता मंडल के पास जा कर उस से कुछ बात तो कर सकते हैं। हम उन लोगों को कुछ दे नहीं सकते। हम उन की अकिंचनता, विपन्नता और साधनों के अभाव को पूरा नहीं कर सकते हैं, लेकिन कम से कम हम उन के आंसू तो पोंछ सकते हैं, उन को आश्वस्त तो कर सकते हैं, उन को बता सकते हैं कि हमारी यह मजबूरी है, यह विवशता है।

सभापति महोदय : हाउस की महानुभूति आप के साथ है।

श्री राम सहाय पांडे : धन्यवाद।

इस बात का प्रबन्ध होना चाहिए कि हम पर जो दायित्व हैं, हम किसी हद तक उन का निर्वाह करने के मार्ग पर चल सकें।

अब मैं चुनाव के खर्च के सम्बन्ध में कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। कोई माननीय सदस्य यह कह कर मुझे न टोके कि उस का इस बिल से क्या सम्बन्ध है। चूंकि उस का सम्बन्ध इस सदन की प्रतिक्रियाओं व्यवस्थाओं और परम्पराओं से है, इस लिए इस बिल से उस का सम्बन्ध है। श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र

ने कहा है कि यह डेमोक्रेसी काले धन की डेमोक्रेसी है।

श्री श्यामनन्धन मिश्र : मैंने कहा है कि "हो जायेगी।"

श्री राम सहाय पांडे : कभी नहीं होगी, क्योंकि हल्के हल्के जनता में अपने दायित्व का पालन करने की चेतना और बोध आ जायेगा और वे चुनाव के खर्चे कम हो जायेंगे। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि चुनाव जीतने के बाद हम जिस फार्म पर साइन करते हैं, उस में खर्चा ठीक होना चाहिए। या तो उस का प्रावधान ही समाप्त कर दिया जाये और या वैस्ट जर्मनी तथा अन्य देशों की तरह सरकार ही खर्च की व्यवस्था करे। जनता हम से पूछती है कि आप चुनाव पर दो लाख रुपया क्यों खर्च करते हैं। सब जानते हैं कि चुनाव पर डेढ़ दो लाख रुपया खर्च होता है। हम ने इस का रास्ता निकाला है। हम लिख देते हैं कि इतना पैसा पार्टी ने खर्च किया और इतना पैसा दोन्म ने खर्च किया, आदि। हमारी कान्फ्रान्स, हमारी आत्मा, जानती है कि हम जो फार्म भरते हैं, उस में कितना सच और कितना झूठ होता है।

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Auseram). He should be disqualified, because he has spent more than Rs. 2 lakhs.

श्री राम सहाय पांडे : नहीं। हम कहते हैं कि हमारे मित्रों, साथियों और सहयोगियों ने और हमारी पार्टी ने, दो लाख रुपये खर्च किये हैं। कैंडिडेट तो पन्चमि हजार रुपये से ज्यादा खर्च नहीं करता है और इतना भी नहीं चाहिए। जैसे, मैंने सिर्फ 17, 18 हजार रुपया खर्च किया है। वैधानिक प्रावधान के अलावा जो कुछ खर्च होता है, उस के लिए जो आवरण हम रखते हैं, उस की हटा देना चाहिए। ये चुनाव बहुत खर्चिले होते हैं। एक स्वास्थ्य परम्परा के नाते यह इतना खर्चीला चुनाव नहीं होना चाहिए। (अध्यक्ष) तो यह एक स्वस्थ परम्परा की ओर ध्यान दिलाते हुए हम आप से निवेदन

करना चाहते हैं कि यद्यपि हम वैधानिक प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत अपनी सुरक्षा को विधान की दृष्टि से देखते हुए ठीक कर लेते हैं, दोस्त भी खर्च करता है, उस का भी प्रावधान है, पार्टी भी खर्च करती है, उस का भी प्रावधान है। यह सब कुछ है। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि चुनाव खर्चीला ही न हो और खर्चीला न होने का दायित्व सरकार ले ले। पिछले चुनावों में यह देख ले कि दल ने कितने वोट पाए। वह दल जितना वोट पाये हो उस के कुछ प्रोपोर्शन में उतनी धनराशि उस दल को दे दे। अब दल का काम है कि वह कौसे डिस्ट्रीब्यूट करे उस को। .. (अध्यक्ष) ... जैसे पश्चिमी जर्मनी में होता है। क्यों कि पोलिटिकल पार्टी जो भी बहुमत में आयेगी एस० एन० मिश्रा जी वहीने कि उस ने काला धन इकट्ठा किया। ज्योतिर्मय बसु चिल्लाते रहते हैं। ..

सभापति महोदय : बिल पर आइए।

श्री राम सहाय पांडे : यह सब बिल पर ही है। इस बिल में है क्या ? इस बिल में आप यह चाहते हैं कि कुछ सीटें बढ़ानी चाहिए तो बढ़ा दीजिए।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : The Minister is not here to take note of the valuable suggestions of Mr. Pandey.

श्री राम सहाय पांडे : This Bill is very simple. They want to increase the number of seats. Let them increase.

हम जो बताते हैं, हम अपनी तकलीफ बताते हैं। एक स्वस्थ परम्परा की तरफ हम आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहते हैं। एक तो हम जो कह कर आते हैं अपनी बात को सिद्ध करने के लिए और यह सिद्ध करने के लिए कि आप ने जिस को चुना है वह एक सुपात्र उम्मीदवार है, हम उस के पास जाये तो कैसे जायें ? जीप का प्रबन्ध होना चाहिए। टेलिफोन, पोस्टेज, बाबू यह

**[श्री राम सहाय पांडे]**

जो कुछ भी सुविधाएँ हैं वह मिलनी चाहिए ताकि हम अपने दायित्व का पालन कर सकें।

तीसरी बात—यह खर्चीला चुनाव बन्द हो जाना चाहिए और यह सरकार का काम है कि वह हमारी रैम्ब्यू में आए। चुनाव की प्रक्रिया मरल सीधी निम्न और कम खर्चीली हो ताकि हम अपने दायित्व का पालन कर सकें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल वा समर्थन करता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि जब कभी अवसर आए इस सदन के सम्मुख तो इन तमाम सुविधाओं की तरफ और एक स्वस्थ परम्परा की तरफ हमें आगे बढ़ना है और हम लोकतंत्र को घबल बनाना है। जो कमियाँ हैं उन कमियों को दूर करना है। खर्चीले को कम खर्चीला और मितव्ययी बनाना है ताकि हमारा गरीब लोकतंत्र परियन्तवित हो और एक हमारे की तरफ जो छोटाकशी होती है, लाछन होता है वह न हो और हम स्वस्थ परम्परा के साथ यथा आए और स्वस्थ परम्परा के निर्वाह के लिए अपने कर्तव्य के साथ आगे बढ़ें।

**श्री बरबारा सिंह (होशियारपुर) :** सभा-पति महोदय काकी दोस्ती में मैंने बातें सुनीं। यह कुछ तारा कहते हैं कि पार्लियामेंट में गुणांश कम है, सीटें कम हैं, इमान्ण मैम्बर बहुत बढ़ाने नही चाहिए। मैं इस क बिलकुल मुखानिक हूँ। सीटें क्या नहीं बढ़नी चाहिये पापुलेशन बढ़ रही है। पापुलेशन की बैमिस हम ने बनाई है। जब हम नैगेशन समीशन को यह कहा है कि उन्हें हदबन्दा करनी है, हदबन्दी करते वकत यह देखते हैं कि पापुलेशन के हिसाब से क्वांटिट्यासी ठीक बैठनी हे या नही। उम में वायविलिटी भी देखते हैं, एरिया भी देखते हैं एरिया की डिफिकरटीज भी देखते हैं। यह सब कुछ देखते हुए इस को बनाने है। तो हम यह कहें कि पिछले 25 सालो में हम ने कुछ नही बढ़ाया तो अब भी न बढ़ाए, यह बात किसी

दलील पर उतरती हुई दिखाई नही देती। यहा अभी एक दोस्त ने हाउस आफ कामन्स की बात कही। मैंने वहा देखा है, उस को कार्यवाही देखा है स्पीकर बैठा है, कुछ दो चार और मैम्बर बैठे हैं, मिनिस्टर बैठा है, बात चल रही है। बाकी सब बाहर है। कोई सीट में नही है। और यह हम से ज्यादा है नादाद में। नेशन जो इन्टेन्टेड है सब-जेक्ट में वह याने है। यहा भी देख लीजिए कि कितने दोस्त बैठे हैं? साठे पाच सी, कोई बैठे हैं यहा? यहा तो वह उम वकत बैठते हैं कि जब कि पार्टी की तरफ से विह्व हो कि इस खास मजमून पर हो वोट करना है। तब यहा आ कर बैठते हैं। वरना जो इन्टेन्टेड है वह यहा आ कर बैठते हैं और अपनी बात कह कर चले जाते हैं। इस लिए मैं कहता हूँ कि यह चीज मामने रख कर कि चूकि जगह कम हो जायगी इसलिए सीटें नही बढ़ानी चाहिए, यह दलील पर उतरने वाली बात नही है। मैं यह कहता हूँ कि हमें यह सीटें बढ़ानी चाहिए।

अब कहते हैं कि 1 लाख की आबादी की सीटें नीचे बननी हैं और हम मात आठ क्वांटिट्यासी में से एक चुन कर प्राते हैं। पापुलेशन फिक्स्ड है। अगर फिक्स्ड पापुलेशन है तो पापुलेशन एक बैमिस है जिम के आधार पर आप ने सब काम किया है। तो आज क्या करते हैं कि पापुलेशन बढ़ गई है। साठे बाईस करोड तो पापुलेशन बढ़ गई है हो और आप 25 सीटें बढ़ाने हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि यह अच्छा मौका था और मैं मसलता हूँ कि यह अच्छा काम किया है मिनिस्टर साहब ने लेकिन और अच्छा होता कि और इस को काम्प्रीहेंसिव लाते और जितनी पापुलेशन बढ़ी है उस के आधार पर लाने। अगर आप यह कहते हैं कि पापुलेशन तो बढ़ती रहती है इस लिए हम ज्यादा नही बढ़ा सकते, यह एक रीजन हो सकता है, लेकिन मैं यह रीजन इसलिए नही मुनासिब मालूम होता कि पिछले 20-25 साल में आपने क्या किया?

आप ने कोई सीटें बढ़ाई नहीं हैं। बढ़ाने के लिए अब आए हैं और अब जब आए हैं तो खास मखसूस बीस सीटों के लिए। मैं कहता हूँ कि काम्प्रीहेंसिव बिल लाइए।

हमारे दोस्त ने बहुत कुछ कहा है इस के बारे में मतलब क्या हों, हम को सहूलियतें क्या चाहिए? हम तो कुछ नहीं चाहते मैं तो एक बात कहता हूँ कि हमारी जिम्मेदारी लीजिए। यहां हम बैठते हैं। यह नहीं है कि हम चाहते हैं कि हमें 51 रुपये रोज मिलें। हम चाहते हैं कि जो सहूलियत हम अपने एक वोटर को दे सकते हैं वह सहूलियत हमें मिलनी चाहिए। मैं ज्यादा इस बारे में नहीं कहूंगा क्यों कि इस का ज्यादा ताल्लुक इस बिल से नहीं है। लेकिन तालुक है इस लिए कि आप का जो फाइनेंस बिल है उस पर भी इस का कुछ बोझ पड़ता है। इसलिए आप कुछ रकते हैं इस बात के लिए कि कुछ बढ़ाई जायं या कम बढ़ाई जायं। तो उस को भी जब देखते हैं तो यह खर्चा तो होगा। यह भी कोई कह सकता है कि पांच सौ क्यों रखा है? उस को घटा देना चाहिए, क्यों आप ने पांच सौ के करीब रखा हुआ है? लेकिन यह बात नहीं है। आज पापुलेशन बढ़ी है। पापुलेशन को आप रोकें। कौन कहता है कि नहीं रोकें? फॅमिली प्लानिंग हो या कुछ और ढंग इस्तेमाल करें, आप उस को रोकें। लेकिन अगर नहीं रोकते तो उस के कारण यह नहीं है कि आप उन लोगों को जो यहां रेप्रेजेन्टेशन करते हैं उन को रोकें इस से कहीं यह न हो कि आप छोटी स्टेट्स को ज्यादा तरजीह देते जायं, छोटी बनने के लिए उन को इन्सेन्टिव न मिलता जाय क्यों कि यह नहीं है कि जितना छोटा सूबा उस का रेप्रेजेन्टेशन उस के पापुलेशन के लिहाज से नहीं है। उस की एरिया को एक काम्पैक्ट शकल में दिखा कर यह कहते हैं कि क्यों की यह अलाहिदा है, इसलिए उसका रेप्रेजेन्टेशन जरूर होना चाहिए। तो रेप्रेजेन्टेशन बढ़ाने के लिए भी फिर दूसरा रास्ता लोग अख्तियार

करेंगे कि और स्टेट्स का वार्ड-फरकेशन होता जाय। तो आया उस को इंसेंटिव देना चाहते हैं तो इस बात को सोच लीजिए। जिस सूबे में पापुलेशन वेशक पहले थी लेकिन और बढ़ी है तो उस हिसाब से रेशियो प्रोपोर्शन में उस को दीजिए। मैं इस बात के लिए नहीं खड़ा हुआ हूँ, मुझे सूबों का पता है, यहां एक सीट दो सीट बढ़ रही है, पापुलेशन उस की साथ के सूबे से कम बढ़ी है, तो यह किस लिहाज से बढ़ा रहें हैं? अभी मैं यह सवाल नहीं लेना चाहता क्यों कि यह अभी सामने नहीं है। जब वह बात आएगी तो हम यह सवाल उठाएंगे। लेकिन ऐसी हालत कि यहां पापुलेशन कम बढ़ी है साथ के सूबे से और उस को एक या दो सीट ज्यादा दी गई है, उन को कम दी गई है। तो यह कहीं ऐसा तो नहीं है कि वह सूबा और कटता जाय, छोटा होता जाय, छोटा होने की तरफ बढ़ता जाय। उस को इतनी सीटें मिल जाये जो कि आबादी के हिसाब से ज्यादा हैं। अब कांस्टीट्यूएंसि है। आप डिस्प्यूट्स को खत्म कीजिए। बहुत से डिस्प्यूट्स ऐसे ही पड़े हैं जैसे एक चंडीगढ़ का है। चंडीगढ़ की पापुलेशन क्या है? लेकिन क्योंकि यूनियन टैरीटरी में रखा है इसलिए एक सीट उस को देनी चाहिए। मेरे दोस्त वहां से चुन कर आए हैं, बड़े अच्छे हमारे साथी हैं। वह और जगहों से भी आ सकते हैं। लेकिन कांस्टीट्यूएंसि इस लिए रखी गई है क्यों कि यूनियन टैरीटरी में टैंग्ड है। तो यूनियन टैरीटरी का भी कहीं ऐसा न बनाएं क्यों कि यह झगड़े जो हैं इन को खत्म करना चाहिए। जो सूबों के आपस के झगड़े हैं लैंड के वह आप क्यों नहीं खत्म करते हैं? वह खत्म कर दें तो आप को और सहूलियत होगी। वरना यूनियन टैरीटरी में जो हिस्सा है वह किसी से मिलता जुलता नहीं तो उस का डीलिटेशन करने में दिक्कत होती है। इसलिए यह कहते हैं कि एक सीट बढ़ा दें। उस के बढ़ाने के वजाय जो डिस्प्यूट्स हैं उन को खत्म कीजिए। यह नहीं कि यूनियन टैरीटरी है इसलिए

[श्री दरबारा सिंह]

जहा जी चाहे एक और बधा दे । मैं आप से इतिफाक रखता हू कि जो हमारा ऊपर का हाउस है, उम में उन स्टेट्स का काफी रि-प्रेजेंटेशन होना चाहिए ताकि वे अपनी बातों को बहा रख सकें । रिप्रेजेंटेशन सब को चाहिए, छोटे सूबां को भी चाहिये, लेकिन उन को ऊपर का हाउस में दो ताकि वे बहा कह सकें । यहा आपने आबादी के लिहाज से किया है तो सीटे भी आबादी के लिहाज से होनी चाहिए ।

16 00 hrs

इलैक्शन कमीशन कास्टीचूएन्सीज बनाते वक्त तीन-चार बाते अपने सामने रखता है—उन का पहला बेमिज तौ पोपुलेशन है, उम के बाद वायाबिल्टी को देखा जाता है । लेकिन सब बात को भी नजरअन्दाज नहीं किया जा सकता—जैसा नहाटा जी ने कहा है—ऐसे बहुत से एरियाज है जिनका रकबा बहुत ज्यादा है, आबादी कम है, दूर-दूर तक फैले हुए है । मेरे यहा भी ऐसा एरिया है—जो पहाडी इलाका है, छोटी-छोटी रेबलैंट्स होती है, गेट बह कर आती ह, सारी जमीन बह जाती है, न बहा सडक रहती है, न स्कूल रहते है, न मकान रहते है । ऐसा इलाका जहा न सडके हो, न आने-जाने के माधन हो, 40-50 मील लम्बा एरिया हों, उस की कास्टीचूएन्सी बन जाती है, जहा आदमी पहुच ही नहीं सकता । मैं चाहता हू कि इलैक्शन कमीशन को आप की तरफ से हिदायत होनी चाहिए कि कास्टीचूएन्सी बनाते वक्त वे इन बातों को भी अपने सामने रखे । इस वक्त होता क्या है —इलैक्शन कमीशन के पास नक्शा होता है, कास्टीचूएन्सी किसी ने नहीं देखी होती है, नीचे से कागज आते है और बस्तखन कर दिये जाते है । बहुत थोडी सी कास्टीचूएन्सी देखते है, जिन में कोई दिल-चस्पी हांती है, बाकी वैसे ही छोट देते है, नतीजा यह होता है कि नक्शे में नदी या नाले को देख कर उस के आर-पार कास्टीचूएन्सी बना देते है, जबकि बहा पर वह नाला होता

ही नहीं है । नदी को सडक और सडक को नदी समझ लेते है, बहां जाकर देखने की जरूरत नहीं समझते । कास्टीचूएन्सी बन जाती है और बेचारा मैम्बर पाच साल तक उम से बधा फिरता है । जिनने अन्डेवेल्ड एरियाज है, अगर डेवेल्ड एरियाज के साथ लगाकर कास्टीचूएन्सी की वायाबिल्टी हो सकती है तो क्यों नहीं बनाया जाता ? एक तरफ 50 मील लम्बा पहाडी एरिया ले कर हल्का बना दिया जाता है । इस लिये निहायत जरूरी है कि जहा 20 सीटे बड़ा रहे है, जरूर बढाइये, लेकिन एक काम्प्री-हेन्सिव बिल लाइये । जहा बडी-बडी कास्टीचूएन्सीज है, पहाडी इलाके है, जहा पहुचना मुश्किल है, उन को वायाबिल बनाएये ताकि मैम्बर जनता तक पहुच सकें । इम किम्म की कास्टीचूएन्सीज में खर्चा भी ज्यादा होता है, जिनना ज्यादा में ज्यादा वोटर्स के पास पहुचने की कोशिश करेगा, उनना ज्यादा खर्च करना पडेगा । या तो यह हो जाय कि गवर्नमेंट पावन्दी लगा दे कि एक कैंडीडेट दो जीप में ज्यादा नहीं ले सकता या चार-पाच जीप में ज्यादा नहीं ले सकता या उम पर में लिमिट टटा दी जाय—हर हालत में डिफिकल्ट कास्टीचूएन्सी में खर्च ज्यादा करना पडेगा ।

आप कहते है कि यह बिल एक लिमिटेड परपज के लिए लाया गया है—लेकिन मैं आप से यह दरख्वास्त करना चाहता हू कि आप एक काम्प्रीहेन्सिव बिल लाइये । मैं इस बात से इतफाक नहीं करता कि 500 मैम्बर हो गये है, इम लिये तादाद नहीं बढाई जा सकती, जब हम कास्टीचूशन में तबदीलिया ला रहे है, पिछले दो सालो में ऐसी बहुत सी नई तबदीलिया लाये है, जिस से बहुत सा परिवर्तन हुआ है तो हम इस में भी तबदीली ला सकते है और लानी चाहिये । आबादी के लिहाज से आप जो सीटे बढाना चाहते है, बढाये, लेकिन साइज आफ दी कास्टीचूएन्सी को भी देखना होगा । बहा पापुलेशन कम

है, लेकिन इतने बिखरे हुए लोग हैं कि पहुंचना मुश्किल है, कैंडीडेट के पास पहुंचने के साधन नहीं है। अगर ज्यादा खर्च करता है तो वह कानून के खिलाफ है, क्योंकि 25 हजार रुपये की लिमिट है।

इस लिये चूँकि अब आप डिलिमिटेशन करेंगे, 20 सीटें बढ़ायेंगे, जाहिर है सारे हिन्दुस्तान का डिलिमिटेशन होगा तो इस बात को ध्यान में रखें कि किसी हल्के के साथ ज्यादाती न हो, वहाँ की वायाबिल्टी की तरफ भी पूरा ध्यान रखा जाय। कहीं ऐमा न हो जिम आदमी को जिस हल्के को रिप्रेजेंट करना है, वह वहाँ पहुंच ही न सके।

इन अनफाज के साथ मैं इस को सपोर्ट करता हूँ।

SHRI P. M. SAYEED (Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands): I was rather compelled to stand before you because at the time when Prof. Samar Guha was speaking, I was not here and he mentioned about Laccadive Islands and also about me. Now, this Delimitation Committee, when it visited Coimbatore, the leaders of Laccadives went there and met them and explained to them the special nature, the geographical location and the problems confronting them and that is how the Laccadive Islands which was once a part of Cheveayoor Constituency became an independent Lok Sabha constituency.

I have been hearing from the other side Mr. Pilo Mody saying that the Bill has been brought with a motivation before the House. I provoked him as to what was the motivation. He had no answer. Of course, there was no answer to give. He said that the motivation of the Government was...;—something he mentioned but it was not clear. He only made a sweeping allegation.

What I want to bring home here is that there are so many strategic areas, e.g. Mizoram, NEFA, Andamans, Laccadives, Chandigarh and also Dadra and Nagar Haveli, etc. You know, Sir, that unless we give a proper background, perhaps I will not be in a position to touch even the Bill as to why such Territories have been

given a special status and special representation in this Lok Sabha. Mr. Nahata was telling that his constituency is larger than the State of Kerala. Of Course, the population is not that much but the area is more. He said: Population should be linked with area. I am in agreement with him. Not only population, Sir. One has to take the area. If you go strictly by area, my constituency may be such that it may not be qualified for representation in this House. So far as area alone goes, the whole of the Laccadive Islands group consists of 20 islands of which 10 are inhabited. It spreads to the length and breadth of Kerala. When you take the population and area I go a step further and say that not only the landscape but the whole waterfront should be taken into account. Unless that is done it would be difficult to come to a proper understanding of the problem. The hon. Home Minister visited that area; he saw the people there. He knows it. My hon. friends when they come there would not find any vehicle and they have to walk for long distances. My friend Mr. Nahata said that there are camels in his constituency and one has to travel for months like this. In our group of islands it so happens that when monsoon comes one has to remain in a single island for months together. Very recently only we had one all-weather ship and we can go throughout the year. Our area is very much limited and our population is very much limited. But it is a strategic area. You have not only to take the land area but the waterfront also. Considering all these things one who visits the area would recommend that one Member alone is not sufficient.

16-13 hours

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

My hon. friend Mr. Madhu Limaye said about equating the Rajya Sabha's strength with that of the Lok Sabha. What will be the use? It will be only a repetition; the same House will be repeated there. What is the special nature of such a thing, I don't understand, except the political part of it; I say this with my due respect to the House. Members of this House are elected directly by the People, whereas the Members of the Rajya Sabha come through the States. They represent the States.

## Bill

[Shri P.M. Sayeed]

There is a certain contradiction in our Constitution. If it is only based on population one can understand. If it is based only on area then also one can understand. It is based neither on population nor on area. There are different States who elect their Members to the Rajya Sabha. They represent the concerned States for 6 years. This Honourable House gets one Member from each constituency, but he stays only for 5 years. This appears to me to be a contradiction. I think it should have been the other way round. This is my humble submission.

There is one more submission, Sir, there are union territories which have legislatures and there are union territories which have no legislature. I come from an area that has no legislature. As such, I do not even stand a chance of coming to Rajya Sabha. If this union territory of Laccadive and Andaman will remain a union territory. It cannot be merged to any neighbouring State. Therefore, my humble submission is taking into account the special nature of communications and transport difficulties and also economic backwardness Government should provide one more seat in this House for this area and, if possible, one seat in the other House also. With these suggestions I support the Bill in *to-to*.

SHRI J. MATHA GOWDER (Nilgiris) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to express briefly my views on the Constitution (Thirty-first Amendment) Bill now under discussion in the House. Through this Bill, it is proposed to raise the maximum number of members to be elected to the Lok Sabha from the States to 525 and reduce the number of members from the Union territories to 20 from 25. This would mean that the total maximum strength of Lok Sabha would be 545. It is not clear as to the compelling reasons for raising the strength of Lok Sabha and the principles and criteria for increasing the number of members to be elected to Lok Sabha. Nor is it clear whether population has been adopted as the sole criterion for determining the strength of Lok Sabha.

The Government, I am afraid, have hurriedly brought this measure. The argument that may be advanced in support of this measure could be that since the Delimitation Act had been passed in 1972 it has

become necessary now to fix the strength of Lok Sabha.

Sir, I would humbly submit that this kind of Bill fails to have much significance when you consider the various important reforms that would have to be brought about in the Election Laws of our country. Sir, the Chief Election Commissioner has submitted three reports since the 1962 General Election suggesting various amendments to be made in the Election Laws. I am sorry to say that the Government have not paid adequate attention to these valuable suggestions of the Chief Election Commissioner. While the Government have come forward with measure to increase the strength of Lok Sabha, it is regrettable that they have not though it is fit to amend the Election law to ensure free and fair elections.

Sir, the Election laws do not have any provision imposing a ceiling on the election propaganda expenses. You may recall Sir, that the Companies Act was amended three years ago in relation to the political donation. You will be surprised to know that till June 1972 no rules were framed under the amended provision of the Companies Act. The Public Accounts Committee has now pointed out this. We do not know the causes for this unconscionable delay, in framing the rules. I would like to know from the hon. Minister the motive of the Government behind this delay. Sir, the House does not hesitate to give approval to the legislative proposals of the Government. The Government have not shown the same speed in framing the rules under the various Acts that they show in getting a Bill through the House. The delay in such matters leads to legal complications. It is also not unusual to find certain Acts invalidated by the Supreme Court.

Since 1964, there has been a popular demand that the political parties should publish annually their audited accounts. The ruling party for their own reasons has not done anything to ensure this wholesome procedure. From these audited accounts the people can well see the type of donations the political parties receive and from whom and from what companies. I would therefore appeal to the Government that the Election Laws should be

suitably amended to ensure the publication of the audited accounts by every political party. I charge the ruling party that their greed for power is the only reason for not bringing about necessary amendment in the Election Laws in this respect.

Sir, under the present provisions of the Election Laws the expenses incurred on elections cannot be ascertained from the political parties. There is no legal provision to compel the political parties to submit an account of the election expenses. If we want to have fair elections in our country it is necessary that the political parties should render an account in public about the expenses they incur on the elections. I would therefore like to say that the ruling Congress party should move into this matter and bring forward necessary amendments in the election laws.

The Joint Committee on Election Laws (Amendment) Bill did not accept the idea of forcing the political parties to submit annually their audited accounts. I do not know why the Committee did not accept the suggestion. It has been the unanimous demand of the people all over the country, that this should be done. The only way to ensure that corrupt practices are not adopted at the time of elections, is to make the political parties publish their accounts. I therefore feel that a comprehensive legislation incorporating these provisions should be enacted.

Sir, if we are going to increase the strength of Lok Sabha on the basis of population increase I wonder for how long this criterion can stand the test of time. I should think that it would have been more proper if the strength of the State Assemblies is increased in relation to the population and it is not necessary that merely because the population has increased the strength of Lok Sabha should *ipso facto* increase.

Sir, at this juncture I would also point out that the population yard stick would prove to be a great disincentive to the vigorous implementation of family planning Schemes. If the Family Planning programmes are implemented vigorously it is quite possible that some States will get less representation in the Lok Sabha and because of this fear the State Governments may not go ahead with the Family Planning programme. Sir,

in Tamilnadu we actually faced this phenomenon of reduction in representation from that State to the Lok Sabha as a result of vigorous implementation of population control measures. When we point out this the Central Government ask us what they could do in the matter. Therefore, Sir, I have this fear that more adoption of population as the criterion for determining the strength of Lok Sabha will mean a serious set back to family planning and the country will ultimately suffer.

Sir, population cannot be the sole basis for determining the strength of Lok Sabha from tribal areas, such as in Assam, Nagaland and elsewhere. These areas should also get full and proper representation. I would suggest that the Central Government should ensure that no State suffers merely because that State has gone ahead with vigorous implementation of the family planning programme. With these words I conclude.

**SHRI GIRIDHAR GOMANGO (Koraput)** : I rise to support the Delimitation Bill. This Bill will increase the number of seats in this House and legislative Assemblies. This is a sign of the development of our country as a whole.

Sir, I want to place before you some difficulties. If you increase the seats according to population, it is good. But there are some areas where the population is less, but the area is large. For example, the Koraput district in Orissa, which is the single largest district of Orissa, is represented by two members representing the tribals.

Some members have argued that one M.P.'s seat should be equal to 8 MLA's seats. I want to say that if the area is fixed like this, the people will not get justice. In my opinion, there should be one MP's seat consisting of 6 MLA's constituencies.

The people of these areas are economically backward. They are illiterate. They have no voice. If adequate representation is given to the weaker sections of the people, they may be in a position to voice the grievances of the people in this House and the people will thus be benefited.

We know that MPs are VIPs, very important persons. Not only that, they are VRPs, very responsible persons of this

[Shri Giridhar Gomango]

country. We know that the definition of democracy is that it is for the people, by the people and of the people. Similarly the definition of representative should be that it has to do with problems of the people, by the problems of the people and for the problems of the people. Considering this, increase in seats should be based on area as well as population, for in some areas of this country the position is such that they deserve more.

**SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobbili):** I wholeheartedly support this measure which is long overdue. Actually, the suggested increase is not adequate. Looking to the size of the constituencies, they are certainly unwieldy. They present problems we have to face, sometimes single-handedly without the support of the Assembly candidates as happened in the mid-term elections. Then it becomes extremely difficult to canvass effectively throughout the entire constituency within the short time available, taking in account the financial factor, the economy of the country as a whole, and the ability of each candidate to invest money merely for the purpose of circulating propaganda material and all that and also canvassing. Therefore, I support Shri Gomango that the constituencies should be arranged in such a way that one parliamentary constituency should not extend to more than five Assembly constituencies.

Added to that, I have to make another submission. So far as the tribal seats are concerned, if you look at the way in which the tribal parliamentary constituencies have been carved out, you will find that it is extremely difficult for the candidate to tour the entire area. I know that many tribal constituencies cover three or four districts and that too in a mountainous region where canvassing is extremely difficult. Therefore, in view of the nature of the terrain in the tribal areas, so far as the tribal seats are concerned, I would humbly make a suggestion to the House whether it will not be more conducive to evolve a system of nomination as we do in the case of the Rajya Sabha, so far as the tribal people are concerned, so that this very difficulty will be alleviated and adequate representation can be easily given for them.

Again, it is not only a question of canvassing during the elections. There is a constant criticism of our people that because of the unwieldiness, they say, "Once in five years our candidates come and appear before the people." That is a genuine grievance which we should appreciate. It is difficult to constantly go to the constituencies in such areas; especially taking into consideration the time spent in Parliament and also in the Parliamentary Committees, there is much less time left. Therefore it is not possible to tour the entire constituency which is very big. Therefore, taking into consideration all these factors there is need to reduce the area of such constituencies and increase the number of Parliamentary seats. The more the number of seats that are allotted for Parliament, the greater will be the scope for effective representation of the nation as a whole.

With this humble submission, I would wholeheartedly support this Bill.

**SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I begin my reply to the points made by the hon. friends who have taken part in this debate, I would like to thank them for the frank expression of opinion; whether they have opposed or supported the Bill, it does not matter. During the debate, so many points have been made by my hon. friends, and I will try to reply to as many of them as I possibly can.

It has been asked as to how this figure of 525 has been fixed, whether it is arbitrary or in what way it has been fixed. As I said in my opening speech, to ensure that the States do not lose their present representation, we had to work out the figure, and the second object was that the existing strength in the case of those smaller States should also be maintained. If my hon. friends had worked it out, they will find that 525 is the only figure at which we can preserve the present representation for the big and the small States. Therefore, the figure of 525 was arrived at.

Then, it was asked whether this figure of 525 has any relationship to the rise in the population of this country as given out in the 1971 census. If after the 1971 census the upper limit now provided in article 81 of the Constitution is maintained, the

bigger States would lose two seats. Presently they have 489 seats in this House; they would have only 487. And the smaller States would lose four seats. They would have 13 instead of 17. As I said, to maintain the *status quo* and to see that none of them are effected adversely, this has been worked out and the figure of 525 has been arrived at.

This Bill, as I said, only seeks to prevent this adverse effect. This Bill is not based on an increase in population. It seeks to maintain the present level. The distribution of the 525 seats between the bigger and the smaller States will be done by the Delimitation Commission. If the present representation is not to be reduced, as is sought by this Bill, 508 seats have to be allocated to the bigger States and 17 to the smaller States. Presently, the smaller States have the following number Jammu and Kashmir, six; Himachal Pradesh, four; Meghalaya, two; Tripura, two; Manipur, two; and Nagaland, one. This would be maintained by the Delimitation Commission.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :** That is a matter for the Delimitation Commission. The Government cannot give any direction.

**SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY :** Since this figure of 525 was fixed after taking all these factors into consideration, we expect that this strength would be maintained.

Another point was raised whether after the census of 1981 the figure of 525 would go up. The census figure, I hope, will not cause any automatic increase in the proposed number. It depends upon the circumstances then prevailing. If there are some special circumstances, there might be some marginal changes. But no such contingency is foreseen today.

A question was put as to why the proviso is being added to article 81(2)(b). That is being done to ensure that the representation of the smaller States like Himachal Pradesh, Tripura, Manipur and Meghalaya in the Lok Sabha is maintained at the present level. Without this protection, Himachal Pradesh, Tripura, Manipur and Meghalaya will lose one Member each in the House of the people. The attainment of Statehood by these Union Territories should

not place them at a disadvantage, therefore, this provision.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :** Article 81(2)(a) is not applicable to small States which would be covered by the proviso. Under what guidelines will the Delimitation Commission determine the number of seats. That is the point. There are no standards laid down for the Delimitation Commission.

**SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY :** The provision itself takes care of that. If you work at the population figure given therein, you will find that the number would be protected. Whether with the rise in the number of seats the representation of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes would increase was asked by one Hon'ble Member. The number of representatives of the Scheduled Tribes will remain at 37 and that of the Scheduled Castes would increase. Some Members have stated that the number of representatives provided for Delhi and other Union Territories should be increased while some others said that they should be decreased. In the case of Delhi one hon. Member said that it should be raised to 8 from 7, while another Member said that it should be reduced to 4. I draw the attention of the hon. Members to the 'provisions of Article 81(1)(b): not more than 25 Members to represent the Union Territories chosen in such manner as Parliament may by law provide'. Parliament has enacted various laws. Delhi representation is governed by the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963. Section 42 applies to Delhi. For Andaman and Nicobar islands, Chandigarh, Nagar Haveli, Goa, Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands, Pondicherry, Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram, there are separate enactments and separate conventions by which their number is fixed. One hon. Member suggested that the nomination provided by article 331 should be done away with. That suggestion is not connected with this Bill and therefore, I would say nothing about it.

Some hon. Friends suggested that the Joint Committee consisting of Member of both the Houses was appointed to go into the election law and that Committee

[Shri Nitiraj Singh Chaudhary] has submitted its report. They wanted to know what was happening to it. The report has been examined by the Government and at the moment it is under close scrutiny. I hope a decision on that would be taken very soon and a Bill will be introduced in either House of Parliament.

An hon. Member said that the increase in the strength of the Lok Sabha is for the advantage of the ruling party and the prefixed "re:" before so many words which I do not remember. I would only draw his attention, unfortunately he is not present in the House at the moment, to article 82 of the Constitution: upon the completion of each census the allocation of seats in the House of the People to the States and the division of each State into territorial constituencies shall be readjusted by such authority in such manner as Parliament may by law determine. Parliament by passing the Delimitation Act has already given the work to the Delimitation Commission and this readjustment has to be done by them.

Then, Sir, Shri Basumatari, Shastriji and some other Members referred to the reservation of seats for the scheduled tribes people for the autonomous hill districts of Assam-North Cachar and Mikir Hills. I have already moved an amendment which has been circulated. I think this will meet their objections.

My esteemed friend, Shri Madhu Thaneve referred to certain things out of which I shall reply to two of his points. He first concentrated on the Rana Sabha asking for more representation. Secondly he wanted amenities and secretarial facilities to the Members to enable them to work efficiently. Incidentally he referred to the American system. I do not know what was in his mind. I would only say what is stated in Article I of our Constitution. Article I(1) says—

"1.(1) India, that is Bharat, shall be a Union of States"

In the Constituent Assembly there was a long debate whether India is a Union of States or a Federation. It was decided that it should not be a Federation but a Union of States. If my hon. friends desire, they may have a copy of that report and pursue the same.

About the facilities, I think you would remember that in the Fourth Lok Sabha a Committee was appointed by this House which was headed by my esteemed friend, Shri Bibhuti Mishra. As Chairman of the Committee he consulted all the parties. Unfortunately, there was no agreement. Therefore, the Committee suggested that the daily allowance of Rs. 31/- should be raised to Rs. 51/-. The extra Rs. 20/- may be made use for whatever facilities members want. I may inform my hon. friends, who raised this objection, that presently also the matter is under consideration.

It is for the Members to use this amount in any way they like. Anyway, the matter is presently also under consideration.

**SHRI D. N. TIWARY :** For the information of the Minister, I want to tell that this Committee of Members of Salaries and Allowances has submitted a report.

**SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY :** Shri Goswami referred to article 330 and he made some remarks and made some comments about it. He asked me as to why the whole of this should not be re-drafted. Article 330 (1) reads as follows:—

"330 (1) Seats shall be reserved in the House of the People for—

- (a) the Scheduled Castes ;
- (b) the Scheduled Tribes except the Scheduled Tribes in the tribal areas of Assam and Nagaland ; and
- (c) the Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts of Assam

Sir, Article 330 (1) provides for reservation to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes throughout the country with the exception of the tribal areas of Assam while clause (b) provides for reservation of seats for the scheduled tribes in the country including the plain areas of Assam. Since the Assam tribal area is excluded from (b) in clause (c) a specific provision for the representation of the scheduled tribes of the tribal area, of Assam is made.

I request Shri Goswami to refer to the Sixth schedule, paras 1 and 20 and the list attached thereto.

With these words I hope that the House will accept and adopt this Bill unanimously.

Mr. SPEAKER : This being a Constitution on Amendment Bill we will, have to dispose of the consideration motion and the clauses by division. I will not ask for voice vote. I will ask straightway for division. Let the lobbies be cleared. Now the lobbies have been cleared.

श्री मधु लिमये : मुझे नियम और संविधान के तेहत व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने दिया जाए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: मधु लिमये जी जब पिछली लोक सभा में थे, इन्होंने इस बिलिंग के सिलसिले में कुछ तर्जवीज रखी थी । वह अब फिर आये हैं इस लिए उन को अब फिर देखेंगे । नये सिरे से उन को लाइये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : सर्व सम्मति से रूलज कमेटी में पास हो गई थी । मैं संविधान के अर्न्तगत व्यवस्था उठाना चाहता हूं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उस को मैं बाद में देखूंगा ।

The question is :

“ That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration ”

*The Lok Sabha divided.*

Division No. 14] Ayes [16.49 hrs.

Achal Singh, Shri  
Afzalpurkar, Shri Dharamrao  
Agarwal, Shri Virendra  
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
Ahmed, Shri F. A.  
Anand Singh, Shri  
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti  
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahaman  
Arvind Netam, Shri  
Austin, Dr. Henry  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Banamali Babu, Shri  
Benara, Shri Hamendra Singh  
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul  
Barman, Shri R. N.  
Berua, Shri Bedabrata  
Barupal, Shri Panna Lal  
Basappa, Shri K.  
Basumatari, Shri D.  
Bhagat, Shri B. R.  
Bhagat Shri H. K. L.  
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal  
Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen  
Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.  
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu  
Bhaura, Shri B. S.  
Bfst, Shri Nerendra Singh  
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri  
Buta Singh, Shri  
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri  
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
Chandra Gowda, Shri D. B.  
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal  
Chandrika Prasad, Shri

Chaturved, Shri Rohan Lal  
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib  
Chavan, Shri D. R.  
Chawla, Shri Amar Nath  
Chhotey Lal, Shri  
Chutten Lal, Shri  
Chittibabu, Shri C.  
Choudhary, Shri B. E.  
Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque  
Daga, Shri M. C.  
Dalbir Singh, Shri  
Dalip Singh, Shri  
Darbara Singh, Shri  
Das, Shri Anadi Charan  
Das, Shri Dharmidhar  
Das, Shri R. P.  
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.  
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh  
Desa, Shri D. D.  
Seshmukh, Shri K. G.  
Dhamankar, Shri  
Dharmraj Singh, Shri  
Dharia, Shri Mohan  
Dhussia, Shri Anant Prashad  
Dmesh, Singh Shri  
Dixit Shri G.C.  
Doda, Shri Hiralal  
Dumada, Shri L. K.  
Dutta, Shri Biren  
Engthi, Shri Buren  
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira  
Ganga Devi Shrimati  
Gangadeb, Shri P.  
Gutam Shri C. D.  
Gavit, Shri T. H.  
George, Shri Varkey  
Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
Giri Shri S. B.  
Godara, Shri Mani Ram  
Gogoi, Shri Tarun  
Goham, Shri C. C.  
Gomango, Shri Girdhar  
Gopal, Shri K.  
Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh  
Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra  
Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb  
Govind Das Dr.  
Gowda, Shri Pampan  
Gowder, Shri J. Matha  
Gupta, Shri Indrajit  
Hansda, Shri Subodh  
Hari Kishore Singh, Shri  
Hari Singh, Shri  
Hashim, Shri M. M.  
Hazra, Shri Manoranjan  
Ishque, Shri A. K. M.

Judeja, Shri D. P.  
 Juffer Sharief Shri, C. K.  
 Jha, Shri Chiranjib  
 Jharkhande Rai, Shri  
 Jitendra Prashad, Shri  
 Joarder, Shri Dinesh  
 Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao  
 Joshi Shri Popatlal M.  
 Kadam Shri J. G.  
 Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran  
 Kader, Shri S. A.  
 Khandole, Shri Z. M.  
 Kailas, Dr.  
 Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam  
 Kolti, Shri Rohin  
 Kamkshaiah, Shri D.  
 Kamala Prashad, Shri  
 Kamble, Shri T. D.  
 Kapur, Shri Sat Pal  
 Kiran Singh, Dr.  
 Kasture, Shri A. S.  
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila  
 Kavde, Shri B. R.  
 Kadar Nath Singh, Shri  
 Kinder Lal, Shri  
 Kiruttinan, Shri Tha  
 Kisku, Shri A. K.  
 Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.  
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.  
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja  
 Kureel, Shri B. N.  
 Kushok Bakula, Shri  
 Lakkappa, Shri K.  
 Lakshminarayanan, Shri M. R.  
 Lalji Bhai Shri  
 Laskar, Shri Nihar  
 Lutfal Haque, Shri  
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.  
 Maharaj Singh, Shri  
 Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath  
 Majhi, Shri Gajadhar  
 Majhi, Shri Kumar  
 Malikarjan, Shri  
 Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain  
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prashad  
 Maurya, Shri B. P.  
 Mehta, Dr. Jivraj  
 Mehta Dr, Mahipatray  
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Mishra, Shri G. S.  
 Mishra, Shri Jagannath  
 Mishra Shri L. N.  
 Mishra, Shri Shyamnandan  
 Mohammad Tahir, Shri

Mohammad Yousuf, Shri  
 Mohan Swarup, Shri  
 Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri  
 Mukherjee, Shri Samar  
 Mukherjee, Shri Saroj  
 Murthy, Shri B. S.  
 Nahata, Shri Amrit  
 Neir, Shri Sreekantan  
 Nenda, Shri G. L.  
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh  
 Oraon, Shri Kartik  
 Oraon, Shri Tuna  
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath  
 Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand  
 Palodkar, Shri Manikrao  
 Pandey, Shri Damodar  
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra  
 Pandey, Shri R. S.  
 \*Pandey, Shri Sudhakar  
 Pandit, Shri S. T.  
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani  
 Pant, Shri K. C.  
 Paoki Haokip, Shri  
 Prashar, Prof. Narain Charid  
 Parikh, Shri Rasiklal  
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
 Pratap Singh Shri  
 Parthasarthi, Shri P.  
 Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat  
 Patel, Shri Natwarlal  
 Patil, Shri Anantrao  
 Patil, Shri F. V. Vikhe  
 Patil, Shri Krishnarao  
 Patil, Shri S. B.  
 Patil, Shri T. A.  
 Patnaik, Shri J. B.  
 Peje, Shri S. L.  
 Pillai, Shri R. Balakrishna  
 Prabodh Chandra, Shri  
 Pradhan, Shri Dhan Shah  
 Pradhani, Shri K.  
 Purty, Shri M. S.  
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd Shafi  
 Raghu Ramiah, Shri K.  
 Rai, Shrinati Sahodrabai  
 Raj Bahadur, Shri  
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri  
 Raju, Shri M. T.  
 Raju, Shri P. V. G.  
 Ram, Shri Tulmohan  
 Ram Dhan, Shri  
 Ram Sewak, Ch.  
 Ram Surat Prasad, Shri  
 Ram Swarup, Shri  
 Ramji Ram, Shri  
 Ramshekar Prasad Singh, Shri

\*He voted by mistake from a wrong seat and later informed the Speaker accordingly.

Rana, Shri M. B.  
 Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.  
 Rao, Shri Jagannath  
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana  
 Rao, Shri P. Ankinedu Prasada  
 Rao Dr. V. K. R. Varadaraja  
 Rathia, Shri Umed Singh  
 Raut, Shri Bhola  
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar  
 Ray, Shrimati Maya  
 Reddi, Shri P. Antony  
 Reddy, Shri B. N.  
 Reddy, Shri K. Kodanada Ram  
 Reddy, Shri P. Ganga  
 Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha  
 Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das  
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath  
 Roy, Dr. Saradish  
 Rudra Pratap Singh, Shri  
 Sadhu Ram, Shri  
 Saha, Shri, Ajit Kumar  
 Saha, Shri Gadadhar  
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.  
 Samanta, Shri S. C.  
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaque  
 Sanghiana, Shri  
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri  
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar  
 Sathe, Shri Vasant  
 Satish Chandra, Shri  
 Satpathy, Shri Devendra  
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.  
 Sen, Dr. Ranen  
 Sehti, Shri Arjun  
 Sezhiyan Shri  
 Shah Nawaz Khan, Shri  
 Shanker Dayal Singh, Shri  
 Shanker Dev. Shri  
 Shankaranand, Shri B  
 Sharma, Shri A. P.  
 Sharma Dr. H. P.  
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram  
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sharma, Shri R. N.  
 Sharma, Dr. Shanker Dayal  
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri  
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan  
 Shastri, Shri Raja Ram  
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.  
 Sher Singh, Prof.  
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.  
 Shivnath, Singh Shri

Shukla, Shri B. R.  
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan  
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap  
 Sinha, Shri Dharm Bir  
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sinha, Shri R. K.  
 Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh  
 Stephen, Shri C. M.  
 Subramaniam, Shri C.  
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.  
 Sunder Lal, Shri  
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
 Swaran Singh, Shri  
 Tarodekar, Shri V. B.  
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri  
 Thakre, Shri S. B.  
 Thakur, Shri Krishanrao  
 Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Manu,  
 Tiwari, Shri R. G.  
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.  
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.  
 Tombi Singh, Shri N.  
 Uikty, Shri M. G.  
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.  
 Veeriah, Shri K.  
 Vekaria, Shri  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.  
 Venkatsawamy, Shri G.  
 Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Verma, Shri Ram Singh Bhai  
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad  
 Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath  
 Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra  
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri  
 Viswanathan, Shri G.  
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit  
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh  
 Yadav, Shri N. P.  
 Yadav, Shri R. P.  
 Yadav, Shri D. P.

#### NOES

Balakrishnan, Shri K.  
 Guha, Shri Samar  
 Lumaye,\* Shri Maduk  
 Mavalankar, Shri, P. G.  
 †Mishra, Shri Bibhuti  
 Mody, Shri Piloo  
 Patil, Shri H. M.  
 †Patil, Shri C. A.

Mr. SPEAKER : The result\* of the division is : Ayes 294; Noes : 8.

†Wrongly voted for NOES.

\*The following members also recorded their votes for AYES; Sarvashri Sidrarmeshwar Swamy, Banamali Patnik, Nimbalkar, Nageswara Rao, Dattajirao Kadam, Basheswar Nath Bhargava, Shankerrao Savant, A. Shafee. T. Sohan Lal, Bibhuti Mishra and C. A. Patil.

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. SPFAKER : We will now take clause 2. There is one amendment given notice of by Shri Samar Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am not moving it.

MR SPEAKER : The question is :

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill"

*The Lok Sabha divided:*

**DIVISION No. 15] Ayes [16.53 hrs.**

Achal Singh, Shri  
Afzalpukar, Shri Dharamrao  
Ahiwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
Ahmad Shri, F. A.  
Anand Singh, Shri  
Ankineedu, Shri Magantu  
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman  
Arvind Netam, Shri  
Austin Dr. Henry  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Banamali Babu, Shri  
Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh  
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul  
Barman, Shri R. N.  
Barua, Shri Bodabrata  
Barupal, Shri Punna Lal  
Basappa, Shri K.  
Basumatari Shri D.  
Bhagat, Shri B. R.  
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.  
Bhargava, Shri Bhasheshwar Nath  
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal  
Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen  
Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.  
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu  
Bhaura, Shri B. S.  
Bist, Shri Narendra Singh  
Bij Raj Singh—Kotah, Shri  
Butta Singh, Shri  
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri  
Chanda Shrimati Jyotsna  
Chandra Gowda, Shri D. B.  
Chandrika Prasad, Shri  
Chatterjee, Shri Somnath  
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal  
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
Chadhuri, Shri Tridib

Chavan, Shri D. R.  
Chawla, Shri Amar Nath  
Chhotey Lal, Shri  
Chhuttan Lal, Shri  
Chittibabu, Shri C.  
Choudhary, Shri B. E.  
Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque  
Daga, Shri M. C.  
Dalbir Singh, Shri  
Dalip Singh, Shri  
Damani, Shri S. R.  
Darbara Singh, Shri  
Das, Shri Anadi Charan  
Das, Shri Dharnidhar  
Das, Shri R. P.  
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.  
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh  
Desai, Shri D. D.  
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.  
Dhamankar, Shri  
Dharamgaj Singh, Shri  
Dharia, Shri Mohan  
Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad  
Dinesh Singh, Shri  
Dixit, Shri G. C.  
Doda, Shri Hiralal  
Dumada, Shri L. K.  
Dutta, Shri Biren  
Engti, Shri Biren  
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira  
Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
Gangadeb, Shri P.  
Gautam, Shri C. D.  
Gavit, Shri T. H.  
George, Shri Varkey  
Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
Giri, Shri S. B.  
Godara, Shri Mani Ram  
Gogoi, Shri Tarun  
Gohain, Shri C. C.  
Gomango, Shri Giridhar  
Gopal, Shri K.  
Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh  
Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra  
Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb  
Govind Das, Dr.  
Gowda, Shri Pampan  
Gowder, Shri J. Matha  
Gupta, Shri Indrajit  
Hansda, Shri Subodh  
Hari Kishore Singh, Shri  
Hari Singh, Shri  
Hashim, Shri M. M.  
Hazra, Shri Manoranjan  
Ishaque, Shri A. K. M.  
Jadeja, Shri D. P.

Jeffer Sharief, Shri C. K.	Muhammed Khuda Bukhsh, Shri
Jha, Shri Chiranjib	Mukherjee, Shri Samar
Jharkhande Rai, Shri	Mukherjee, Shri Saroj
Jitendra Prasad, Shri	Murthy, Shri B. S.
Joarder, Shri Dinesh	Nahata, Shri Amrit
Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao	Nanda, Shri G. L.
Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.	Negi, Shri Pratap Singh
Kadam, Shri Dattajirao	Nimbalkar, Shri
Kadam, Shri J. G.	Oraon, Shri Kartik
Kadannakpalli, Shri Ramachandran	Oraon, Shri Tuna
Kader, Shri S. A.	Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
Kahandole, Shri Z. M.	Painuli, Shri Paipoonnand
Kailas, Dr.	Palodkar, Shri Manikrao
Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam	Pandey, Shri Damodar
Kakoti, Shri Robin	Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
Kamakshaiyah, Shri D.	Pandey, Shri R. S.
Kamala Prasad, Shri	Pandey, Shri Sudhakar
Kamble, Shri T. D.	Pandit, Shri S. T.
Kapur, Shri Sat Pal	Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
Karan Singh, Dr.	Pant, Shri K. C.
Kasture, Shri A. S.	Paokai Haokip, Shri
Kaul, Shrimati Shaila	Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
Kavde, Shri B. R.	Parmar, Shri Bhalubhai
Kedar Nath Singh, Shri	Partap Singh, Shri
Kinder Lal, Shri	Parthasarathy, Shri P.
Kirutrinan, Shri Tha	Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat
Kisku Shri A. K.	Patel, Shri Natwarlal
Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.	Patil, Shri Anantrao
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.	Patil, Shri C. A.
Kulkarni, Shri Raja	Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe
Kuceel, Shri B. N.	Patil, Shri S. B.
Kushok Bakula, Shri	Patil, Shri T. A.
Lakshminarayanan, Shri M. R.	Patnaik, Shri J. B.
Lalji Bhai, Shri	Peje, Shri S. I.
Lashkar, Shri Nihar	Pillai, Shri R. Balakrishna
Lutfal Haque, Shri	Prabodh Chandra, Shri
Mahajan, Shri Y. S.	Pradhan, Shri Dhan Shah
Maharaj Singh, Shri	Patdhani, Shri K.
Mahata, Shri Dabendra Nath	Purty, Shri M. S.
Majhi, Shri G. Jadhav	Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi
Majhi, Shri Kumar	Raghu Ramraoh, Shri K.
Mallikarjun, Shri	Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain	Raj Bahadur, Shri
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad	Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Maurya, Shri B. P.	Raju, Shri P. V. G.
Mehra, Dr. Jivraj	Ram, Shri Tulmohat.
Mehra, Dr. Mahipatray	Ram Dhan, Shri
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram	Ram Sewak, Ch.
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Ram Surat Prasad, Shri
Mishra, Shri G. S.	Ram Swaroop, Shri
Mishra, Shri Jagannath	Ranji Ram, Shri
Mishra, Shri L. N.	Rameshkhari Prasad Singh, Shri
Mishra, Shri Shyamnandan	Rana, Shri M. B.
Mohammad Tahir, Shri	Rao, Shrimati B. Rudhabai, A.
Mohammad Yusuf, Shri	Rao, Shri Jagannath
Mohan Swarup, Shri	Rao, Shri K. Narayana

## Bill

Rao, Shri Nageswara  
 Rao, S. Sri P. Ankin Redu Prasada  
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. Vardaraja  
 Rathia, Shri Umed Singh  
 Raut, Shri Bhola  
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar  
 Ray, Shrimati Maya  
 Reddi, Shri P. Antony  
 Reddy, Shri B. N.  
 Reddy, Shri K. Kodanada Ram  
 Reddy, Shri P. Ganga  
 Reddy, Shri P. Nurasimha  
 Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das  
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath  
 Roy, Dr. Saradish  
 Rudra Pratap Singh, Shri  
 Sadhu Ram, Shri  
 Shah, Shri Ajit Kumar  
 Saha, Shri Gadadhar  
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.  
 Samanta, Shri S. C.  
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaque  
 Sangliana, Shri  
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri  
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar  
 Sathe, Shri Vasant  
 Satish Chandra, Shri  
 Satpathy, Shri Devendra  
 Savant, Shri Shankarrao  
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.  
 Sen, Dr. Ranen  
 Sethi, Shri Arjun  
 Sezhiyan, Shri  
 Shafce, Shri A.  
 Shah Nawaz Khan, Shri  
 Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri  
 Shankar Dev, Shri  
 Shankaranand, Shri B.  
 Sharma, Shri A. P.  
 Sharma, Dr. H. P.  
 Sharma, Shri Madheram  
 Sharma, Shri Naval Kishore  
 Sharma, Shri R. N.  
 Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal  
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri  
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan  
 Shastri, Shri Raja Ram  
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.  
 Sher Singh, Prof.  
 Shetty, Shri K. K.  
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.

Shivnath Singh, Shri  
 Shukla, Shri B. R.  
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan  
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap  
 Sinha, Shri Dharam Bi  
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sinha, Shri R. K.  
 Sohan Lal, Shri T.  
 Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh  
 Subramaniam, Shri C.  
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.  
 Sunder Lal, Shri  
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
 Swamy, Shri Sidramaeshwar  
 Swaran Singh, Shri  
 Taraodekar, Shri V. B.  
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri  
 Thakre, Shri S. B.  
 Thakur, Shri Krishanrao  
 Tiwari, Shri R. G.  
 Tiwari, Shri D. N.  
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.  
 Tombi Singh, Shri N.  
 Ulkey, Shri M. G.  
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.  
 Veeriah, Shri K.  
 Vekaria, Shri  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.  
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.  
 Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Verma, Shri Ramsingh Bhai  
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad  
 Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath  
 Vikal., Shri Ram Chandra  
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri  
 Viswanathan, Shri G.  
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit  
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh  
 Yadav, Shri N. P.  
 Yadav, Shri R. P.  
 Yadav, Shri D. P.

## NOES

Balakrishnan, Shri K.  
 Guha, Shri Samar  
 Limaye, Shri Madhu  
 Mody, Shri Pilo  
 †Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani

Mr. Speaker: The result\* of the division is:

Ayes: 298; Noes: 5.

†Wrongly voted for Noes.

\*The following Members also recorded their votes:—

Ayes: Sarvashri Banamali Patnaik, Krishnarao Patil, K. Lakkappa, Rasiklal Parikh, C. M. Stephen, M. T. Raju and Chandra Bhal Mani Tiwari.

Noes: Sarvashri H. M. Patel and P. G. Mavalankar.

Bill

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.*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

**Clause 3 (Amendment of article 330)**

**SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY :**  
I beg to move :

Page 2,-

*for line 1, substitute -*

"3.(1) In article 330 of the Constitution, -

(a) in sub-clause (b) of clause" (2)

Page 2,-

*after line 10, insert -*

'(b) after clause (2), the following clause shall be inserted, namely :-

"(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in clause (2), the number of seats reserved in the House of the People for the Scheduled Tribes in the autonomous districts of Assam shall bear to the total number of seats allotted to that State a proportion not less than the population of the Scheduled Tribes in the said autonomous districts bears to the total population of the State." (3)

MR. SPEAKER : Let the Lobbies be cleared again.

The Lobbies have been cleared. Now, I put Amendment Nos. 2 and 3 to clause 3 moved by Shri Nitiraj Singh Chaudhary to the vote of the House.

The question is -

Page 2,-

*for line 1, substitute -*

"3.(1) In article 330 of the Constitution,

(a) in sub-clause (b) of clause" (2)

Page 2,-

*after line 10, insert -*

'(b) after clause (2), the following clause shall be inserted, namely :-

"(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in clause (2), the number of seats reserved in the House of the People for the Scheduled Tribes in the

autonomous districts of Assam shall bear to the total number of seats allotted to that State a proportion not less than the population of the Scheduled Tribes in the said autonomous districts bears to the total population of the State" (3)

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

*The Lok Sabha divided :*

Division No. 16

[16.57 Hrs.]

### AYES

Achal Singh, Shri  
Achalpurkar, Shri Dharamdas  
Agarwal, Shri Virendra  
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
Ahmed, Shri F. A.  
Anand Singh, Shri  
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti  
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman  
Arvind Netam, Shri  
Austin, Dr. Henry  
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Banamali Babu, Shri  
Benera, Shri Hamendra Singh  
Banerji, Shrimati Mukul  
Barman, Shri R. N.  
Barua, Shri Redabrata  
Barupal, Shri Panna Lal  
Basappa, Shri K.  
Basumatari, Shri D.  
Bhagat, Shri B. R.  
Bhagat Shri H. K. L.  
Bhargava, Shri Bhasheshwar Nath  
Bhatia, Shri Ragbunandan Lal  
Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagadish  
Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.  
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chhapalendu  
Bhauri, Shri B. S.  
Bisr, Shri Narendra Singh  
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri  
Buta Singh, Shri  
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri  
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
Chandra Gowda, Shri D. B.  
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal  
Chandrika Prasad, Shri  
Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal  
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib

Chavan, Shri D. R.  
 Chawla, Shri Amar Nath  
 Chhotey Lal, Shri  
 Chhutten Lal, Shri  
 Chittibabu, Shri C.  
 Choudhary, Shri B. E.  
 Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque  
 Daga, Shri M. C.  
 Dalbir Singh, Shri  
 Dalip Singh, Shri  
 Damani, Shri S. R.  
 Darbara Singh, Shri  
 Das, Shri Anadi Charan  
 Das, Shri Dharnidhar  
 Das, Shri R. P.  
 Daschowdhury, Shri B.K.  
 Deo, Shri S. N. Singh  
 Desai, Shri D. D.  
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.  
 Dhamankar, Shri  
 Dharamgaj Singh, Shri  
 Dharia, Shri Mohan  
 Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad  
 Dinesh Singh, Shri  
 Dixit, Shri G. C.  
 Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra  
 Doda, Shri Hirafal  
 Durairasu, Shri A.  
 Dutta, Shri Biren  
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
 Engti, Shri Biren  
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira  
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
 Gangadeb, Shri P.  
 Gautam, Shri C. D.  
 Gavit, Shri T. H.  
 Gosh, Shri P. K.  
 Godara, Shri Mani Ram  
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun  
 Gohain, Shri C. C.  
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar  
 Gopal, Shri K.  
 Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh  
 Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra  
 Gotkhande, Shri Annasaheb  
 Govind Das, Dr.  
 Gowder, Shri J. Matha  
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit  
 Hansda, Shri Subodh  
 Hari Kishore Singh, Shri  
 Hari Singh, Shri  
 Hashim, Shri M.M.  
 Hazra, Shri Manoranjan  
 Ishaque, Shri A.K.M.  
 Jadeja, Shri D. P.  
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.  
 Jha, Shri Chiranjib

Jharkhande Rai, Shri  
 Jitendra Prasad, Shri  
 Joarder, Shri Dinesh  
 Joshi Shri Jagannathrao  
 Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.  
 Kadam, Shri Dattajirao  
 Kadam, Shri J. G.  
 Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandrarao  
 Kader, Shri S. A.  
 Kahandole, Shri Z.M.  
 Kailas, Dr.  
 Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam  
 Kakoti, Shri Robin  
 Kamakahaiah, Shri D.  
 Kamaia Prasad, Shri  
 Kanble, Shri T.D.  
 Kapur, Shri Sat Pal  
 Karan Singh, Dr.  
 Kasture, Shri A.S.  
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila  
 Kavde, Shri B.R.  
 Kedar Nath Singh, Shri  
 Kunder Lal, Shri  
 Kiruttinan, Shri Tha  
 Kishku, Shri A. K.  
 Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.  
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.  
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja  
 Kureel, Shri B. N.  
 Kushok Bakula, Shri  
 Lakkappa, Shri K.  
 Lakshmi Kanthamma, Shrimati T.  
 Lakshminarayanan, Shri M.R.  
 Lalji, Bhai, Shri  
 Laskar, Shri Nihar  
 Lutfal Haque, Shri  
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.  
 Mahavaj Singh, Shri  
 Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath  
 Majhi, Shri Gajadhar  
 Majhi, Shri Kumar  
 Mallikarjun, Shri  
 Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain  
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad  
 Maturya, Shri B. P.  
 Mehta, Dr. Jivraj  
 Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray  
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Mishra, Shri Bibhoti  
 Mishra, Shri G. S.  
 Mishra, Shri Jagannath  
 Mishra, Shri L. N.  
 Mishra, Shri Shyamnandan  
 Misra, Shri S. N.  
 Mohammad Tahir, Shri  
 Mohammad Yusuf, Shri  
 Mohan Swarup, Shri

Mohapatra, Shri Shyam Sunder	Ram Surat Prasad, Shri
Muhammed Khuda Bukhs, Shri	Ram Swarup, Shri
Mukherjee, Shri Samar	Ramji Ram, Shri
Mukherjee, Shri Saroji	Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Murthy, Shri B.S.	Rana, Shri M.B.
Muruganatham, Shri S.A.	Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
Nahata, Shri Amrit	Rao, Shri Jagannath
Nair, Shri Sreekantan	Rao, Shri K. Ngrayana
Nanda, Shri G.L.	Rao, Shri Nageswara
Negi, Shri Pratap Singh	Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada
Nimbalkar, Shri	Rao, Dr. V. K. R. Varadaraja
Oraon, Shri Kartik	Rathia, Shri Umed Singh
Oraon, Shri Tuna	Raut, Shri Bhola
Pahadia, Shri Jagannath	Ravi, Shri Vayalaj
Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand	Ray, Shrimati Mayu
Palodkar, Shri Manikrao	Reddi, Shri P. Antony
Pandey, Shri Damodar	Reddy, Shri B. N.
Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra	Reddy, Shri K. Kodanda Rami
Pandey, Shri R.S.	Reddy, Shri K. Ramakrishna
Pandey, Shri Sudhakar	Reddy, Shri P. Ganga
Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar	Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha
Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarain	Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das
Pandit, Shri S. T.	Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani	Roy, Dr. Saradish
Pant, Shri K. C.	Rudra Pratap Singh, Shri
Paokai Haokij, Shri	Sadhu Ram, Shri
Parashar, Prof Narain Chand	Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
Parikh, Shri Rasiklal	Saha, Shri Gadadhar
Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai	Salve, Shri N.K.P.
Partap Singh, Shri	Samanta, Shri S.C.
Parthasarathy, Shri P.	Sambhali, Shri Ishaque
Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat	Sangliana, Shri
Patel, Shri Natwarlal	Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Patil, Shri Anantrao	Sant Bux Singh, Shri
Patil, Shri C. A.	Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar
Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe	Sathe, Shri Vasant
Patil, Shri Krishnarao	Satish Chandra, Shri
Patil, Shri S. B.	Satpathy, Shri Devedra
Patil, Shri T. A.	Savant, Shri Shankarrao
Patnuk, Shri J. B.	Sayeed, Shri P.M.
Peje, Shri S. L.	Sen, Dr. Ranen
Pillai, Shri R. Balakrishna	Sethi, Shri Arjun
Prabodh Chandra, Shri	Sezhayan, Shri
Pradhan, Shri Dhan Shah	Shafee, Shri A.
Pradhani, Shri K.	Shahnawaz Khan, Shri
Purty, Shri M. S.	Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri
Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi	Shankar Dev, Shri
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.	Shankaranand, Shri B.
Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai	Sharma, Shri A. P.
Raj Bahadur, Shri	Sharma, Dr. H.P.
Rajdeo Singh, Shri	Sharma, Shri Madhoram
Raju, Shri M.T.	Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore
Raju Shri P.V.G.	Sharma, Shri R.N.
Ram, Shri Tulmohan	Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal
Ram Dhan, Shri	Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Ram Prakash, Shri	Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
Ram Sewak, Ch.	Shastri, Shri Raja Ram

Shenoy, Shri P.R.  
 Sher Singh, Prof.  
 Shetty, Shri K. K.  
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.  
 Shivnath Singh, Shri  
 Shukla, Shri B.R.  
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan  
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap  
 Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir  
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sinha, Shri R.K.  
 Sohan Lal, Shri J  
 Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh  
 Stephen, Shri C.M.  
 Subramamam, Shri C.  
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.  
 Sunder Lal, Shri  
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri  
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
 Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar  
 Swaram Singh, Shri  
 Tarodekar, Shri V.B.  
 Tayyab Husain, Shri  
 Thakre, Shri S.B.  
 Thakur, Shri Krishnarao  
 Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Maji  
 Tiwari, Shri R.G.  
 Tiwary, Shri D.N.  
 Tiwary, Shri K.N.  
 Tombi Singh, Shri N.  
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K.P.  
 Veeriah, Shri K.  
 Vekaria, Shri  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.  
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.  
 Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Verma, Shri Ramsingh Bhai  
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad  
 Vidyalkar, Shri Amarnath  
 Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra  
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri  
 Viswanathan, Shri G.  
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit  
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh  
 Yadav, Shri N.P.  
 Yadav, Shri R.P.  
 Yadav Shri D.P.

## NOES

Balakrishnan, Shri K.  
 Guha, Shri Samar  
 Mavalankar, Shri P. G.  
 Mody, Shri Pilo  
 Patel, Shri H.M.

MR. SPEAKER: The result\* of the division is:

Ayes: 314; Noes: 5.

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.

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.

[17.00 hrs.]

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:  
 "That Clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 17 [16.59 hrs.]

## AYES

Achal Singh, Shri  
 Afzalpurkar, Shri Dharamraj  
 Agarwal, Shri Virendra  
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.  
 Anand Singh, Shri  
 Ankineedu, Shri Maganti  
 Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman  
 Arvind Netam, Shri  
 Austin, Dr. Henry  
 Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
 Babunath Singh, Shri  
 Banamali Babu, Shri  
 Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh  
 Banerji, Shrimati Mukul  
 Barman, Shri R. N.  
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata  
 Barupal, Shri Panna Lal  
 Basappa, Shri K.  
 Basumatari, Shri D.  
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.  
 Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.  
 Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath  
 Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagadish  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu  
 Bhaura, Shri B. S.  
 Bist, Shri Narendra Singh  
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri  
 Buta Singh, Shri  
 Chakleshwar Singh, Shri

\*The following Members also recorded their votes for AYES:—

Sarvashri Banamali Patnaik, M. G. Uikey, L. K. Dumada, Pampar Gowda and Shrimati Savitri Shyam.

- Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
 Chandra Gowda, Shri D. B.  
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal  
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri  
 Chatterjee, Shri Somnath  
 Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lai  
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
 Chavan, Shri D. R.  
 Chawla, Shri Amar Nath  
 Chhotey Lal, Shri  
 Chhuten Lal, Shri  
 Chittibabu, Shri C.  
 Choudhary, Shri B. E.  
 Choudhury, Shri Moinul Haque  
 Daga, Shri M. C.  
 Dalbir Singh, Shri  
 Dalip Singh, Shri  
 Damani, Shri S. R.  
 Darbara Singh, Shri  
 Das, Shri Anadi Charan  
 Das, Shri Dharnidhar  
 Das, Shri R. P.  
 Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.  
 Deo, Shri S. N. Singh  
 Desai, Shri D. D.  
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.  
 Dhamankar, Shri  
 Dharamraj Singh, Shri  
 Dharia, Shri Mohan  
 Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad  
 Dinesh Singh, Shri  
 Dixit, Shri G. C.  
 Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra  
 Doda, Shri Hiralal  
 Dumada, Shri I. K.  
 Durairasu, Shri A.  
 Dutta, Shri Eren  
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
 Engti, Shri Biren  
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira  
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
 Ganga'eb, Shri P.  
 Gautam, Shri C. D.  
 Gavit, Shri T. H.  
 George, Shri Varkey  
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.  
 Giri, Shri S. B.  
 Godara, Shri Mani Ram  
 Gahau, Shri C. C.  
 Gamango, Shri Giridhar  
 Gopal, Shri K.  
 Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Goash  
 Gotkhinde, Shri Anasaheb  
 Govind Das, Dr.  
 Gowda, Shri Pampan  
 Gowder, Shri J. Matha  
 Gupta, Shri Indraj  
 Hansda, Shri Subodh  
 Hari Kishore Singh, Shri  
 Hari Singh, Shri  
 Hashim, Shri M. M.  
 Hazra, Shri Manoranjan  
 Isbaque, Shri A.K.M.  
 Jedeja, Shri D. P.  
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.  
 Jha, Shri Chiranjib  
 Jharkhande Rai, Shri  
 Jitendra Prasad, Shri  
 Joarder, Shri Dinesh  
 Joshi, Shri Jangannathrao  
 Joshi, Shri Popatlal M.  
 Kadam, Shri Dattajirao  
 Kadam, Shri J. G.  
 Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran  
 Kader, Shri S. A.  
 Kahandole, Shri. Z. M.  
 Kailas, Dr.  
 Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam  
 Kakoti, Shri Robin  
 Kamakshatah, Shri D.  
 Kamala Prasad, Shri  
 Kamble, Shri T. D.  
 Kapur, Shri Sat Pal  
 Karan Singh, Dr.  
 Kasture, Shri A.S.  
 Kaul, Shrimati, Sheila  
 Kavde, Shri B. R.  
 Kedar Nath Singh, Shri  
 Kinder Lal, Shri  
 Kiruttinan, Shri Thia  
 Kisku, Shri A. K.  
 Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.  
 Krishnan, Shri G. Y.  
 Kulkarni, Shri Raja  
 Kureel, Shri B. N.  
 Kushok Bakula, Shri  
 Lakkappa, Shri K.  
 Lakshmiikanthamma, Shrimati T.  
 Lakshminarayanan, Shri M. R.  
 Lalji Bhai, Shri  
 Laskar, Shri Nihar  
 Iuffal Haque, Shri  
 Mahajan, Shri Y. S.  
 Maharaaj Singh, Shri  
 Mahata, Shri Debendra Nath  
 Majhi Shri, Gajachai  
 Majhi, Shri Kumar  
 Mallkarjun, Shri  
 Mandal, Shri Jagdish Naraijan  
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad  
 Maurya, Shri B. P.  
 Mehta, Dr. Jivraj  
 Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray  
 Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram

- Mishra, Shri Bibhuti  
 Mishra, Shri G. S.  
 Mishra, Shri Jagannath  
 Mishra, Shri L. N.  
 Mishra Shri Shyamnandan  
 Misra, Shri S. N.  
 Mohammad Tahir, Shri  
 Mohammad Yusul, Shri  
 Mohan Swarup, Shri  
 Mohapatra, Shri Shyam Sunder  
 Muhammed Khuda Bukhah, Shri  
 Mukherjee, Shri Samar  
 Mukharjee, Shri Saroj  
 Murthy, Shri B. S.  
 Muruganatham, Shri S. A.  
 Nahata, Shri Amrit.  
 Nair, Shri Sreeckantan  
 Nanda, Shri G. L.  
 Negi, Shri Pratap Singh  
 Nimbalkar, Shri  
 Oraon, Shri Kartik  
 Oram, Shri Tuna  
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath  
 Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand  
 Palodkar, Shri Manikrao  
 Panday, Shri Damodar  
 Panday, Shri Krishna Chandra  
 Pandey, Shri R. S.  
 Pandey, Shri Sudhakar  
 Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar  
 Pandya, Dr. Laxminarain  
 Pandit, Shri S.T.  
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani  
 Pant, Shri, K. C.  
 Paokai Haokip, Shri  
 Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand  
 Parikh, Shri Rasiklal  
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
 Pratap Singh, Shri  
 Parthasarathy, Shri P.  
 Paswan, Shri, Ram Bhagat.  
 Patel, Shri Natwarlal  
 Patil, Shri Anantao  
 Patil, Shri C.A.  
 Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe  
 Pati, Shri Krishnatao  
 Patil, Shri S. B.  
 Patil, Shri T. A.  
 Patnaik, Shri Banamali  
 Patnaik, Shri J. B.  
 Peje, Shri S. L.  
 Pillai, Shri R. Balakrishna  
 Prabodh Chandra, Shri  
 Pradhan, Shri Dhan Shah  
 Pradhani, Shri K.  
 Purty, Shri M. S.  
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi  
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.  
 Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai  
 Raj Bahadur, Shri  
 Rajdeo Singh, Shri  
 Raju, Shri M. T.  
 Raju, Shri P.V.G.  
 Ram, Shri Thlmohan  
 Ram Dhan, Shri  
 Ram Prakash, Shri  
 Ram Sewak, Ch.  
 Ram Surat Prasad, Shri  
 Ram Swarup, Shri  
 Ramji Ram, Shri  
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri  
 Rana, Shri M. B.  
 Rao Shrimati, B. Radhabei A.  
 Rao, Shri Jagannth  
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana  
 Rao, Shri Nageswara  
 Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada  
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. Varadaraja  
 Rathia, Shri Umed Singh  
 Raut, Shri Bhola  
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar  
 Ray, Shrimati Maya  
 Reddi, Shri P. Antony  
 Reddy, Shri B. N.  
 Reddy, Shri K. Kodanda Rami  
 Reddy, Shri K. Ramakrishna  
 Reddy, Shri P. Ganga  
 Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha  
 Richhariya Dr. Govind Das  
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath  
 Roy, Dr. Saradish  
 Rudra Pratap Singh, Shri  
 Sadhu Ram, Shri  
 Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar  
 Saha, Shri Gadadhar  
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.  
 Samanta, Shri S. C.  
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaque  
 Sankata Prasad Dr.  
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri  
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar  
 Sathe, Shri Vasant  
 Satish Chandra, Shri  
 Satpathy, Shri Devendra  
 Savant, Shri Shankarrao  
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati  
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.  
 Sen, Dr. Ranen  
 Sethi, Shri Arjun  
 Sezhiyan, Shri  
 Shafee, Shri A.  
 Shahnawaz Khan, Shri  
 Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri  
 Shankar Dev, Shri

Shankaranand, Shri B.  
 Sharma, Shri A. P.  
 Sharma, Dr. H. P.  
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram  
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sharma, Shri R. N.  
 Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal  
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan  
 Shastri, Shri Raja Ram  
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.  
 Sher Singh, Prof.  
 Shetty, Shri K. K.  
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.  
 Shivnath Singh, Shri  
 Shukla, Shri B. R.  
 Shukla, Shri Vidya charan  
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap  
 Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir  
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sinha, Shri R. K.  
 Sohan Lal, Shri T.  
 Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh  
 Stepen, Shri C. M.  
 Subramaniam, Shri C  
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.  
 Sunder Lal, Shri  
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri  
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
 Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar  
 Swaran Singh, Shri  
 Tarodekar, Shri V. B.  
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri  
 Thakre, Shri S. B.  
 Thakur, Shri Krishnarao  
 Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani  
 Tiwari, Shri R. G.  
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.  
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.  
 Tonibi Singh, Shri N.  
 Uikey, Shri M. G.  
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.  
 Veeriah, Shri K.  
 Vekaria, Shri  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.  
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.  
 Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Verma, Shri Ramsingh Bhai  
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad  
 Vidvalankar, Shri Amarnath  
 Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra  
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri  
 Viswanathan, Shri G.  
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit  
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh  
 Yadav, Shri N. P.

Yadav, Shri R. P.  
 Yadav, Shri D. P.

## NOES

Balakrishnan, Shri K.  
 Guha, Shri Samar  
 Mavalankar, Shri P. G.  
 Patel, Shri H. M.  
 Mody, Shri Piloo

MR. SPEAKER : The result\* of the Division is :

Ayes : 318

Noes : 5

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.*

*Clause 4 was added to the Bill.*

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title together, for which only a voice vote is required.

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.*

MR. SPEAKER : Do you want the lobbies to be cleared again before the Bill is passed ?  
 ... Let the doors be opened.

SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY :  
 I move :

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

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

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

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Although this Constitution (Amendment) Bill, as it was expected, is going to be passed with a massive majority in a packed House and by a packed Party, I want to voice my opposition because this Bill is unprincipled, arbitrary, partisan and, to a certain extent, conspiratorial. I call it unprincipled for

\*The following Members also recorded their votes for Ayes : -

Sarvashri Tarun Gogoi, Dinesh Chandra Goswami and Hashi Bhushan.

[Shri Samar Guha]

this reason. In the Constituent Assembly, the founding fathers of our Constitution discussed the problem whether population and the number of seats would be related. The question is: whether the increase in the number of seats in the Lok Sabha will be related to the growth of population or whether any optimum size of the Lok Sabha will be fixed. If the number of seats is related or made proportionate to the growth of population, then a time will come when this Lok Sabha will be turned into a Baza Sabha because it will be impossible to accommodate so many Members. For that reason, our constitution-makers decided that 500 should be the number taking into consideration all aspects, 500 should be the optimum number and the strength of the Lok Sabha.

In this Bill no principle has been enunciated as to why the number should be increased. When this note was circulated by Mr. Sen Verma, there was a meeting of the Opposition Parties and in that meeting the majority of the Parties expressed the opinion that there was no principle whatsoever in increasing the strength of the Lok Sabha. On the basis of that it should not be increased because there was no principle whatsoever for increasing the strength. This *ad-hoc* increase every five years for certain reason or the other, for certain *ad-hoc* reason or the other, for certain principle or the other, you increase by 25, then there is another increase of 25 and if it goes on like that, then what will the future generations say? A time will come that after 10 or 15 or 20 years the population may increase and it may even go upto 100 crores. Then the whole pattern of the electoral college may have to be redrawn. Till then, for our future guidance, we should lay down certain principles. In this Bill we have not laid down any principles, we have not given any reason why this number should be increased. That is why I call it also arbitrary. That is why I call it partisan and for certain reason it may turn into conspiratorial also.

According to the 1961 census a constituency was formed on the basis of 8.9 lakhs of the population and in 1971 it was something like 10.7 lakhs. On this basis Delhi should get only four seats and not seven

(Interruptions)

Bill

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): On a point of order, Sir. We are in the middle of passing an important Bill which relates to the amendment of the Constitution ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Mr. Mavalankar, let him finish.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: But Sir, I am raising a point of order. My point of order is this: that when an hon. Member... (Interruptions) Even if the entic ruling party in the House shouts, until the Speaker asks me to sit down, I am not going to sit down.

My point of order is this that when an important and serious Bill of this nature is being discussed and passed and when an hon. Member of this House who has a right ... (Interruptions)

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): He should not be allowed to say all irrelevant things.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I strongly object to my hon. Friend, Mr. Lakkappa saying this. Who is he to say that what I am speaking is irrelevant or relevant? Let the Chair decide.

In this House, as everybody knows, the Government party has a steamroller majority and so they are going to pass this Bill. Therefore, why cannot have they the patience to listen to what the hon. Member says for a few more minutes? This is my respectful submission, Sir. In a Parliamentary democracy, every member must have his say. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please come out with your point of order.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Sir, in a Parliamentary Democracy, where, even though the Government has got a steamroller majority and therefore even though it may have its way, still, do you not think that the Opposition must first have its say?

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I have allowed you. There is no point of order.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: The hon. Member Mr. Samar Guha has not

finished. You may please ask the hon. Members on that side to keep quiet and listen with patience. I want your ruling on this.

MR. SPEAKER : My ruling is, you kindly sit down. Let the Member speak.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR : You may kindly ask these people to listen with patience.

MR. SPEAKER : They are just jubilant over it. They are just expressing their jubilation over it.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Then, do I take it, you have approved of the noise in the House ?

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Piloo Mody, do you think you approve of it ?

SHRI PILOO MODY : If you show your displeasure, may be, things might improve.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : The hon. Minister said that there is necessity for increasing the number of seats as some new States have been formed. On that basis, there is no necessity at all for increasing the number of seats. According to the basis of population, Delhi should have got not seven but four seats. Goa should get four and not six; Himachal Pradesh should get three and not four; Tripur should get one and not two; Manipur should get one and not two; Meghalaya should get one and not two; Goa, Daman and Diu should get one and not two. This is my respectful submission, Sir. By certain internal re-allocation and by certain rationalisation, these new States can be given certain seats, without increasing the total number of seats. We suspect that it is done for the benefit of the ruling party. This sort of restructuring and reorganising different constituencies can be manipulated in such a way that it will go against the interests of the opposition parties which will ultimately weaken the opposition parties, so that the opposition parties may not come back.

Finally, I would repeat what I said earlier and say now this is unprincipled, arbitrary, without any reason, partisan, and to a certain extent, conspiratorial. I oppose the Bill.

SHRI PILOO MODY : MR. Speaker, Sir, earlier on, in the course of my speech,

I said that the strength of this House should be restricted to 500 Members.

I think, what you have seen for the last ten minutes, should confirm the reasons which I advanced why this House's strength should not go beyond 500 Members.

Today, Sir, there are about 300 Members or thereabouts present in the House. And yet you will see, from the point of view of noise that is there, from the point of view of the overcrowding that is there,—how it is already looking so much over-crowded.

Not only that, some day this country may elect Members to Parliament who are more interested in legislation in which case you might not even have a quorum problem every afternoon. If the number goes beyond 500 it would be totally unmanageable. At a future date we may have a Speaker with the same wisdom as you have then you will have difficulty in controlling the House and keeping those Members in check such as is happening right now. Therefore, I strongly advocate that the size of the House should not be extended beyond 500 and whatever amendments are necessary—even if the present Bill has to be withdrawn and a fresh bill with proper thought brought forward—I certainly would welcome it very much. One more point that was made that when the various Opposition parties were consulted about the increase in the size of this House, I think, it was an overwhelming verdict of all of them that the size of the House should not be increased. In view of that I do not understand why this particular Bill has been brought and particularly in the manner in which it has been brought before the House.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Minister.

SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY : Sir, unfortunately when I was replying neither Mr. Guha nor Mr. Piloo Mody was present here. I have replied to all the points made by them and therefore I do not want to say anything more.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put it to vote. Let the lobbies be cleared. The lobbies have been cleared. The question is :

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

## The Lok Sabha divided

## Division No. 18]

## AYES

Achal Singh, Shri  
 Afzalpurkar, Shri Dharamrao  
 Agarwal, Shri Virendra  
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
 Ahmed, Shri F A  
 Ambesh, Shri  
 Anand Singh, Shri  
 Ankineedu, Shri Maganti  
 Ansari Shri Ziaur Rahman  
 Arvind Netam, Shri  
 Austin, Dr Henry  
 Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
 Babunath Singh, Shri  
 Banamali Babu, Shri  
 Banerji, Shrimati Mukul  
 Baiman, Shri R N  
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata  
 Barupal, Shri Panna Lal  
 Basappa Shri K  
 Basumatari, Shri D  
 Bhagat, Shri B R  
 Bhagat Shri H K L  
 Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath  
 Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagadish  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri S P  
 Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu  
 Bhaura, Shri B S  
 Bist, Shri Narendra Singh  
 Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri  
 Buta Singh, Shri  
 Chakleshiwar Singh, Shri  
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
 Chandra Gowda, Shri D B  
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal  
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri  
 Chaturvedi, Shri Rohan Lal  
 Chaudhary, Shri Nituraj Singh  
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib  
 Chavan, Shri D R  
 Chawla, Shri Amar Nath  
 Chhotey Lal, Shri  
 Chhuttan Lal, Shri  
 Chittibabu, Shri C  
 Choudhary, Shri B E  
 Choudhury, Shri Motul Haque  
 Daga, Shri M C  
 Dalbi Singh, Shri  
 Dalip Singh, Shri  
 Darbara Singh, Shri  
 Das, Shri Anadi Charan  
 Das, Shri Dharnidhar  
 Das, Shri R P

## [17-18 hrs.]

Daschowdhury, Shri B K  
 Deo, Shri S N Smgh  
 Desai, Shri D. D.  
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G  
 Dhamankar, Shri  
 Dharamgaj Singh, Shri  
 Dharia, Shri Mohan  
 Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad  
 Dmesh Singh, Shri  
 Dixit, Shri G. C  
 Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra  
 Doda, Shri Hiralal  
 Dumada, Shri L K  
 Dutta, Shri Biren  
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
 Engti, Shri Biren  
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira  
 Gangadeb, Shri P  
 Gautam, Shri C D  
 Gavit, Shri T H  
 George, Shri Varkey  
 Ghosh, Shri P K  
 Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh  
 Giri, Shri S B  
 Godara, Shri Mani Ram  
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun  
 Gobain, Shri C C  
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar  
 Gopal, Shri K  
 Goswami, Shri Bibha Ghosh  
 Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra  
 Gotkhinde, Shri Annaaheb  
 Govind Das Dr  
 Gowder, Shri J Matha  
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit  
 Hansda Shri Subodh  
 Hari Kishor Singh, Shri  
 Hari Singh, Shri  
 Hashim, Shri M M  
 Hazra, Shri Manoranjan  
 Ishaque, Shri A K M  
 Jadaja, Shri D P  
 Jaffer, Shri C K  
 Jagjivan Ram Shri  
 Jamilurrahman Shri Md  
 Isha, Shri Chuanjib  
 Jharkhande Rai, Shri  
 Jitendra Prasad, Shri  
 Jordevi, Shri Dmesh  
 Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao  
 Joshi, Shri Popatlal M  
 Kadam, Shri Dattajirao  
 Kadam, Shri J G  
 Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran  
 Kader, Shri S A  
 Kahandeole, Shri Z M  
 Kailas, Dr.

<b>Kakodkar, Shri Purushottan.</b>	<b>Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand</b>
<b>Kakoti, Shri Robin</b>	<b>Palodkar, Shri Manikrao</b>
<b>Kamakshaiyah, Shri D.</b>	<b>Pandey, Shri Damodar</b>
<b>Kamala Prasad Shri</b>	<b>Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra</b>
<b>Kamble, Shri T. D.</b>	<b>Pandey, Shri R. S.</b>
<b>Kapur, Shri Sit Pal</b>	<b>Pandey, Shri Sudhakar</b>
<b>Karan Singh, Dr.</b>	<b>Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar</b>
<b>Kasture, Shri A. S.</b>	<b>Pandit, Shri S. T.</b>
<b>Kaul, Shrimati Sheila</b>	<b>Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani</b>
<b>Kavde, Shri B. R.</b>	<b>Pant, Shri K. C.</b>
<b>Kedar Nath Singh, Shri</b>	<b>Paokai Haokip, Shri</b>
<b>Kinder Lal, Shri</b>	<b>Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand</b>
<b>Kiruttinan, Shri Tha</b>	<b>Parikh, Shri Rasiklal</b>
<b>Kisku, Shri A.K.</b>	<b>Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai</b>
<b>Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.</b>	<b>Partap Singh, Shri</b>
<b>Krishnan, Shri G.Y.</b>	<b>Parthasarathy, Shri P.</b>
<b>Kulkarni, Shri Raja</b>	<b>Paswan, Shri Ram Bhagat</b>
<b>Kureel, Shri B.N.</b>	<b>Patel, Shri Natwarlal</b>
<b>Lakkappa, Shri K.</b>	<b>Patil, Shri Anant Rao</b>
<b>Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati I.</b>	<b>Patil, Shri C. A.</b>
<b>Lakshminarayanan, Shri M. R.</b>	<b>Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe</b>
<b>Lalji Bhai, Shri</b>	<b>Patil, Shri Krishnarao</b>
<b>Laskar, Shri Nihar</b>	<b>Patil, Shri T.A.</b>
<b>Iaufal Haque, Shri</b>	<b>Patnaik, Shri Banamali</b>
<b>Mahajan, Shri Vikram</b>	<b>Patnaik, Shri J. B.</b>
<b>Majahan, Shri Y. S.</b>	<b>Peje, Shri S.L.</b>
<b>Maharaj Singh, Shri</b>	<b>Pillar, Shri R. Balakrishna</b>
<b>Mahata, Shri Debenendra Nath</b>	<b>Prabodh Chandra, Shri</b>
<b>Majhi, Shri Gajadhar</b>	<b>Pradhan, Shri Dhan Shah</b>
<b>Majrhi, Shri Kumar</b>	<b>Pradhani, Shri K.</b>
<b>Mallakajjun, Shri</b>	<b>Purty, Shri M. S.</b>
<b>Mandal, Shri Jagdish marain</b>	<b>Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi</b>
<b>Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad</b>	<b>Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.</b>
<b>Maurya, Shri B.P.</b>	<b>Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai</b>
<b>Mehta, Dr. Mahipatray</b>	<b>Raj Bahadur, Shri</b>
<b>Melkote, Dr. G. S.</b>	<b>Rajdeo Singh, Shri</b>
<b>Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram</b>	<b>Raju, Shri M. T.</b>
<b>Mishra, Shri Bibhuti</b>	<b>Raju, Shri P. V. G.</b>
<b>Mishra, Shri G. S.</b>	<b>Ram, Shri Tulmohan</b>
<b>Mishra, Shri Jagannath</b>	<b>Ram Dhan, Shri</b>
<b>Mishra, Shri L. N.</b>	<b>Ram Prakash, Shri</b>
<b>Mishra, Shri S.N.</b>	<b>Ram Sewak, Ch.</b>
<b>Mohammad Tahir, Shri</b>	<b>Ram Surat Prasad, Shri</b>
<b>Mohammad Yusuf, Shri</b>	<b>Ram Swarup, Shri</b>
<b>Mohan Swarup, Shri</b>	<b>Ramji Ram, Shri</b>
<b>Mohapatra, Shri Shyam Sunder</b>	<b>Ramshekhari Prasad Singh, Shri</b>
<b>Muhammed Khuda Biukhsal, Shri</b>	<b>Rana, Shri M. B.</b>
<b>Mukherjee, Shri Samar</b>	<b>Rao, Shri M. B. Radhabai A.</b>
<b>Mukherjee, Shri Saroj</b>	<b>Rao, Shri Jagannath</b>
<b>Murthy, Shri B.S.</b>	<b>Rao, Shri K. Narayana</b>
<b>Nahata, Shri Amrit</b>	<b>Rao, Shri Nageswara</b>
<b>Nanda, Shri G.L.</b>	<b>Rao, Shri P. Ankincedu Prasada</b>
<b>Negi, Shri Pratap Singh</b>	<b>Rao, Dr. V. K. R. Varadaraja</b>
<b>Nimbalkar, Shri</b>	<b>Rathia, Shri Umed Singh</b>
<b>Oraon, Shri Kartik</b>	<b>Raut, Shri Bhola</b>
<b>Oraon, Shri Tuna</b>	<b>Ravi, Shri Vayalar</b>
<b>Pabadia, Shri Jagannath</b>	<b>Ray, Shrimati Maya</b>

Reddi, Shri P. Antony  
 Reddy Shri B.N.  
 Reddy, Shri K. Ramakrishna  
 Reddy, Shri P. Ganga  
 Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha  
 Richhariya, Dr. Govind Das  
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath  
 Roy, Dr. Saradish  
 Sadhu Ram, Shri  
 Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar  
 Saha, Shri Gadadhar  
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.  
 Samanta, Shri S. C.  
 Sambhali, Shri Ishaque  
 Sangliana, Shri  
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri  
 Sarkar, Shri Sakti Kumar  
 Sathe, Shri Vasant  
 Satish Chandra, Shri  
 Satpathy, Shri Devendra  
 Savant, Shri Shankarrao  
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati  
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.  
 Sen, Dr. Ranen  
 Sethi, Shri Arjun  
 Sezhiyan, Shri  
 Shafee, Shri A.  
 Shah Nawaz Khan, Shri  
 Shambhu Nath, Shri  
 Shankar Dayal Singh, Shri  
 Shankar Dev, Shri  
 Shankaranand, Shri B.  
 Sharma, Shri A.P.  
 Sharma, Dr. H. P.  
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram  
 Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sharma, Shri R. N.  
 Sharma, Dr. Shankar Dayal  
 Shashi Bhushan, Shri  
 Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan  
 Shastri, Shri Raja Ram  
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan  
 Shenoy, Shri P. R.  
 Shrivastava, Prof.  
 Shetty Shri K. K.  
 Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.  
 Shivanth Singh, Shri  
 Shukla, Shri B.R.  
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan  
 Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap  
 Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir  
 Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore  
 Sinha, Shri R. K.  
 Sohani Lal, Shri T.  
 Sokhi, Shri Swaran Singh  
 Stephen, Shri C. M.

Subramaniam, Shri C.  
 Sudarsanam, Shri M.  
 Sunder Lal, Shri  
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri  
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
 Swaminathan, Shri R. V.  
 Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar  
 Swaran Singh, Shri  
 Tarodekar, Shri V. D.  
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri  
 Thakre, Shri S. B.  
 Thakur, Shri Krishnarao  
 Tiwari, Shri Chandra Bhal Mani  
 Tiwari, Shri, R. G.  
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.  
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.  
 Tombi Singh, Shri  
 Uikey, Shri M. G.  
 Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.  
 Veeriah, Shri K.  
 Vekaria, Shri  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P  
 Venkatswamy, Shri G.  
 Verma, Shri Balgovind  
 Verma, Shri Ramsinh Bhai  
 Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad  
 Vidyalkar, Shri Anarnath  
 Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra  
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri  
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit  
 Yadav, Shri Karan Singh  
 Yadav, Shri N. P.  
 Yadav, Shri R. P.  
 Yadav, Shri D. P.

#### NOES

Balakrishnan, Shri K.  
 Guha, Shri Samar  
 Limaye, Shri Madhu  
 Mavalankar, Shri P. G.  
 Mody, Shri Pilloo,  
 Patel, Shri H. M.  
 Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan

MR. SPEAKER : The result\* of the division is:

Ayes : 316; Noes : 7.

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.*

\*The following Members also recorded their votes for AYES:—