

[श्री नवल प्रभाकर]

गांवों में आप के पास कोई जमीन नहीं रहेगी। जो लोग जमींदार हैं या काश्तकार हैं, उनके पास आगे भी जमीन है और उन्होंने लाठी के जोर से और जमीन तोड़ ली है। लेकिन जो कि एक गरीब आदमी है और जो कि पहले किसी तरह मजदूरी करता था उसको कठिनाई हो गयी है। जब भूमि सुधार कानून नहीं था . .

ध्यक्ष महोदय : बिल के बारे में तो आप कह चुके हैं। उन्होंने जवाब दिया कि विचाराधीन है। अब आप क्या कहते हैं वह बोलिये।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : हां या ना कहियेगा।

श्री नवल प्रभाकर : जब भूमि सुधार कानून नहीं था तो गांव में गरीब हरिजन को औरों के यहां काम मिल जाता था और उसको मजदूरी मिल जाती थी। जब से भूमि सुधार हुआ है और वह कानून लागू हुआ है, उस गरीब आदमी को मजदूरी कोई देता नहीं और न कोई उसको बटाई पर जमीन देता है। पहले उसको बटाई पर जमीन मिल जाती थी उसमें वह अपना गुजारा कर लेता था और कुछ जिसकी जमीन होती थी उसको दे देता था। अब वह भी नहीं है। जो शामिलत जमीन है, जिसके बारे में प्रशासन ने कहा था कि ऐसे लोगों को पट्टे पर मिलेगी, वह भी उनको नहीं दी जाती। इस तरफ ध्यान दिया जाये यही सुझाव मैंने दिया था।

मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि सिद्धान्ततः वह इस बात को स्वीकार करते हैं और एक नया ढांचा लाने वाले हैं। यहां सदस्यों ने कई बार प्रश्न किया है कि वह नया ढांचा क्या होगा। अभी तक तो उस नये ढांचे की रूप रेखा हमारे सामने नहीं आयी है। कहते हैं कि बातचीत हो रही है। पता नहीं वह नया ढांचा क्या होगा। मैं तो नहीं कह सकता। लेकिन अगर कोई नया ढांचा आ रहा है और कोई बहुत बड़ा विधेयक लाने वाले हैं तो मेरा

यही कहना है कि ये जो कमियां और खामियां हैं पंचायत राज में उनको अपने ध्यान में रखें।

जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने मेरे इस विधेयक का समर्थन किया है मैं उनका आभारी हूँ। मंत्री महोदय ने इसके सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार किया है। मैं फिर कहूंगा कि इस में सुधार की अत्यन्त आवश्यकता यह सलिए भी आवश्यक है कि यहां यह काम सीधे केन्द्र के अधीन चल रहा है। अगर केन्द्र शासित प्रदेश में पंचायत अच्छा काम करेगी तो उसको आप दूसरे क्षेत्रों के सामने आदर्श रूप में रख सकेंगे। लेकिन अगर केन्द्र शासित देश में पंचायत राज्य ठीक काम नहीं करे तो इसको दूसरे राज्यों पर बुरा असर पड़ेगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक को वापस लेता हूँ।

Shri Somavane: On an assurance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri D. C. Sharma . . . not here. Shri Sezhiyan.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Amendment of Article 171) by Shri Era Sezhiyan.

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

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

I have great pleasure in moving this Bill for the consideration of the House. It is a very simple Bill and I think I will not take much time of the House.

As you know, Sir, the working of democracy rests on the well-being of the legislature, the judiciary and the executive. Now, taking the position of the legislature, especially the State legislature, it is composed of two chambers well-known as the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council.

Article 171 gives the composition of the Legislative Council and how the members of the Legislative Council are to be elected. They come from different categories, namely, as nearly as may be one-third shall be elected from local authorities, one Twelfth from the graduates constituency, one twelfth from the teachers' constituency, one third to be elected by the Members of the Legislative Assembly and the rest to be nominated by the Governor. That is the composition. The Legislative Councils are now in existence in as many as 9 States, namely, Andhra, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Maharashtra, Mysore, Punjab, U. P. and West Bengal. Out of the total of 670 seats available in these 9 States, as many as 56, that is 1/12th, are elected from the teachers' constituencies.

The framers of our Constitution rightly recognised the role of the teachers in society and accorded them some representation in the Legislative Council. Democracy, is government by discussion and to discuss anything the citizens and the legislators should be enlightened. Here the teachers play a prominent role if not a major role, in shaping the democracy. It is well-known that the content of democracy is well protected to the extent the citizens are educated, to the prevalence of literacy in the country. India, a vast country and an infant democracy, faces a very grave and dangerous situation because the literacy rate in India is only 24 per cent. Therefore, the first and the foremost task of a democratic India should be to spread education to make as many people as possible literate so that in

2256 (A) LSD—6.

exercising the franchise and in defending democracy and freedom, the people have a better know of the things. They should be enlightened as to how the Government should function. It is not enough that they vote once in five years and give somebody a place in the Government. They should be able to discern and they should be able to discuss the day-to-day affairs of the country. So, from that point of view, education plays a very prominent role in a democratic society. Two thousand years ago, Plato, the famous Greek Philosopher, while defining democracy said that 'Education is the foundation of democracy.' Only if the citizens are educated and are able to discern between the evil and the good and decide what they want they will be able to exercise their democratic rights and to defend democracy when a crisis comes. Otherwise, if illiteracy rules high, the people will not be able to express themselves effectively they will not be able to discern what is best for the country also the best for themselves. So, education forms the foundation of democracy.

Only in an enlightened society the norms of democracy will be well appreciated and well guarded. Especially in India where about 76 per cent of the people are uneducated, the role of the teacher comes foremost in the making of our democracy. Therefore, our Constitution had laid down a certain target by which free education should be given to all. That means that every citizen should be able to study and also get the benefit of education up to the age of 16 years, that is, of primary education and elementary education and secondary education. For that purpose, we want more teachers, and we want the position of the teachers to be more respectable and attractive. Unless we give respect for the job that they hold, people will not come forward in enough numbers to take up this job. Even now if you go to the distant villages you will find many schools without teachers or only a few teachers managing a huge

[Shri Sezhiyan]

team of children. That means that we have not put the role of the teacher in the proper perspective before the people and the country. We do not give that much respect which is due to them. Although laudatory and oratorical terms are being used in respect of the teacher, and much commendation is being given and praise bestowed on the role of the teachers, although we say that it is the noblest and the best of professions yet, in reality we find that they are among the lowest paid persons and they are almost a forgotten tribe; and they are not also given the respect that is due to them. This Bill of mine seeks to remedy one such situation.

As I said earlier the framers of our Constitution recognised the prominent role of the teachers and gave them some representation in the Legislative Council along with the graduates, along with the local authorities and along with the Assembly Members. But there is one small snag in the sense that equal opportunity has not been given to all the teachers. Article 171 (3) (c) dealing with the composition of the Legislative Council of a State provides that:

"as nearly as may be, one-twelfth shall be elected by electorates consisting of persons who have been for at least three years engaged in teaching in such educational institutions within the State, not lower in standard than that of a secondary school, as may be prescribed by or under any law made by Parliament."

The main portion of this clause which is to be discussed now is:

"in such educational institutions within the State, not lower in standard than that of a secondary school,"

That means that teachers employed in other institutions lower in standard

than that of a secondary school will not be given the franchise in election to the Legislative Council under teachers' Constituency.

The total number of teachers in all institutions, including universities, research institutions, colleges professional as well as general technical schools, secondary schools, primary schools and pre-primary schools, according to the figures given by the Education Ministry for 1959-60 comes to 14,05,546. Out of this number, the number of primary and pre-primary teachers is to about 7,34,960. This means that about 52 per cent of the teachers are employed in primary and pre-primary schools. Therefore, if we say that we shall give the franchise in the teachers' constituency only to those teachers who are employed in institutions not lower in standard than that of a secondary school, then we are excluding as many as 7,34,960 teachers out of a total of 14,05,456; that is, 52 per cent of the teachers do not enjoy the franchise now being offered for elections to the Legislative Council. Therefore, it is a grave injustice, and a grave discrimination against the teachers who are employed in elementary and primary schools.

When we see the pattern of education the more onerous and the more important aspect of it lies in the pre-primary and the primary schools. Only if the school children are brought up in a well-knit way and well-educated way, they can grow up into useful citizens and in later life they can come up to the expectations laid down in the Constitution and to the political and moral standards laid down therein. That is possible only if the pre-primary and primary education is well thought out and well planned. When we plan elementary and primary education, we have to look after the interests of the teachers also. Unless we give them the honour and the respect due to them, we may not be able to attract the best man and to expect the

kind of enthusiasm work that we require.

At present the primary school and pre-primary school teachers have not been included in the list of voters for the Legislative Council in the teachers' constituency. The Bill that I have brought forward before the House will therefore, I hope, get the support of all the Members of the House irrespective of their political affiliations.

In proposing this Bill for the consideration of the House, I may stress once again that a grave injustice and a grave discrimination has been perpetrated against the teachers in the elementary and primary schools. This Bill which is a simple Bill seeks to remove the disabilities that have been put against them.

With these words, I beg to move for the consideration of my Bill which seeks to amend article 171 (3) (c) so that the teachers in the primary and pre-primary schools also may be included in the list of voters. That is to say, all those teachers who are in the noble profession of educating the children and educating the future citizens of India, irrespective of whether they are in the secondary or primary or elementary schools, may be given the honoured role and the status that they deserve so that they also can exercise their franchise for election to the Legislative Council.

With these words, I move for the consideration of my Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

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

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): The Legislative Councils in various States, that is, wherever we have allowed them to exist, are elected through indirect election. The elections take place not on the basis of direct fran-

chise as in the case of the State Legislative Assemblies or the Lok Sabha but indirectly, and in certain cases through a limited franchise. One of the provisions is that one-twelfth of the members of the Legislative Council should be elected by the teachers.

On this occasion, we may apply our minds to the question whether this mode of indirect election is the correct one. Our experience during the last decade or so, since the Constitution came into force has given an opportunity now to think over the problem again.

To take an analogy, you will remember, that in the United States, their legislative councils that is to say, the Senates of the State as well as the Federal Senate were elected in the same way as the Legislative Councils and the Rajya Sabha here, that is, through indirect elections. Later on, they found by experience that the system was not so good, so healthy and so democratic, and, therefore, they changed over to the system of direct election itself.

I think in the last 15 years, the general level of consciousness among the people has risen to such an extent that it is time for us to consider whether we cannot safely change over because even a man in the street even the illiterate person has become aware and conscious of political and public matters. My hon. friend mentioned that 70 per cent are illiterate. The question of illiteracy is not so important. Even the so-called illiterate person applies his mind to political and public matters. My hon. friend mentioned that 70 he pinpoints certain issues in a way which shows that many times I feel he is more politically conscious than many of us are.

For example, I was going in a scooter. The driver happened to be a Peshwari a man from the Afghanistan border. After independence of India, he had come over here. I enquired of him how matters were going on. He

[Shri Heda].

said: 'Delhi is very good. We are earning very well and are quite happy. Though the prices are rising, we get here every thing, but water.' He meant that the water available in his former place in Afghanistan was so pure and clean that that type of water was just a rare thing in Delhi.

So many times, these people pinpoint problems in a way that most of us, educated and literate people, fail to do. So I think it is time for us to consider whether we should not dispense with indirect election.

I know there is one practical difficulty. In America this is possible because they have got the biennial elections and the Presidential election takes place once in four years. Therefore, the two elections synchronise and there are no separate elections. Here the life of the Assemblies and the Lok Sabha is five years. There are biennial elections for the Rajya Sabha and Legislative Councils. Therefore, we have to readjust the period. But this is a matter which can be decided. Once we agree on the principle we can find a *via media*. Then the periodicity of elections to the Council may be changed or the life of the Assemblies and Lok Sabha may be changed so as to suit our requirements. But I strongly put in a plea that the time has come for us to think of doing away with indirect elections.

Many times we hear of very serious defects in indirect elections. Where the franchise is limited, in a number of cases there is great scope for pressure and corruption. In a number of cases we came across very serious complaints; it was even said that members of the Assemblies had sold their votes for such and such amount. All these things would be done away with if we change over from indirect to direct election.

So far as the subject-matter of this Bill is concerned, I think the amendment is a very healthy one. I support

it and would put forth two more factors for the consideration of the House. One is that teachers even in the primary and other schools are equally politically conscious as the teachers in the university and higher institutions. It may be that 14—15 years ago the level of consciousness between the two was different. But today the level is the same, thanks to panchayati raj. Taking democracy to the grassroots, to the villages, we have created this consciousness. Every thinking person has become plain conscious. Therefore, when that consciousness has increased, I think the primary and other teachers who are now excluded from the franchise today, also deserve equal treatment as the other teachers.

The second thing is that not only do they deserve the right of franchise, but if they get an opportunity to represent the interest of teaching, I think they would do better than the present representatives would do. Whether they will get that opportunity or not—because being in the primary schools, they would be scattered in small villages; their contacts will be far less—given the opportunity, they would represent the teaching profession far better than the others. I say this because the primary teacher is the most hard-hit person. This is so not only in our country but in every other country, except probably the USSR. This is the sorry phenomenon everywhere. Even in the US, I found that the primary teacher is one of the lowest paid men in that country. Almost the same is the case our country too.

Therefore it is time that not only is he given the right of franchise, but he is also provided an opportunity where he can vigorously put forth his own interest and try to further it because, after all, teaching is not only a noble profession but as my hon. friend said—here we unite—it creates a good climate for democracy. If young boys and girls have to inculcate the spirit of democracy, the proper initiation would be in these very

schools. If these institutions have that opportunity and the teachers feel that they are a part of it, and will play a greater part in the success of democracy, I think they would be more responsible and try to make this democracy a greater success. These two factors constitute added reasons why the primary teachers should be included. From that angle, the relevant entry may be suitably changed. With these words, I support the Bill.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य, श्री सेन्नियान, जो बिल लाए हैं, उसके लिए मैं उनको कान्ग्रेटु वोट करता हूँ कि उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की समस्याओं को समझने की कोशिश की है। साथ ही मैं विधि मंत्री, श्री मिश्र, से भी यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह हर एक बिल को नामंजूर न किया करें। जो बिल अच्छा हो, उसको वह मंजूर कर लिया करें। हम लोग आपोजीशन में इसलिए नहीं बैठे हैं कि हम सरकार की हर एक बात की मुञ्चालिफ्त करें। कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से जो अच्छी चीज पेश की जाती है, हम उसका समर्थन करते हैं, उसको सपोर्ट करते हैं। इसलिए जो बिल इस समय लाया गया है, उसको वह मान लें और इस को वापस न लेना पड़े। माननीय सदस्य से भी मुझे आशा है कि वह इस को वापस नहीं लेंगे।

आज हिन्दुस्तान में टीचरों की हालत जितनी बुरी है, उतनी बुरी कहीं भी नहीं है। जब मैं अपनी कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी में जाता हूँ और किसी स्कूल में जा कर पूछता हूँ कि हैडमास्टर साहब कहाँ गये हैं, सैकंड मास्टर साहब कहाँ गये हैं, तो पता चलता है कि आज तो वह चले गए, पंचायत राज का इलैडेशन कराने के लिए। जब अगली दफा जा कर पूछता हूँ, तो पता लगता है कि आज वह भूदान के लिए गए हैं। जब मैं तीसरी दफा जा कर पूछता हूँ, तो बताया जाता है कि आज वह भ्रमदान के लिए गये हैं। जब मैं चौथी दफा जा कर पूछता हूँ, तो पता लगता है कि आज कोई नेता जी आ रहे हैं, उन के लिए फूल-मालायें तैयार करने के लिए और उन का स्वागत

करने के लिए वह गये हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश के लिए यह सब से बड़ी प्रगति की बात है।

टीचरों का दर्जा सब से ऊँचा दर्जा है। ग्रेट ब्रिटेन में अगर प्राइमरी स्कूल में वहाँ का किंग एम्परर, शहशाह, सम्राट, भी जाता है, तो वह दर्जा चार को पढ़ाने वाले अध्यापक के सामने हेट उतार कर सलाम करता है। इसका कारण यह है कि जब बच्चों को पता लगता है कि हमारे टीचर से भी बड़ी कोई एथारिटी है, तो उन का डिस्प्लिन नहीं बन सकता है, उन में अनुशासन का निर्माण नहीं हो सकता है।

15.39 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

हमारे देश में सब से बड़ी कमी यह है कि अध्यापक को हम एक घड़े से भी कम त र्का देते हैं। घड़े का जो भत्ता है, वह अस्सी रुपये माहवार है, जब कि यू० पी० के टीचर्स की तर्काह सत्तर रुपये माहवार है—घड़े से दस रुपये माहवार कम है। जिस हम् राष्ट्र का निर्माता कहते हैं, जिसे हम नेशन का बिल्डर कहते हैं, जिसे हम कौम का मेमार कहते हैं, उसकी कोई इज्जत हमारे देश में नहीं है।

हमें इन टीचर्स ने दिये हैं रामस्वामी मुदलियार जैसे लोग। इस क्लास में से आये हैं सर राधाकृष्णन् जैसे लोग और डा० जाकिर हुसैन जैसे लोग। इस क्लास में अच्छे से अच्छे लोग पैदा हुए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या यशपाल सिंह साहब भी इसी क्लास से आए हैं ?

Shri Yashpal Singh: I am a soldier.

उनके रिप्रेजेंटेशन का जब तक यहाँ इन्तजाम नहीं होगा तब तक किसी तरह से देश उन्नति कर सकता है। मुझे ताज्जुब हुआ कि जब हर एक जगह पर सीट्स बढ़ाई जा रही हैं, हर

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

एक कांस्टिट्यून्सी में तादाद बढ़ाई जा रही है। ई तब अध्यापकों की कांस्टिट्यून्सी में कमी की जा रही है। कल ही मैं एक एम० एल० सी० से मिला जो कि उत्तर प्रदेश में टीचर्स एसोसिएशन को रिप्रेजेंट करते हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि अब तक वे दो आदमी थे जो अध्यापकों के लिये लड़ते थे, टीचर्स की तनख्वाह के लिये लड़ते थे, लेकिन उन दोनों को भी अब दस्त-बरदार होना पड़ेगा। इतनी बड़ी समस्या है। २० या २२ लाख अध्यापक सारे देश में हैं। २०, २२ लाख लोगों के मसले, जब तक कि वे लोग रिप्रेजेंट न हों, हल हो जायें, यह नामुमकिन बात है। इसलिये मन्त्री जो से भेरा निवेदन है कि वे यहां इसलिये नहीं बैठें हैं कि हर एक चीज को नामंजूर ही करते हैं उनको यहां पर हर चीज को डिसअलाऊ करने के लिये ही नहीं भेजा गया है। वे यहां पर इसलिये आये हैं कि अगर कोई अच्छा रेजोल्यूशन आये तो वे उसे मंजूर करें। यह जो विधेयक है वह बिल्कुल एक इम्प्लेंट चीज है। यह २० या २२ लाख लोगों का सवाल है जो कि कौम के मुस्तकबिल के मालिक हैं, जिनके ऊपर इस देश के निर्माण का दायरे-भदार है।

अध्यक्ष, महोदय, मुझे कहने की आप इजाजत दीजिये कि आज हमारे देश के अन्दर गाने वाले को कितनी तनख्वाह मिलती है, नाचने वाले को कितनी तनख्वाह मिलती है। २० हजार रुपये रोज। ऐसे आदमियों को जो कि सिनेमा में खड़े होकर इस देश को गुमराह करने की कोशिश करते हैं। नाचने और गाने वालों में अनएजुकेटड लोग भी हैं, उनमें से बहुत से ऐसे लोग हैं। जिनके २० हजार रुपये रोज मिलने हैं, लेकिन गरीब अध्यापक को जो कि नेशन का बिल्डर है उसके हिस्से में २० ५० १० १० १० मुश्किल से प्राता है। स डिस्पैरिटी को दूर करने की जरूरत है। सरकार को यह मान लेना चाहिये कि उनकी पूरा रिप्रेजेंटेशन हो। अगर अध्यापक का पूरा

रिप्रेजेंटेशन न होगा तो कौन उन्हें रिप्रेजेंट करेगा। हम लोगों को तो अपने कामों से ही फुसंत नहीं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर आप को मुकाबला ही करना है तो अमरीका में एक फिल्म स्टार है जो सिर्फ एक अपिअरेंस के लिये ५० हजार डालर लेता है।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : एक अपिअरेंस के लिये ५० हजार डालर लेती हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ५० हजार डालर लेती नहीं हैं। वह मर्द हैं।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : वह एक अपिअरेंस के लिये ५०,००० डालर लेते हैं और आप एक टीचर या अध्यापक को टाई २पया रोज देते हैं। यह किस तरह से देश को सहन हो सकता है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान को आगे बढ़ाना है तो हम को इस डिस्पैरिटी को खत्म करना पड़ेगा। डा० श्रीमाली ने पांच महीने पहले कहा था कि अब भी हिन्दुस्तान में सारी दुनिया से ज्यादा अनएजुकेटड लोग हैं। हमारी यह हालत है तो कौन देश का निर्माण करेगा। इसलिये अध्यापकों को पूरा रिप्रेजेंटेशन मिलना चाहिये। जब तक उनकी कांस्टिट्यून्सी अलग नहीं होती, जब तक उनके लिये बाकायदा रिजर्वेशन नहीं होगा तब तक इस देश का भला नहीं हो सकता। देश का भला करने वाले जो लोग हैं उनके फायदे के लिये यह बिल लाया गया है। इतना इम्प्लेंट बिल जो है उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं माननीय श्री मिश्र से दरख्वास्त करता हूँ कि इस बिल को बगैर किसी राय शुमारी के लिये भेजे हुए मंजूर करने की कोशिश करें।

साथ ही साथ अध्यापकों के साथ जो बुरा सुलूक हो रहा है उस को दूर करने के लिये उनको कोई न कोई प्राविजन लाना चाहिये। आपको सुन कर ताज्जुब होगा कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, जिसको आप जिला परिषद् कहते हैं,

उसके चेअरमैन दर्जा चार पास होते हैं। दर्जा चार पास, ग्रंगूठा लगाने वाला जाहिल मुनसक बह होता है। वह ५० रु० माहवार का एक मुंशी रख लेता है। वह कालेज में जाता है और जो नौजवान एम० ए० एल० टी० है और कालेज का प्रिंसिपल है, जो कालेज को चलाने का काम करता है, उसके रेकार्ड को खराब करके चला जाता है। उस एम० ए० एल० टी० प्रिंसिपल का इन्सपेक्शन कौन लिखता है। ५० रु० माहवार पाने वाला मुंशी या दर्जा चार पास डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड का चेअरमैन, क्योंकि जिस वक्त आपने डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड के ल्या को बनाया था उस वक्त आपने यह कानून नहीं बनाया था कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड का चेअरमैन पढा लिखा होना चाहिये। नतीजा यह हुआ है कि दर्जा चार पास चेअरमैन, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड एक एम० ए० एल० टी० प्रिंसिपल का इन्सपेक्शन लिखता है या उसका मुंशी लिखता है और चेअरमैन ग्रंगूठा लगा देता है। क्या कोई और देश इस को बदल कर सकता था। नहीं कर सकता था।

इसलिये अध्यापकों को नुमाइन्दगी देने के लिये हमारे माननीय सदस्य जो बिल लाये हैं उसे बरीर किमी राय शुमारी के लिये भेजे हुए मंजूर किया जाये और अध्यापकों के वेतन को बढ़ाने के लिये, उनके स्टैण्डर्ड आफ लिविंग को बढ़ाने के लिये पूरी कोशिश की जाये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं माननीय सदस्य को मुबारकवाद देता हूँ और माननीय मन्त्री जी से आग्रह करता हूँ कि वे इस बिल को जरूर मंजूर करें।

Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar (Fatehpur): Sir, I stand to support this amendment. It is a simple and innocent amendment to widen the franchise. It is true that indirect elections in this country bring in a lot of corruption but once that has been conceded in the Constitution and special seats have been allotted to every class of persons, it is very unjust to debar the teachers from seek-

ing election or exercising their votes. Student may become the Prime Minister tomorrow or the President of the Indian Republic. So, when all limitations are lifted, teachers at the elementary stage deserve to get this encouragement. There have been indirect elections before and in UP I know there were cases where voters were actually lifted in a truck and detained for 2-3 days: certain pradhans participating in zila parishad elections were not allowed to go out. That is of course with regard to indirect elections.

A majority of the teachers have no right to exercise their vote or seek election. There is a talk about certain minimum education with regard to the zila parishad or non-official office bearers. As long as there is no minimum educational qualification for candidates to Lok Sabha election, we cannot afford to say that there should be some minimum educational qualification for the zila parishad or State legislature or for any other non-official post. This was hotly discussed in the Constituent Assembly. Somehow those who were promoting democracy thought it proper that with adult franchise every person who is major is entitled to cast his precious vote. Is any person restricted in seeking election even to the highest body, Lok Sabha? These things are to be considered seriously. Once we conclude that some educational qualification is essential at all, then we have to start with Members of Lok Sabha; there must be certain minimum educational qualification for people seeking election to Lok Sabha. Then only we can afford to say so with regard to non-official office bearers.

We are now pursuing a policy of special allotment of seats to certain special sections. It is, therefore very advisable to include these teachers who have been so far debarred from exercising their vote or actually participating in the teachers' consti-

[Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar]

tuency. I welcome this amendment and I request the hon. Deputy Minister to think over this matter coolly and allow this amendment to be passed by this House.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I congratulate the hon. Member Shri Sezhiyan who has brought this Bill at the right moment. This Constitution (Amendment) Bill is a very simple one which has got only one clause, namely, to delete the words: "not lower in standard than that of a secondary school."

As you know, the educational field is not only at the secondary or the college level. It should start from below. These are the poor teachers who educate the masses at large in this country. May I quote here the words of Vinobhaji? He has said:

"In any form of faultless Government the following characteristics must be found without fail."

There are four characteristics which he has mentioned, but I shall only quote the fourth characteristic, because it is concerned directly with the object of this Bill. The fourth characteristic of a faultless Government is:

"honest work on the part of anyone will be considered to be of equal value (moral and monetary). We shall now discuss briefly the each of the above."

Now, may I ask the Deputy Minister, are these primary school teachers less valued persons, or, what are the reasons behind this restriction that the opinion of primary school teachers should not be taken? As you know, democracy or basic democracy should be as wide and as broad-based as possible. Otherwise, it will be the authority of the few which will prevail. Mahatma Gandhi himself has said:

"By Swaraj I mean the government of India or the States by the consent of the people as ascertained by the largest number of the

adult population, male or female, native-born or domiciled, who have contributed by manual labour to the service of the State and who have taken the trouble of having their names registered as voters."

Cannot these primary school teachers be registered as voters in these particular constituencies for the direct election? What fault is there or what objection is there on the part of the Government, I want to know. Gandhiji further says:

"I hope to demonstrate that real Swaraj will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist the authority when abused."

I would like to suggest to the hon. Member concerned, who has brought this Bill, to add or to amend another clause to the effect that these teachers should have the authority to recall their representatives also from the Legislative Councils. We have no calling back authority in respect of the Lok Sabha Members but at least for these educated voters or for these honest primary school teachers or any other teachers, I am of the opinion that there should be the right for calling back also. In the name of educational representation, party politics come in.

Mr. Speaker: For re-call, the hon. Member should bring forward a new Constitution Amendment Bill.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: I am making this point only by way of a suggestion.

With these words, I support this Bill. If the Government are interested in making this democracy a broad-based one and a real one, I appeal to the treasury benches, especially to the Deputy Minister to consider this matter seriously. If the Government rejects this Bill, it means their interest in democracy will go away.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I do not know what shall be the attitude of the Government to this particular Bill. I cannot conceive of any possible objection they can take to the principle on which this amending Bill is based by my hon. friend, the Member of the DMK Party. There is no doubt that the Legislative Councils stand on a different footing from the State Assemblies and the Lok Sabha. We have taken our model particularly from the U.K. The House of Lords was the model which was before the minds to some extent of those who framed our Constitution.

The Council of States here and the Legislative Councils in the States are more or less intended to be bodies which are smaller in size representing something different from what the Lok Sabha or the State Assemblies represent. That is the idea. Coming to the choice of the constituency, in England, of course, they had a ready-made thing. There was an aristocratic class which constituted the membership of the Upper House by virtue of heredity and their right of belonging to a particular nobility and so on.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There is no written Constitution there.

Dr. M. S. Aney: There is a convention and a recognised mode for the membership of the Upper House. Convention is as good as written Constitution.

The second House is supposed to be a House to exercise some kind of a restraining influence on the work which the House of Commons does. That may be the idea here also. But in India there was no class as in England for the membership of the Upper House. So, to think of some kind of election was the only way to form the other House also. :

So far as the teachers are concerned, I think the only consideration that must have governed is that the electorate should not be unnecessarily big.

So, they thought that teachers not belonging to the primary schools but belonging to the secondary schools and other higher institutions should form the electorate, so that the electorate would be a compact and small one, and probably a more learned one. In my opinion, to make a distinction of that kind among the teachers themselves is invidious. If you want that educational interest should be represented in the other House, then we should take education as a whole and include all the teachers from the first standard to the college in the electorate. In fact, one of the defects of our educational system is that this particular integrated view of education as a whole is not being taken and we find different States taking different views on education. But at least in the matter of franchise, Government should be well-advised in including all those who are engaged in the profession of teaching without making any distinction. Recognised institutions should have the right of franchise and they should be eligible to record their votes. This is more logical and, in a way, good. This will not only give a better status to the teachers but it will also widen the constituency which will be less free, less open to means of corruption. One of the reasons that was urged for having a wider constituency was that in a wider constituency there was lesser chance of persons using their influence by means of corruption and so on. The idea was that there will be less opportunity for corruption in a wider constituency. I am not going to discuss that point at length now, but if that is possible in a constituency for the Lok Sabha, having adopted the principle of representation there also, we should try to introduce this salutary principle in the case of the Councils also. If that is to be done, then the best way is to take the entire class of teachers as one constituency and no distinction ought to be made on the ground that one is a primary teacher or a secondary teacher. A primary school teacher already suffers from the disability that he gets a small pay. You are further giving him another disability saying that he is not entitled to

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

vote, which privilege even a fool or an illiterate man has got under the Constitution.

Sir, I am very eager to hear what extra-ordinary arguments our Deputy Minister for Law has got to advance in support of the existing practice and to oppose the salutary amendment which has been brought by my hon. friend. Sir, I support the amending Bill.

Shri Subbaraman (Madurai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you for the opportunity you have given me to speak a few words on this Bill. My hon. friend, Shri Sezhiyan, has brought this Bill to include nearly half of the teachers in this country who are in the profession and who have not got the franchise under the constituency of teachers for the legislative councils. He has brought this with all good intentions. No doubt, teaching is a very noble and honourable profession, but if you consider the qualification of elementary school teachers you will find that they would have passed only third-form or eighth standard with one or two years of training. Most of them are less than under-graduates or even S.S.L.C. These are the people who are sought to be included in the teachers' constituency.

No doubt, they perform a very noble duty of training our children to be good citizens. There are other professions equally important such as medical, engineering, legal and others. But we do not give any special representation for them.

Besides, it is the mothers who play a great part in bringing up a new society. Still, we do not give any special treatment or position to them. They have got franchise as anybody else.

If we want to include elementary school teachers also, then I think their qualifications should be raised at least to SSLC or secondary trained. Though

we have got every sympathy for elementary school teachers, do we on our part entrust our children to the elementary school teachers? No. We want our children to be trained by highly qualified people. So, unless their standard and qualifications are raised, it is not at all good to include teachers who do not possess such qualifications. I would like to add that business people, industrialists and labour play a great part in building the society. They are also quite essential for the society. Yet, we do not provide any special constituency to them. So, I would like to suggest that their position should also be improved.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the underlying idea of the Bill in as much as such representation to teachers in elementary schools would dignify the profession of teaching at all levels. At the moment, as the provision stands, there is an unseemly discrimination against teachers at the elementary schools. There is no reason why special representation should not be given to teachers in elementary schools. Although I am not able to support the Bill as it has come before us, I would strongly request the Government to consider the possibility of giving separate representation, specific and certain, to the class of teachers who teach in elementary schools. It may be 1/24 and half the teachers may be from secondary teachers but the other half should be from elementary schools because their plight today is really most pathetic. They are most numerous and it is they who are engaged, as other teachers are also engaged, in the task of building the nation. There is no reason why this discrimination should be allowed to be perpetrated to the disadvantage of teachers in the elementary schools. I would, therefore, request the Minister to make a statement giving an assurance that this matter would be given full consideration in consultation with the various State Governments, and that this effort to dignify the status of elementary school teachers would receive

sympathetic consideration at the hands of the Government.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Bade also wants to speak? All right, I will give him two minutes.

Shri Bade (Khargone): In two minutes I can only say that I support the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Three minutes.

Shri Bade: I support the Bill and I request the hon. Minister to accept the principle of the Bill. The most important point is this. I am opposed to Legislative Councils and Upper Houses. Fortunately, in Madhya Pradesh there is no Legislative Council. Nowadays, those persons who do not get a ticket for the general election or who get defeated in the general election are given a sheltered place in the Upper House. Of course, some experts and some scholars are also sent there. If they are going to keep or maintain the Upper House, then, of course, the teachers who serve in the primary and middle schools should be given representation there. Now the difficulty is that in the States there is no definition of "secondary school". In some places they say "you are middle school teachers; therefore, you are not entitled to vote" while in some other places they say "you are middle school teachers; so, you are entitled to vote". It is left to the sweet will of the State. When the *kisans*, *harijans* and the *Adibasis* are given the right to vote, why should the poor elementary school teachers alone be deprived from the right to vote? So, I would support the Bill and I would request the hon. Minister also to accept the underlying principle of the Bill.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Law (Shri Bibudhendra Misra): Mr. Speaker, Sir, almost all the Members excepting one have supported the provisions of the Bill. But I am sorry to state that I have not been able to persuade myself to accept the reason-

ing given by any of the Members. So far as I am concerned.....

Dr. M. S. Aney: Because it emanates from the Opposition?

Shri Bibudhendra Misra: I oppose it not because it emanates from a Member of the Opposition but because it has no legs whatsoever to stand upon. I do not dispute the proposition laid down in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that teachers are to be held in the highest honour. But I fail to see any connection between the Statement of Objects and Reasons and the provisions of the Bill. I do not understand it. Is it meant thereby that by not giving primary teachers any representation in the Legislative Council of a State they are dishonoured? Or, is it meant that they will be honoured only if they are given representation in the different Legislative Councils of those States which have Legislative Councils? That is the reasoning which cannot appeal to anybody. (*An Hon. Member: Discriminatory*). I will come to the point of discrimination later on.

Now, Dr. Aney wanted to know why the primary teachers have been excluded from the scope of the operation of article 171 of the Constitution. The matter was discussed in the Constituent Assembly and he himself has given the reason as to why it was thought proper that primary teachers should not get a representation there at all. As I have followed the temper of this House during the last two years of my career as the Deputy Minister, the demand has been the other way that no special representation should be given to the teachers whatsoever. It is not a question of giving special representation to primary teachers, to bring primary teachers into the fold of the provisions of sub-section (3) of article 171. Whenever there has been any Bill to amend article 171, numerous suggestions have been made that there should not be any functional representation of teachers when there is no provision for any functional representation to medical men, lawyers or engineers. Article 171 of the Constitu-

[Shri Bibudhendra Misra]

tion does not envisage at all any functional representation being granted. Rightly or wrongly, a special representation has been granted to secondary teachers. Now the matter has been agitated and I may inform the House—I think I had informed the House earlier also—that the matter was also referred to the different State Governments because the Election Commission was against granting functional representation only to teachers when such functional representation has not been granted to any other profession. Secondly, if I remember aright, it was the Vice-Chancellors' Conference in Uttar Pradesh that was of the view and they passed a resolution that teachers should not be brought into the Legislative Councils because, apart from the fact that the absence of teachers in the educational institutions is to the detriment of teaching there, the reason advanced by them was that it brings politics into the educational institutions. Out of the 8 States that have Legislative Councils 6 States are opposed to giving any representation whatsoever to secondary teachers also. It is only one State, that is, Mysore, which has said that the representation should continue and the reply of another State, I think, Maharashtra, is being awaited. Therefore, it is not only the Election Commission but it is also the considered view of the States having Legislative Councils that no functional representation of this character should be given to the teachers, and particularly in view of the fact that there is no such provision so far as other professions are concerned.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Are we to understand that the Government is opposed even to the existing representation granted to secondary teachers?

Shri Bibudhendra Misra: I mean the views of the States are being considered. If it comes to it that the representation given to secondary teachers in the Legislative Council of a State is to be abolished, there will be no question of discrimination. May I ask those

Members who now point out that when the representation to the secondary teachers is there we do not give any representation to primary teachers and there is discrimination, whether even if you give any representation to primary teachers along with secondary teachers, is it not a discrimination not to give representation to other professions like law, medical and engineering?

Shri Bade: Does it mean that the Government wants to bring in an amendment to abolish this also?

Mr. Speaker: That question has already been put by Dr. Singhvi.

Shri Bibudhendra Misra: I have said that the matter is under the consideration of the Government because we have received the views of the States. I am not in a position to state whether there will be a Constitutional amendment or not. But the proposition that I want to enunciate is that the wind is blowing the other way namely that no functional representation should be given to secondary teachers also. So, it is not a question of enlarging the scope of article 171 so as to bring the teachers of primary schools within its fold.

In view of this, I am constrained to oppose this Bill, and I would request the hon. mover to withdraw the Bill.

Shri Gauri Shankar Kakkar: As long as this provision continues, primary teachers also should be brought within its fold. So far, Government have not introduced any amendment to remove the representation given to teachers. Therefore, what the hon. Minister has stated does not constitute sound logic.

Mr. Speaker: An appeal has been made to the hon. Member to withdraw it. Is he withdrawing it?

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): No, I am not withdrawing it.

I shall say just one or two words in reply to the discussion that has taken place now. I find that almost all the Members who have spoken have supported this Bill.

The basic question which has been raised is whether the Legislative Councils should be continued or not. But that question does not arise out of the discussion that we are having now with regard to this Bill. Also, it has been suggested that the system of limited franchise and indirect elections is not proper. Also, one Member suggested regulating the qualifications of the elected members. But I would submit that these things will form the subject-matter of a separate amendment, and do not come within the scope of the present amending Bill of mine.

The important thing which the hon. Deputy-Minister asked was whether the primary school teachers had been dishonoured by the present position or practice. The point that I would emphasise is that there is grave discrimination against the primary teachers and pre-primary teachers in the teachers' constituency. At present, we are taking only 48 per cent of the teachers, and 52 per cent of the teachers are not represented. I had given the figures in my earlier speech. Out of 14,05,546 teachers working in all the teaching institutions in the country, irrespective of the standard of the institution, there are as many as 7,34,960 teachers, that is, about 52 per cent of the total number, working in primary and pre-primary schools. Therefore, my submission is that when you are giving representation in the teachers' constituency, you should give it fully to all the teachers and not exclude nearly 52 per cent of the teachers.

One hon. Member who was opposed to this Bill brought in the argument that those persons who had been educated up to the third or fourth form, had been appointed in elementary schools, and, therefore, franchise should not be given to them. Had that been the spirit of the

framers of the Constitution, they would as well have laid down some educational qualifications for the teachers in the teachers' constituency, and that only those teachers working in certain institutions and possessing certain qualifications could come in. But we find that they have only referred to teachers working in certain institutions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Sezhiyan: 1 hour and 30 minutes have been allotted for my Bill.

Mr. Speaker: That does not mean that if other Members have spoken for only half an hour, the hon. Mover should have the balance of one hour.

Shri Sezhiyan: I began my speech on the motion for consideration only at 3.15 P.M.

Mr. Speaker: The same things cannot be repeated now. The hon. Member has only to reply now to what has been stated in the House.

Shri Sezhiyan: My point is that at present there is discrimination against one teacher and another. Even in the secondary schools, I may point out that there may be some teachers who may not be graduates or who may not even have passed the SSLC examination. For instance, a physical training instructor or a drawing master need not have passed the SSLC examination, and still he will get the franchise under the present provision because he happens to work in an institution which belongs to the secondary grade.

The real anomaly of the present provision is that you are discriminating against teachers working in certain institutions, irrespective of the fact whether they are graduates or they have passed SSLC or not. Simply because they happen to work in a school lower in standard than that of a secondary school they are not allowed to vote and they do not enjoy the franchise.

[Shri Sezhiyan.]

Therefore, my plea to the hon. Minister is that he may reconsider the plight of the primary and pre-primary school teachers who form 52 per cent of the total, and give them the franchise which is their due. The discrimination which is there at present should be eliminated. I would again implore the Deputy Minister to consider this matter and also to respect the opinion of the House. Excluding the Deputy Minister, seven Members have spoken on this Bill, and out of them, six have supported the Bill. Therefore, I would request the House to consider this Bill and pass it.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put the motion for consideration to the vote of the House. It requires a special majority since it is a Bill to amend the Constitution.

Let the Lobby be cleared.

The question is:

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

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 10]

[16.24 hrs.

AYES

Alvares, Shri
Aney, Dr M. S.
Bade., Shri
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Bhattacharya, Shri Dinen
Bheel, Shri P. H.
Bist, Shri J. B. S.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Daji, Shri
Elias, Shri Mohammed
Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Gounder, Shri Mathur
Jena, Shri
Jha, Shri Yogendra

Kakkar, Shri Gouri Shankar
Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu
Kunhan, Shri P.
Lahri Singh, Shri
Manoharan, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H.N.

Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Nambiar, Shri

Pattanayak, Shri Kishan
Rajaram, Shri

Ramabhadran, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Roy, Dr. Saradish
Sen. Dr. Ramon
Sezhiyan, Shri
Sharma, Shri K. C.
Singhvi, Dr. L. M.
Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
Swell, Shri
Tan Singh, Shri
Vimla Devi, Shrimati
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Alva, Shri A. S.
Azad Shri Bhagwat Jha
Babunath Singh, Shri
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Barman, Shri P. C.
Baswant, Shri
Bagat, Shri B. R.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Chandak, Shri
Chandrabhan Singh, Shri
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Chaudhuri, Shri D. S.
Chaudhuri, Shri Sachindra
Chaudhuri, Shrimati Kamala
Chuni Lal, Shri
Daljit Singh Shri
Das, Shri B. K.
Das Shri Sudhanu
Das, Shri G.

Deo Bhanj, Shri P. C.
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
Dhaon, Shri
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Hazarnavis, Shri
Hanumanthaiya, Shri
Jadhav, Shri M. L.
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
Jamunadevi, Shrimati
Jedhe, Shri
Kajrolkar, Shri
Kamble, Shri
Kanungo, Shri
Kedaria, Shri C. M.
Khadilkar, Shri
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Kisan Veer, Shri
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Lakhan Das, Shri

Laskar, Shri
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Lonikar, Shri
Mahishi, Shrimati Sarojini
Mandal, Dr. P.
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
Mantri, Shri
Maruthiah Shri
Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
Minimata, Shrimati
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhudh
Mishra, Shri Bibudhendra
Mohanty, Shri G.
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri S. S.
Monzoni, Shri David
Murti, Shri M. S.
Muthia, Shri
Naik, Shri D. J.
Naik, Shri Maheswar
Niranjan Lal, Shri

Pande, Shri K. N.
 Pandey Shri Vishwa Nath
 Panna Lal, Shri
 Parasher, Shri
 Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
 Patel, Shri N. N.
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Patil, Suri D. S.
 Patil, Shri J. S.
 Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
 Pillai, Shri Nataraja
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval
 Pratap Singh, Shri
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Rai, Shrimati Sabodrabai
 Raj Bahadur Shri
 Rao, Shri Krishnamoorthy
 Rao, Shri Thirumala

Rattan Lal, Shri
 Rawandale, Shri
 Reddi, Dr. B. Gopala
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Seigal, Shri A. S.
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sanji Rupji, Shri
 Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
 Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
 Shah, Shri Manubhai
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Shinkre, Shri
 Shree Narayan Das, Shri
 Siddanajappa, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh Shri R. P.

Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarakeshwari
 Sonavane, Shri
 Srinivasan, Dr. P.
 Subbaraman, Shri C.
 Subramanyam, Shri T.
 Sumat Prasad, Shri
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Thomas, Shri A. M.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tiwary, Shri R. S.
 Tyagi, Shri
 Uikey, Shri
 Varma, Shri Ravindra
 Vijaya Ananda, Maharajkumar
 Wasnik, Shri Balkrishna
 Yadava, Shri B. P.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

The Lok Sabha divided.

Shri R. G. Dubey (Bijapur North):
 My machine has not worked.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): My
 vote has not been recorded.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: My vote has
 also not been recorded.

Shri K. C. Jena rose—

Mr. Speaker: He did not try.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandasaur):
 I could not push it.

Mr. Speaker: Those hon. Members
 whose votes have not been recorded
 may say so. I would take them into
 account if the result is going to be
 materially affected by them.

The result of the division is: Ayes
 37; Noes 118. The 'Noes' have it; the
 'Noes' have it.

The motion is not 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. Therefore, the
 motion is not adopted.

The motion was negatived.

GOVERNMENT SERVANTS (BAN
 ON SERVICE AFTER RETIREMENT)
 BILL, 1963 by Shri R. G. Dubey.

Shri R. G. Dubey (Bijapur North):
 I beg to move:

"That the Bill to enforce ban
 on employees of the Government
 of India from entering into ser-
 vice in private undertakings after
 their retirement be taken into
 consideration".

The object of my Bill is very sim-
 ple.....

Mr. Speaker: We will hear him
 next time.

16. 25 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
 OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORT-
 ANCE

REPORTED STATEMENT OF THE CHIEF
 MINISTER OF WEST BENGAL re: REHA-
 BILITATION OF DISPLACED PERSONS.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I
 call the attention of the Minister of
 Works, Housing and Rehabilitation to
 the following matter of urgent pub-
 lic importance, and request that he
 may make a statement thereon:

The reported statement of the
 Chief Minister of West Bengal in