

memorandum has been submitted. But the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh had written a letter to the Prime Minister.

(b) to (d). The main points are (i) additional Central assistance for the State Plan in 1966-67 (ii) assistance towards drought relief expenditure. It has been decided that, while no additional Plan assistance is possible, the question of further assistance for drought relief will be considered early in the next financial year.

Power Supply to Delhi from Punjab

2376. Shri Rameshwar Tanti: Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Punjab Government have recently been approached to release more power to Delhi; and

(b) if so, the reaction of the Punjab Government thereto?

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Fakhruddin Ahmed): (a) Yes. Punjab Government were approached by DESU on 25th February, 1966 for release of more power to Delhi.

(b) The Punjab Government have agreed that if the supply is restricted on average to 20 MW in the months of February and March, 1966, more power will be made available to Delhi during the months of April, May and June, 1966.

Master Plan for Supply of Drinking Water

2377. Dr. L. M. Singhi: Will the Minister of Health and Family Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether a master plan to make drinking water available to all the citizens has been formulated and adopted; and

(b) if so, when would this basic necessity be satisfied throughout the country?

The Minister of Health and Family Planning (Dr. Sushila Nayar): (a) and (b). No such Master Plan has been prepared.

12.09 hrs.

RE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: On the 16th March, 1966, Shri Ram Sewak Yadav sought to raise in the House a question of privilege regarding the alleged obstruction of the taxi of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, Member of Parliament, outside Gate No. 1, Parliament House, New Delhi when he was going from the Parliament House, to give passage to the Prime Minister's car.

I have made enquiries into the matter and have been told by the Watch and Ward Officer, Lok Sabha, that the Constable on duty while regulating traffic in the normal course had to give a stop signal to the taxi of Dr. Lohia as he had already given pass signal to the traffic coming from the other side. The driver of Dr. Lohia's taxi stopped the taxi. Dr. Lohia came out of the taxi towards the constable on duty and in the meantime the Prime Minister's car coming from the other side (Gate No. 5, Parliament House) passed by. There was thus no intention on the part of the police constable on duty to obstruct the hon. Member's taxi from proceeding in the normal course. All that had to be done to avoid any accident and regulate free flow of traffic. There is, therefore, no question of privilege involved.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):
यह बिलकुल झूठ है अध्यक्ष महोदय ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी):
घाप मुझे कुछ निवेदन कर लेने दोज़िये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: यह बिलकुल झूठ है । दोनों टेक्सियाँ एक ही दिशा में जा रही थीं । उनके विपरीत दिशा से आने का कोई सवाल नहीं उठता । दोनों एक ही दिशा में जा रही थीं । इतना बड़ा

झूठ बोल कर के प्रधान मंत्री बच जाना चाहती हैं। इसलिए अब आप मुझे बताने दीजिये कि वस्तुस्थिति क्या है। झूठ बोल कर के विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न टाला नहीं जा सकता। बात यह थी कि जब मैं अपनी टैक्सो में बैठ कर के जाने लगा और टैक्सो आगे बढ़ गई तब उस के बाद पुलिस वालों ने उस टैक्सो को रोका क्योंकि—मैंने पुलिस वाले से पूछा, इसलिए कि प्रधान मंत्री साहब उसके आगे वाले फाटक से निकल कर के अपनी गाड़ी में उसी दिशा में आगे जा रही थी, दोनों एक ही दिशा में। अब यहां मवाल यह उठता है कि सड़क के इस्तेमाल के बारे में खास तौर से इस सदन की सड़क के इस्तेमाल के बारे में अगर सदस्यों में आपस में भेद किया जायगा कि कोई सदस्य ज्यादा इस्तेमाल कर सकता है, कोई कम इस्तेमाल कर सकता है, तो वह कानून के खिलाफ होगा और दूसरे यहां सार्वभौम मत्ता का भी सवाल उठता है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . . देखो अगर इस तरह के चिल्लाने रहोगे . . . (व्यवधान) . . . अब आप मुझे बतलाइए . . . (व्यवधान) . . . इसलिए मैं चुप रहता हूँ जब तक यह नहीं चुप हो जाने।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let him have his say.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): It is our painful experience that whenever a member of the Government passes, his car is given precedence over other cars and traffic is stopped.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं आप को सबसे पहले संविधान की धारा 14 और 15 सुना देता हूँ और आप इनको चुप होने के लिए कहिए तब मैं बोलूंगा। . . . (व्यवधान) अब यह झंड तो चुप रहेगा न ? संविधान की धारा 14 और 15—धारा 14 में है :

“The State shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India.”

यह तो पहली बात है और दूसरी बात है कि

“No citizen shall, on grounds . . . be subject to any disability, liability, restriction or condition . . .”

वगैरह, वगैरह। मैं खास तौर से रेस्ट्रिक्शन शब्द के ऊपर आपका ध्यान खींच रहा हूँ, काहे के लिए रेस्ट्रिक्शन ? restriction . . .

“..... with regard to

(a) access to shops, public restaurants, hotels and places of public entertainment; or

(b) the use of wells, tanks, bathing ghats, roads and places of public resort”

रोड्स में खास तौर से कहा गया है। तो सड़क के इस्तेमाल के बारे में . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please read sub-clauses (3) and (4) also.

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia: I will read them.

“Nothing in this article shall prevent the State from making any special provision for women and children.”

(व्यवधान)

अब मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी बच्चा तो नहीं बनना चाहेंगी और इस मामले में वह औरत भी नहीं बनना चाहेंगी। वह यहां पर संसद की एक सदस्य हैं और इसके भलाबा कुछ नहीं हैं। (व्यवधान) औरत या बच्चा बन कर यह विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न नहीं टाल सकती। (व्यवधान) इसी तरह पिछड़े वर्ग की भी वह नहीं बनना चाहेंगी। अब सवाल यह उठता है कि एक ठो सड़क के ऊपर आने जाने के जो भी समान नियम होने चाहिए उनका उल्लंघन

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

दुआ और दूसरी बात अगर संसद में भारत की सार्वभौम सत्ता का प्रकाश होता है तो संसद के इतने सदस्य हैं, कम से कम संसद के भवन के अन्दर उस सार्वभौमिकता में किसी तरह का अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह घटना दुनिया के किसी और स्वतंत्र और जनतंत्र देश में हो नहीं सकती और यदि होती, बैसे तो खैर असम्भव है, लेकिन अगर हो जाती तो प्रधान मंत्री का पहला काम होता कि सदन में आकर के माफी मांगते और तीसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह कि यहाँ पर जितने भी पुलिस अफसर हैं . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : खत्म हो गया ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अभी कहाँ (ब्यबधान) . . . अरे हंसो फिर उसके बाद जब भीड़ तुम्हारे गले घोटगी तब मेरे ही पास आओगे (ब्यबधान) . . . आज यह हालत हो रही है। आज इस तरह से चिल्ला रहे हो और जब भीड़ आकर के गले घोटना शुरू करेगी तब पता चलेगा और जब भारी भ्रान्तवानेत पकड़ी जायगी तब पता चलेगा। . . . (ब्यबधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : ग्रांडर, ग्रांडर।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब आप सुनिये। पुलिस के जो कांस्टेबल हैं या अफसर हैं या सरकार के जितने नौकर हैं उनको एक बात सिखा दी गई है कि जो कोई उनका बड़ा अफसर हुक्म देता है उनका कर्तव्य है, यह ड्यूटी शब्द अंग्रेज लोग छोड़ गये हैं बड़ा ही घातक और पापी शब्द है, उनकी ड्यूटी है यह कहा करते हैं कि इस हुक्म का पालन करना हमारा कर्तव्य है, चाहे अपने बाग को मार डालना पड़े, चाहे अपनी माँ को, चाहे जो कोई भी, कुकर्म करना पड़े। इसलिए यह जरूरी हो जाता है कि जो भी सरकारी नौकर हैं उनको समझाया जाय कि जहाँ वह काम करने हैं वह असल में

सरकार हैं। मेरे लिए सदन के बाहर जो पुलिस वाला खड़ा हो कर के रास्ता बताता है वह सरकार का सबसे बड़ा अफसर है, उसके मुँह से जब मैं यह सुनता हूँ कि मैं अपना कर्तव्य कर रहा हूँ और कर्तव्य करना, बड़े अफसरों का हुक्म मानना है क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री के जाने के लिए रास्ता साफ कर दिया गया, इसलिए मेरा कहना यह है कि जितने सरकारी नौकर हैं चाहे छोटे से छोटे नौकर जो हैं वह भी सरकार हैं और सरकार के प्रतीक हैं और मंत्रियों से बड़े हैं उस जगह पर। यह शब्द मैं अपनी ड्यूटी कर रहा हूँ यह बिल्कुल छूट जाना चाहिए। जो उनको हुक्म दिया जाता है उन्हें भी उसके बारे में कुछ सोच विचार करना चाहिए। इसलिए इन तीन कारणों से एक तो ट्रैफिक यानी आवागमन के नियम के बारे में कोई भी भेद नहीं होना चाहिए, दूसरे, सदन और लोक सभा की सार्वभौमिक सत्ता के बारे में सदस्यों में आपस में विभेद नहीं करना चाहिए और तीसरे, सरकारी नौकरों को जो भी कोई काम किया करें, उसके बारे में सचेत रहना चाहिए और खाली यह कह कर कि बड़े अफसर ने हुक्म दिया है उसको नहीं टाल देना चाहिए। अच्छा होता कि प्रधान मंत्री स्वयं इस मामले की यहाँ सफाई कर देती।

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker it is not a trivial or a petty matter as it might appear to be, Some three years ago I had faced a similar experience and I happened to write it in our complaint book and also wrote to the then Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, about this. The most ill-mannered, offensive and unbalanced attitude that the police takes when ministerial cars happen to pass is an affront to our democracy and our democratic values. The late Prime Minister had the goodness to write to me expressing disapproval of this practice and had the goodness to express his regret to me.

I would submit also to you that this is done under specific instructions,

whether they are oral or written. Therefore, this is a matter which this House must take cognisance of. I have the greatest respect for the present Prime Minister and for all Prime Ministers. We must give precedence and respect, but the manner in which the police acts on sighting a ministerial car or the Prime Minister's car is really most improper and it gives the lie to the democratic values which we proclaim at the top of our voices. I think, it is a very serious matter.

I hope the Prime Minister herself would make the position clear. When we say this, we do not mean any disrespect to her by any stretch of imagination.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I agree with what Dr. Singhvi had just now said. We are all in favour of protecting the security and the status of our Ministers. It does not matter which particular person happens to be the Prime Minister or a Minister. We have to see that their security, the security of person and possession, is properly safeguarded. Therefore, let there be special steps taken by the special police who go by their patrol cars and so on. But why should the other cars be specially directed not to ply this way or that way for one or two minutes only in order to provide direct access to and fro, to the cars of these Ministers? That is a thing which is not satisfactory and which is unnecessary. Specially, in the precincts of Parliament, the other Members also—after all the Ministers are also the Members of Parliament—move about in the performance of their duties. I do not see any reason why their passage, to and fro, should be obstructed only in order to provide direct access, without any intervention at all, without even a seconds delay, for the cars of the Ministers and even of the Prime Minister.

I would like to make an appeal to the present Prime Minister that it would be graceful for her to disavow

any such necessity and to say that, apart from security, no other special consideration would be needed by her or by any other Minister.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): It is a good thing that this matter has come up . . . (*Interruption*).

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar): How long will this discussion go on?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is a good thing that this matter has come up and, I think, the Chair perhaps can take some steps in regard to this matter. We are all conscious that certain people in the country require security. But there is no reason why certain practices which were quite appropriate in the old days should continue. It is very important that in the precincts of Parliament, Members of Parliament are also treated with a certain amount of consideration which is due not to them personally but because they move about for the performance of their duty. The security police or whoever the other people are concerned are often seen to be rather discourteous in their attitude towards Members of Parliament while they have a deference for Ministers and others. We have no animus against Ministers as such. On the contrary, we desire that they may have every opportunity of moving about smoothly. But the kind of security arrangement which is made in this country is redolent of the old memory of the imperialist days. In cities like Calcutta, for instance, traffic is stopped for two or three hours on end because some dignitary has to pass through one of the arterial routes of the city and in Delhi also, where Members of Parliament have to move about, there is some kind of impediment. This matter should be seriously considered by the Government, together with the Chair, so that some way out can be found.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur) Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir...

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Why have a long discussion?

Shri Karni Singhji (Bikaner): I would also like to say something, Sir.

Shri Sheo Narain (Bansi): Have we no right to say anything? Even during the Question Hour, they have got the right to put questions. Have we no right to say anything. (Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order; please sit down.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The point that has been raised by my friend Dr. Singhvi is the most important point for the purpose of coming to a proper conclusion regarding the mode of conduct towards Members of Parliament. It is not merely the question of a Minister passing through and having a precedence on account of, as my friend Mr. Ranga put it—we do realise that—security reasons. But it is not proper that a car of a Member may be stopped and the car of a Minister may be allowed to pass. We do not grumble against that. But what we do grumble against is the attitude of the police officers and the officials; in fact, I do not limit this only to the police officers; it is the attitude of every officer over whom the Home Ministry has got control; it is those officers who misbehave with the Members of Parliament from one place to another; this is the ordinary experience that we have. At least so far as the Union Ministers are concerned, I have got very great regard for the Ministers here and most of them have similarly responded to the regard that I have shown to them and they have shown equally good regard towards me. But I find that the regard shown in the States is a regard of hate and contempt, and they go on poking the small officers and the small SDO's, the ADM's and the small commissioners and the police officers and the SPs and sub-inspectors to insult Members; every opportunity is being taken by them for this purpose, even by the chowkidar. Very recently, there was one such instance when Shri Kapur Singh was pulled out while he

was getting into the Willingdon Hospital. It is this type of thing which requires to be looked into. Some specific instructions must be sent down by the Home Ministry to the officers concerned and they must be told that insult to Members of Parliament is an insult to the sovereign body of this country.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I agree with what Dr. L. M. Singhvi has said and it has been very cogently put by Acharya Kripalani also. Security must be ensured for the Prime Minister but that must not be carried to the extent of insulting Members of Parliament when they come here to the Parliament House to discharge their own duties. In many European countries the Prime Minister is seen to move in a bus or on a bicycle. Even Mr. Harold Wilson is seen to move in a tube train and all that. In spite of that, what do we find here?

Here, may I say one thing? My own experience is this. One day I was coming to the Parliament in a taxi. My taxi was stopped here by a policeman for no reason; I became so angry and I ran out of the car and I was about to throttle him, that is, that police officer.

Shri Karni Singhji: That would have created new problems.

Shri Hem Barua: I was on the point of doing it, because he had no business to stop the car. No Prime Minister and no Minister was moving that way; even if the Prime Minister or any Minister was moving that way, he had no business to stop it.

So, I would submit that you should instruct the policemen or ask the Home Minister to instruct the policemen not to interfere with the legitimate activities of Members of Parliament, and to tell them that Members of Parliament should not be stopped. Why should the traffic be stopped?

Shri Karni Singhji: I fully support what my hon. friend Dr. Ram Mano-

har Lohia has said, because I have had the same experience myself. I consider that in a free country it is highly undemocratic that the Members of Parliament and their vehicles or cars on their way to Parliament should be stopped. I wish to appeal to the Prime Minister that at least on her way to Parliament she should give up this red carpet treatment, because after all, we are all equals here.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Her father did it. He gave it up.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): May I submit that the question before the House was a very limited one, namely the question of privilege? You have said in reply to that that the traffic men there regulate the traffic when they see it, and they do so just to avoid any clash.

Three points have been urged here. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia has mentioned three points. The first is that road communication is a right for everybody and it should be left uninterrupted. The second is that there should be no discrimination between the Members of the House and the third is that the policemen on duty should be warned to be careful about their duties.

None of us would question the three cardinal principles that he has laid down in this House. We agree with him that road is for all. As regards the third point in regard to the policemen, I would submit that sometimes they stop me, and sometime they stop others, and they do so as not to allow any clash to be there at the traffic square. That is one important point that we should remember.

As regards the point that when Ministers go their cars are given precedence and the cars of others held up, I may be excused in saying that we are arrogating too much importance to ourselves, in the sense that every constable does not know all the Ministers and all the Members of Parliament so as to see that the Minister's car is allowed to pass and the Mem-

ber's stopped. I am sure if that poor constable who stopped Shri Hem Barua's taxi had known that it was Shri Hem Barua who was passing, he would certainly not have stopped him.

I would only say that the general traffic rules and Government's intention and interpretation of these should be taken into account. The red signals which are flashed do not permit a Minister to go forward in disregard of that. The traffic rules are meant to regulate traffic irrespective of the personality of the occupants of the passing cars. At a particular point at a particular time, a Minister's car may be stopped and at other times other cars may have to wait on seeing the red signal. So far as the traffic rules are concerned, they are intended only to avoid clashes. I think this view will be supported by all Members and by Government too.

On the specific issue raised, as you have said in your ruling.....

An hon. Member: There is no ruling given.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: All right.

You have already said that there is no privilege involved because the traffic policemen at the Parliament House gate regulate the traffic to avoid clash. Naturally when the Prime Minister's car goes first because there is a lot of traffic and some Member's car is stopped, there is no question of discrimination against the Parliament Members as such.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has Government anything to say?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): I did not hear the beginning of this discussion, unfortunately....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: (Kanpur): It is most unfortunate.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : प्रधान मंत्री जी की कार की वजह से डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया की कार को रोका गया।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें श्रीर सुनें।

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I have gathered as much.

As far as I am concerned, I am the least bothered about pomp, ceremony or any kind of special provisions as an individual. I do feel, however, that the position of the Prime Minister of India should be regarded as something special. It is not a question of one individual as Prime Minister; it applies to all Prime Ministers.

It is true that in some countries nothing special is done, but in the majority of countries, there are very special traffic regulations, escort, pilot, cars and so on.

Shri Hem Barua: Only in under-developed countries.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: No—I am sorry—even in the others.

Shri Hem Barua: No, no.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : संघेजों में अगर कोई प्रधान मंत्री ऐसा करे, तो दूसरे दिन प्रधान मंत्री न रह पाये।

An hon. Member: Not in Sweden.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: It is in America, because I have been there with some Presidents.....

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : छोड़ो। यह प्रेजिडेंट बनना चाहती है।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबई) : आप प्रधान मंत्री हैं। आप अमरीका की बात न कीजिये। आप इंग्लैंड की बात कीजिये, जहाँ प्रधान मंत्री होता है।

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: There is no President in U.K.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह राष्ट्रपति भी बनना चाहती है !

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: It is a question of deciding whether the Prime Minister should have a special status or not. My view is that the Prime Minister should have, specially because of various other conditions of traffic and so on in India.

But as far as the other point, about rudeness, is concerned, I am fully in agreement with the hon. Member that it should not be permitted, and every effort should be made to see that (a) there is no rudeness shown and (b) there is no inconvenience caused. I am sorry to hear that a Member had to wait for two hours; I had never heard of it before. If they have to wait, it should be the minimum possible wait.

One thing more. You might perhaps have heard that this rule of stopping the traffic for the Prime Minister's car to pass applies only when the car comes into view; the traffic is not stopped beforehand. And it does not apply to other Ministers. It is only for the Prime Minister.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: The only problem is that they are rude; the constables go hay-wire on sighting the Prime Minister's car.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक निवेदन सुन लीजिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. No, please sit down.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक मिनट में निवेदन कर देता हूँ। मैं ने विशेषाधिकार के उल्लंघन का नोटिस दिया था।

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रस्ताव माननीय सदस्य,

श्री यादव, के नाम से है। इस लिए आप
उनको बोलने दीजिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have heard the Members. I have heard Dr. Lohia. All the three principles enunciated by him are accepted. All Members of Parliament are equal. The roads are free in India, but the traffic police have got a duty to perform, they have to prevent accidents. The statement says that he had already given clear to the other side. The Prime Minister of India should be given some consideration. So, there is no question of privilege. I uphold my earlier decision.

श्री अशु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
उन सिद्धान्तों को मंत्री जी ने नहीं माना है।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
आप मेरी बात तो सुन लीजिये। माननीय सदस्य ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है, उस को चेंलेंज किया जा रहा है। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या आप एक माननीय सदस्य के बयान को स्वीकार करेंगे या नहीं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।
माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : आप मेरा निवेदन सुन लें। आप ने थोड़ा अन्याय किया है। आप के सामने माननीय सदस्य ने एक बयान दिया और ट्रैफिक पुलिस ने एक दूसरा बयान दिया। आप किस के बयान को स्वीकार करेंगे? इस लिए विशेषाधिकार कमेटी को सुपुर्द करने के लिए यह एक जबर्दस्त मामला बन जाता है। आप को यह फ़ैसला करना होगा कि माननीय सदस्य ग़लत बयानों कर रहे हैं या ट्रैफिक पुलिस का तरफ़ से ग़लत बयानों का गई है।

श्री किशन पटेलवाक्य : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,
इस तरह से यह अन्याय ख़त्म नहीं हो सकता है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more now. That point is over. Please sit down.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री का एक विशेष स्थान है। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि इस लोक सभा में इस सिद्धान्त को ठुकराया जाये, जलाया जाये और यह बात कहने वाले को भाँ ठुकराया जाये। यह लोक सभा है, जिसमें सब बराबर हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have disallowed it. Please sit down

12.38 hrs.

OPINION ON BILL

Shri A. S. Salgal (Janjgir): I beg to lay on the Table Paper No. 1 to the Bill to provide for the better administration of Sikh Gurdwaras situated in different States of Indian Union and for inquiries into matters connected therewith which was circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the direction of the House on the 3rd September, 1965.

12.38½ hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following Message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 15th March, 1966, agreed without any amendment to the Imports and Exports (Control) Amendment Bill, 1966, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th March, 1966."