

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

GOVERNMENT OF PART C STATES
(AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with further consideration of the Bill to amend the Government of Part C States Act, 1951. The consideration stage is over. Clause by clause consideration will be taken up now.

Clause 2.— (Amendment of section 17.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members who have tabled amendments, if they are intent upon pressing them, may stand up.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Sir, I propose an amendment to clause 2— amendment No. 1†.

I beg to move:

In page 1, line 19, for "President" substitute "Head of the State".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is the amendment opposed?

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): Yes, Sir.

Shri S. S. More: In this clause 2, there is a further sub-clause:

"If any question arises as to whether a member of the Legislative Assembly of a State has become disqualified for being such a member under the provisions of sub-section(1), the question shall be referred for the decision of the President and his decision shall be final."

As far as this particular sub-clause is concerned, Sir, I propose that for the word "President", the words "Head of the State" should be substituted.

Sir, this clause is taken practically word for word, from article 103. In the case of Part A and Part B States, if any question regarding the disqualification of any member arises, under the Constitution it has to be referred to the President, under article 103. Under the next sub-clause, he has to obtain the opinion of the

Election Commission and that opinion is binding on the President.

"Before giving any decision on any such question, the President shall obtain the opinion of the Election Commission and shall act according to such opinion."

Sir, to put it in a straightforward manner, whatever opinion is given by the Election Commissioner is binding on the President and he has to decide the matter in the light of that opinion.

There is another provision, article 192. Under that article, whenever there is any such question about the disqualification incurred by any member belonging to the State Assembly, that question has to be referred to the Governor. I will read article 192.

"(1) If any question arises as to whether a member of a House of the Legislature of a State has become subject to any of the disqualifications mentioned in clause (1) of article 191, the question shall be referred for the decision of the Governor and his decision shall be final."

Then, the next clause reads:

"Before giving any decision on any such question, the Governor shall obtain the opinion of the Election Commission and shall act according to such opinion."

Articles 103 and 192 are identical in words, except the difference that in the case of article 103, in the case of the House of the People or the Council of States, the question has to be referred to the President and, in the case of a State Legislature, the question has to be referred to the Governor.

In the present Bill which is under consideration, the question of the disqualification of a member of a Part C State may arise and that question will have to be referred to some authority for getting an authoritative decision. I fail to understand why the President should be bothered with all these matters. Part C States do not stand in any superior position to Part A and Part B States. If, in the case of Part A

[Shri S. S. More]

States, the Governor can accept the reference and then refer it to the Election Commission,—and, as a matter of fact, you will notice that it is the opinion of the Election Commission which is to be sought and is binding—why in the case of Part C States, should it be the President? So, I propose that the Head of the State, whoever it may be, the Chief Commissioner or the Lieutenant-Governor should be the person to be referred to. Under the next clause he will have to refer the matter to the Election Commission and the Election Commission's opinion is binding on him. As a matter of fact, the President under article 103 or a Governor under article 192, acts more or less like a post office. They accept the references, refer the matter to the Election Commissioner and the Election Commissioner gives his own verdict, and that verdict is going to be binding on the President or the Governor, as the case may be. My contention is why should we bring in the President in this particular clause? Let us leave the business of transmitting certain references to the Election Commission to the Chief Commissioner, who may be in charge of the State affairs, or to the Lieutenant-Governor, whatever his designation may be. This is the purpose of my amendment. I think we should not too much use the word 'President' here as he is supposed to be the highest authority in the Republic. Therefore, my amendment will serve the purpose. Some reference has to be transmitted to the Election Commission and the Chief Commissioner can be relied on for transmitting it to the proper authority and seek a verdict.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is 'Head of the State' defined anywhere?

Shri S. S. More: No, Sir. The word 'State' has been used in two contexts. The federating union has been called 'State' and the whole of India—the Republic—on certain occasions is called 'State', but as far as the Constitution is concerned, the word 'State' is utilised for indicating the federat-

ing units and not the whole of the Republic of India, though ordinarily in the constitutional phraseology. 'State' may mean the whole of the Republic of Bharat.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is only with reference to Fundamental Rights that it has been defined in article 12—

"In this Part, unless the context otherwise requires, "the State" includes the Government and Parliament of India and the Government and the Legislature of each of the States...."

I only wanted to know whether the phrase 'Head of the State' has been defined anywhere.

Shri S. S. More: I am amenable to the suggestion, if it is made, that Government suitably accepts my point; I am not very particular of my phraseology. My only concern is that the President should not be brought in this context, particularly when the decision of the Election Commissioner is supposed to be binding on him. There is no special fascination for that sort of thing here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You do not want the President, but the local Governor?

Shri S. S. More: Because the next clause does seem, according to my conception of the responsibilities of the President, to suggest that he is going to be controlled by the decision of the Election Commission.

Dr. Katju: I fear that this amendment has been made under a misconception. The House is aware that under article 239 of the Constitution, every Part C State is administered by the President through a Chief Commissioner, or a Lieutenant-Governor, or a Governor of a neighbouring State. The Chief Commissioner cannot be called the Head of the State at all. There is a vital difference between the Chief Commissioner of a Part C State and the Governor or Raj Pramukh of a Part A or Part B State. Secondly, with regard to the structure of the Part C States, under section 36 of the Part C States Act, the Chief

Commissioner is appointed by the President, and whenever there is any executive act on which the Chief Commissioner is unable to agree with his Council of Ministers, then the views of the Council of Ministers do not prevail and the matter has to be referred to the President for his direction and decision. Under Section 37 of the Part C States Act, the Ministers are appointed by the President. The Chief Minister is appointed by the President and the other Ministers are appointed by the President on the advice of the Chief Minister. Therefore, as a matter of consequence, we cannot leave the President out of the picture at all. We have, therefore, to bring in this section in strict accord with article 103, because the President is the administrator of the State. So far as the question of disqualification of members and decision thereon are concerned, the President has to act on the advice of the Election Commission and the formal order must be given by the President, because he is the Head of the State and not the Chief Commissioner. That is my answer to this.

Shri S. S. More: I do understand that the President is the *de facto* Head, acting through some of his executive officers. But as far as this matter is concerned, can we not entrust this function to some of his executive officers? We are not here modifying or amending the Constitution. All that we are doing is enacting a measure in which we can deviate from the Constitution without any harm. That is my submission.

Dr. Katju: I have nothing more to say, Sir, except to draw the attention of the hon. Member to Section 26 of the Part C States Act under which no Act passed by the Legislative Assembly of a Part C State can be given assent to by the Chief Commissioner. It is only the President who can give assent to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it necessary to press this?

Shri S. S. More: No, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4.— (Amendment of section 22)

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I beg to move:

In page 2, line 17, omit "before the 1st day of April, 1952".

Sir, as I pointed out in the course of my speech during the consideration stage these words take away some of the plenary powers of the Part C States. The Statement of Objects and Reasons says:

"In addition, representations have been made that the Act does not enable the State Legislative Assemblies to amend laws made for the States by Parliament prior to 1st April, 1952 in regard to subjects included in the 'State List'."

Now, I find that there is no reference to any State List so far as this matter is concerned. On a plain reading of this amendment it appears that it refers to matters both in the State List as well as in the Concurrent List. Article 254(2) of the Constitution which applies to Parts A and B States reads as follows:

"Where a law made by the Legislature of a State specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule with respect to one of the matters enumerated in the Concurrent List contains any provision repugnant to the provisions of an earlier law made by Parliament or an existing law with respect to that matter, then, the law made by the Legislature of such State shall, if it has been reserved for the consideration of the President and has received his assent, prevail in that State:

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

Provided that nothing in this clause shall prevent Parliament from enacting at any time any law with respect to the same matter including a law adding to, amending, varying or repealing the law so made by the Legislature of the State."

Of course, we are not concerned with the proviso.

So far as Part A and Part B States are concerned their powers extend even to laws which have been enacted after the 1st April 1952. Now, the hon. Mover of the Bill has made an attempt in this Bill to bring Part C States in line with Parts A and B States, which in itself is a laudable object. But I do not understand why from this point of view this restriction should be placed upon Part C States. When we are out to say that there should be no difference between them, I fail to see why powers can be given in regard to Acts which are made before 1st April 1952 but powers are not given in regard to Acts which are made by Parliament after 1952. As regards Parts A and B States they have got these powers; and there is no reason why these powers should not be given to Part C States in regard to legislation after 1st April 1952. As regards the question of Bills being reserved for assent by the President, I would beg the hon. Mover of this Bill to kindly see Section 26 wherein this provision is already there that in Part C States all the Bills are assented to by the President and are reserved for assent by the President. There is provision under article 254 (2) that the Bills must be reserved for the assent of the President. This requirement is, I should say, fully complied with by the present provision. There is no point whatsoever in keeping and sticking to this date. I am at one with the Mover of the Bill that this provision is very good and in fact the powers of the Part C States have been extended and have become more ample than before. But I do not see why this exception should be made and a differentiation should be made

between Acts which were passed before 1st April 1952 and Acts which were passed subsequent to that date. In my humble opinion, both stand on the same footing. Similarly, States in Parts A, B and C should be on the same footing in regard to such powers. That is my humble suggestion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment moved:

In page 2, line 17, omit "before the 1st day of April, 1952".

Shri S. S. More: Sir, I want to say that my views are diametrically opposite to what has been said by my friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. I would rather refer to article 251. Under certain circumstances, Parliament had been given power to legislate effectively in the case of subjects which are in the State List under articles 249 and 250. Under the present amendment certain Acts were passed by the Provisional Parliament before the 1st day of April 1952 because this House was not constituted and summoned. The Provisional Parliament was there and under Order No. 2 (Removal of Difficulties) passed by the President the Constitution was amended to make it applicable to the Provinces on 26th January, 1950 till both the Houses came into existence, duly constituted and summoned. For this interval, the Provisional Parliament was the sovereign Parliament as far as this country was concerned. If that was the sovereign Parliament and if in that capacity it has legislated even for Part C States, it was perfectly within its power in passing this legislation. Now, the power which is being sought to be given to the Part C States, to me at least appears to be a dangerous precedent. Supposing certain provisions are not acceptable to Part C States' legislatures which have come into existence, supposing they find certain difficulties regarding certain provisions, the course, which appears to me to be proper, is not to give them power to amend the legislation passed by the

sovereign Parliament because that will be wrong in principle. Let them make a recommendation to this House and let us go in a more practical manner; let us say that all the legislation that we have passed, we repeal by our own action and as regards those provisions which are acceptable to the Part C States legislatures, let them incorporate these provisions in their own incorporating Acts, if they incorporated this provision in their own Acts, then they have every power to amend these Acts and we have nothing to say but to say that a State legislature shall be competent to amend a piece of legislation which has been passed by the sovereign Parliament is something strange as far as my knowledge about Constitution is concerned.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: There is nothing strange about it. Article 254 is clear....

Shri S. S. More: My friend will allow me to develop my point. In respect of certain provisions in the Constitution it is a question of principle. Suppose a claim is made in the case of Part C States. Should we allow or encourage this sort of practice, even supposing for the sake of argument that it has constitutional sanction—should we encourage the practice? What will happen to us? We might have passed certain legislation, and the State will be nibbling at it. A time will come when the legislation will disappear completely and yet we shall not be knowing what has happened to that piece of legislation.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Why not? All these Bills must be reserved for the assent of the President. That is provided in article 254 (2). That is the safeguard.

Shri S. S. More: But what happens to this House itself?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Nothing happens. We have enacted article 254 and we have enacted that so far as State List and Concurrent List are concerned, even Part A and Part B States can make a law today which is repugnant to the law that we have made. But that Bill will be reserved for the assent of the President. They are also competent legislatures. They are in charge of State List as well as Concurrent List. It is only as regards the Concurrent List that the question arises. So far as the State List is concerned they are the proper and exclusive legislatures. And the safeguard has been enacted in article 254, for subjects in the Concurrent List.

Now, the only point of difference is that while the Mover of the Bill is agreeable to give all the powers to Part C States, he wants to reserve such Acts as were passed after 1st April, 1952, which are according to him taboo for the other legislature to touch. My submission is this, that if we are going to give the powers to Part A and Part B States, then Part C States should also be given the same powers. What is the difficulty?

Shri S. S. More: Sir, I would draw your attention to articles 251 and 252. I will give you the gist of them. If certain things are repugnant to....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If Parliament was entitled to pass certain laws affecting Part C States before the legislature was constituted in respect of a Part C State, is it now open, when once a legislature has been constituted in the Part C State, for this Parliament to legislate? If the Part C State Legislature passes a law it has to receive the assent of the President. Under these circumstances, with reference to the State List, is it open to Parliament to modify any law passed by it? Or, now that the legislature has come into being in Part C States, has not that legislature got exclusive jurisdiction to legislate in respect of matters pertaining to the State List, provided that

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

there is nothing inconsistent? And the President is there. Whether consistent or inconsistent, does not Parliament lose jurisdiction over that?

Shri S. S. More: After the legislature for the State has come into existence, this House, will have no power to legislate in respect of those matters.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then how will it legislate?

Shri S. S. More: But it can repeal, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is also legislation.

Shri S. S. More: I take this view, that we become sort of *functus officio* the moment the State Legislature has come into existence which shall take complete charge of matters under the State List. But it should be left to us to repeal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Repeal is also enacting.

Shri S. S. More: I beg to differ from you, Sir. I will only say that it is best to scrap the Acts which we have passed, leaving the ground clear for the State Legislature to proceed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even after we have lost jurisdiction?

Shri S. S. More: I do not think we completely lose jurisdiction, because there are certain clauses under which we do get jurisdiction for State subjects.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): I only want to say that the point raised by Mr. More does not arise if you only see Section 22 of the old Act. It provides that in all cases where any legislation passed by Parliament is inconsistent with any legislation that may be passed or has been passed by the State, it is the Parliamentary legislation that does prevail. Therefore, there is no inconsistency at all. As you were

afraid that there may be an inconsistency that might arise, I may say that it is already provided.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Where? In article 22?

Shri Raghavachari: Section 22 of Part C States Act reads:

"If any provision of a Law made by the Legislative Assembly of a State is repugnant to any provision of a law made by Parliament, then the law made by Parliament, whether passed before or after the law made by the Legislative Assembly of the State, shall prevail and the law made by the Legislative Assembly of the State shall, to the extent of the repugnancy, be void."

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: We are only concerned with the explanation, and not with the section.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are concerned with section 22. That sub-clause has already provided for all these contingencies.

Dr. Katju: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, with all respect to my hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, it is really a very trivial matter—I may put it that way. The clause has been put in this Bill at the instance of some Ministries of some of the Part C States on the ground that the Constitution came into force on the 26th of January 1950. The Part C States Act came into force from the 1st April 1952. In between, the President was administering these Part C States and whatever legislation had to be promoted was enacted by this Parliament and the Parliament was enacting legislation in respect of all the three Lists—the State List, the Concurrent List and the Union List. These Ministries said, we find that there are some pieces of legislation passed by Parliament in the intervening period, from the 26th January 1950 up to 1st April 1952, which fall exclusively either in the State List or in the Concurrent List;

we are here on the spot and would like to promote legislation in our own States in relation to these matters. So, the matter has been put in this way: 'after the 1st April 1952'. The matter stands on the same basis with regard to other States, Part A States, Part B States and Part C States. We had to put in this date so that that period may be provided for. As regards the rest, well, that is a matter governed by the Constitution. I therefore respectfully suggest that my hon. friend Mr. Bhargava will let it remain as it is, because, in so far as the State List is concerned, Parliament has had no jurisdiction to pass any legislation after the 1st April 1952. In so far as the Concurrent List is concerned, the power rests with the President, the Parliament, and also the State Legislature to do it and if the legislation in the Concurrent List is to be changed, then it is desirable that the Parliament only should be able to change it, the President being really the Administrative Head of the Part C States. I therefore respectfully submit that the Bill should be left as it is.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, line 17, omit "before the 1st day of April, 1952".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 6.— (Insertion of new section 33A).

Shri N. L. Joshi (Indore): I beg to move:

In page 2, line 39, for "English" substitute "Hindi".

In page 2, line 41, for "English" substitute "Hindi".

In page 2—

(i) line 45, for "English language" substitute "Hindi and English languages" and

(ii) line 48, for "the English language" substitute "the Hindi and English languages".

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरा निवेदन है कि जो बात माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने, जब इस विधेयक पर विचार हो रहा था, हिन्दी के सम्बन्ध में बतलाई थी, उस पर पूरी तरह से विचार करने पर मैं इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा हूँ कि बहुत अच्छा होता यदि माननीय गृह मंत्री जी धारा ३३ को धारा ३३ए कह कर दुरुस्ती के लिये इस सभा भवन में प्रस्तुत न करते। उसका मूल कारण यह है कि जो सन् १९५१ का गवर्नमेंट आफ पार्ट सी स्टेट्स ऐक्ट है उसकी धारा ३३ (१) में यह कहा गया है कि :

"Notwithstanding anything in Part XVII of the Constitution but subject to the provisions of article 348, business in the Legislative Assembly of a State shall be transacted in the official language or languages of the State or in Hindi or in English."

मेरा निवेदन यह है कि इस धारा ३३ में यह स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि :

"But subject to the provisions of article 348".

संविधान के अनुच्छेद ३४८ में जो कुछ कहा गया है उस के अनुसार पार्ट सी स्टेट्स में काम चलेगा। तो यदि पार्ट सी स्टेट्स में संविधान की धारा ३४८ के अनुसार काम चलने वाला है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है इस बात की कि धारा ३३ए सुधार के लिये इस सभा भवन में प्रस्तुत की जाय क्योंकि जो धारा इस सभा भवन के समझ प्रस्तुत की गई है संशोधन के लिए, उसमें हूबहू वही बातें कही गई हैं जो कि संविधान की धारा ३४८ (१) और ३४८ (३) में

[श्री एन० एल० जोशी]

कही गई हैं। या यों कहा जाय कि जो बातें संशोधन के लिए रखी गई हैं वह ठीक वही हैं जो कि धारा ३४८ (१) और (३) में संविधान में हैं। तो जब कि पार्ट सी स्टेट्स ऐक्ट की धारा ३३ में यह स्पष्ट रूप से लिखा है कि :

"Subject to the provisions of article 348 of the Constitution".

तो फिर क्या आवश्यकता है कि इस तरह की धारा संशोधन के लिए इस सभा भवन के सामने प्रस्तुत की जाय। और क्योंकि इसकी आवश्यकता नहीं है, इसलिये मेरा तो नम्र निवेदन यह है कि बजाय इसके कि इस धारा को जैसा है वैसा ही रखा जाय, यह बहुत अच्छा हो कि यह सभा भवन इस बात पर विचार करे कि इस धारा को पार्ट सी स्टेट्स के लिये संशोधित रूप में क्यों न रखा जाय। जितनी भी पार्ट सी० स्टेट्स हैं उन में से एक आध को छोड़ कर बाकी सब राज्यों में हिन्दी ही प्रचलित है और वहां अधिकांश लोग ही नहीं बल्कि ९९ प्रति शत लोग हिन्दी को पूरी तौर से समझते हैं। अतः हिन्दी में ही वहां विधान बनाए जाने चाहियें। क्योंकि संविधान की धारा ३४८ में यह स्पष्ट कहा गया है कि

"Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing provisions of this Part I, until Parliament by law otherwise provides."

तो इस सभा भवन को यह पूरा अधिकार कि वह यह कायदा बनाये कि पार्ट सी० स्टेट्स में जो भी विधान बनेंगे या विधेयक प्रस्तुत होंगे वे हिन्दी में प्रस्तुत होंगे और हिन्दी में ही स्वीकृत किये जायेंगे। तो इस तरफ १ कुछ विचार किया जा सकता है, बजाये इसके कि जो संविधान हिन्दी में करने को कहा गया है उसको अंग्रेजी में करने को कहा जाय। इसकी तो मुझे कोई आवश्यकता प्रतीत नहीं होती कि अभी जो कुछ मौजूदा विधान में है उसको दोबारा कहा जाय। इसके बजाय

इस बात की आवश्यकता महसूस की जाय कि वहां के सारे विधेयक हिन्दी में ही बनें और उनको हिन्दी में ही स्वीकार किया जाय। अतः उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो मेरा संशोधन इस धारा में है वह यह है कि बजाय इसके कि जैसा कि अभी संविधान में है वहां के विधेयक अंग्रेजी में बनें, होना यह चाहिये कि वह हिन्दी में प्रस्तुत किये जायें और हिन्दी ही में स्वीकार हों। हां यदि विधेयक वहां की प्रादेशिक भाषा में बनते हैं तो उनका अनुवाद हिन्दी में किया जाय और अंग्रेजी में भी किया जाय। इस तरह का मेरा संशोधन है। मेरा नम्र निवेदन है कि इस संशोधन को माननीय गृह मंत्री जी स्वीकार करें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments moved:

In page 2, line 39, for "English" substitute "Hindi".

In page 2, line 41, for "English" substitute "Hindi".

In page 2—

(i) line 45 for "English language" substitute "Hindi and English languages"; and.

(ii) line 48 for "the English language" substitute "the Hindi and English languages".

Dr. Katju: May I respectfully say that my hon. friend has not seemingly read section 33 of the Act and clause 33 A in the Bill together. As I understand the Part C States Act, section 33 allowed proceedings in the Legislature to be conducted in English or Hindi or the regional language—only the business. It said quite clearly: "but subject to the provisions of article 348 of the Constitution". Therefore, the result, as we were advised, was that under article 348, the language of the Bills must be in English. You may discuss the matter in the regional language, or Hindi. Then we were advised that article 348 of the Constitution as it stands which at the very opening

(Amendment) Bill

says that Bills must be in the English language and Acts must be passed in the English language....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I understand the amendment to be this: "...until Parliament by law otherwise provides...." The hon. Member wants this Parliament now through the agency of the hon. Home Minister to provide Hindi in place of English.

Dr. Katju: I am not prepared to do that for the Part C States. We should make this article 348 apply to everybody. I want to put the Part C States together on the same level as the Parts A and B States. If you introduce a Bill in Hindi or a regional language like Coorgi, then it is open to you to do so. You may pass it in the regional language, but you must have an authoritative translation of it in the English language. That is the gist of it, and I submit that what is good for the Parts A and B States should be good enough for the Part C States.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, line 39 for "English" substitute "Hindi".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, line 41 for "English" substitute "Hindi".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2—

(i) line 45 for "English language" substitute "Hindi and English languages"; and

(ii) line 48 for "the English language" substitute "the Hindi and English languages".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

4 P.M.

Clause 8.—(Insertion of new sections 39A and 39B).

Amendment made:

In page 3, lines 22 and 23, for "such sum as the President may, by order, determine", substitute "such sums as may, from time to time, be determined by law made by the Legislative Assembly of the State;"

—[Dr. Katju]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 8, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 8, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In clause 1, "1953" has to be modified into "1954". I think it will be corrected by the draftsman.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

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

Dr. Katju: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.