

Mr. Chairman : Speaking is quite another matter and replying is a different matter.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Then I will speak.

Shri Abid Ali: He has already spoken.

Mr. Chairman: I will put the motion. The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923 be taken into consideration."

The motion was negatived.

INDIAN REGISTRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 ETC.)

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): Before I formally move my motion before this House, I would request you to allow me to give an introduction about the Bill. This Bill was introduced by me in 1948 in another form. You know the fate of such non-official Bills; it only came up this year. But as some legal difficulties were found out by the hon. Minister here, I withdrew the Bill and I have brought it here in a new form.

The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar): May I make one submission. This Bill has been put on the agenda in the form of a motion for circulation. You are aware that the same Bill was introduced some time back and it was discussed. Then, I also on behalf of the Government said that probably Government would not have any objection with respect to the amendment proposed in clause 2 of this Bill. So, if the hon. Member is prepared to make a motion that the Bill be taken into consideration I think that would be better. I will accept it. But clause 3 may be deleted. Clause 2 will serve the purpose for which this Bill is being brought.

Mr. Chairman: The first point is whether the hon. Member accepts the suggestion of the hon. Minister?

Shri S. C. Samanta: Sir, I am thankful to the hon. Minister for giving me this suggestion and I am ready to accept it.

Mr. Chairman: That means clause 3 of the Bill is omitted and the rest of the Bill stands.

Shri Pataskar: Also, in clause 2 the words "hereinafter referred to as the principal Act" may be omitted because that is not necessary.

Mr. Chairman: That is a matter of small amendment and that will be considered later on.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): Sir, I have to oppose the Bill.

Shri Pataskar: Let him make the motion first.

Mr. Chairman: So, let the motion be moved first. The Bill with the amendment as suggested by the hon. Minister may be moved for consideration.

Shri S. C. Samanta: I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Registration Act, 1908 be taken into consideration."

In the last session the hon. Minister gave me an assurance that he will elicit opinion from different States and I thought, if that is not done then I should have my Bill moved for eliciting public opinion. I am glad to know that the Government has already elicited opinion from different States and that the Government is not at all against this Bill. That is why I am moving this motion for taking the Bill into consideration except the last portion of the Bill as has been asked by the hon. Minister.

Sir, I do not like to take much time of the House on this because last time I have already put my views on the Bill. There is no denying the fact that the caste system which originated to make the society prosperous have come to such a pass that everybody in India spoke against it. It is not

[Shri S. C. Samanta]

that caste system is bad, but it was manipulated in such a way that Swami Vivekananda and Mahatma Gandhi who are the greatmen of the day spoke vehemently about this sin. They went so far as to say that unless we free ourselves of this sin there is no great future for India. So, all of us here and outside know the bad effects and we want to make amends for it. My only question is this. In the Registration Act there is a mention that unless the document for registration contains the name of the caste of the individual concerned then that should not be registered in India. Can this remain? It cannot. So, this is a very simple proposition. We have to go far and far. We are trying to redeem ourselves of the vices we have committed—the untouchability. We are progressing and why should there be any mention in any record of the Government of this sinful act? It should go at once; it should go.

Therefore, my proposition is a simple one which will not face any opposition from any quarters. I am glad the Government is also willing to accept it. So, I put my proposition before the House and I request my friends that in no time they should accept it and pass it.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): What is the advice that you give?

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Registration Act, 1908, be taken into consideration.”

Clause 3 of the Bill as it stands has been proposed to be omitted.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): What is the time allotted to this Bill, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: 1½ hours.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: If clause 3 is omitted then what is the effect of this Bill?

Mr. Chairman: The effect, so far as I understand, is that the name of the caste shall not be mentioned. Please go through it and if you have got anything to say you can do so.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: Sir, I wish to say a few words on this Bill. I very much appreciate the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member, Shri S. C. Samanta, but with regard to the actual administrative difficulties it has to be pointed out, to Shri Samanta especially, that in certain parts of this country unless the name of the caste is also noted in the document it is not possible to discern between two persons having the same name in the same village and, probably, having the same occupation also.

Shri L. N. Mishra (Darbhanga-cum-Bhagalpur): The father's name will be there.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: Might be, but a father might have two sons bearing the same name—I am not joking, I am seriously saying that. So, it is always safe to retain the existing provision in the Act.

Shri L. N. Mishra: No.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: Until we are in a position to completely dissolve the caste system and abrogate it by means of law it would not be advisable that this innovation should be thought of at this stage. Though the Government might think that it is all easy to do, in our part of the country—Southern India—this will lead to several practical difficulties and administrative difficulties too. This will also be taken advantage of by the officers if they are corrupt; naturally, a good deal has to be spent to see that the registration is made.

Therefore, in these circumstances I think that unless the matter is cleared up in a different manner altogether it is not advisable that at this stage this law should be enacted on the floor of this House.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): Mr. Chairman, I give my wholehearted support to the Bill moved for consideration by the hon. Member **Shri S. C. Samanta** and I oppose the contention of **Shri Ramachandra Reddi**. The Bill is very simple although very significant; because here, all that it seeks to do is to remove the necessity of mentioning the name of a particular caste or sub-caste so far as the names of persons contained in documents for registration are concerned. What was the necessity of having this mention of the names of castes? **Shri Ramachandra Reddi** said that without the mention of the caste or sub-caste, it may not be very easy to find out the person or identify the person. But I do not think that it is a valid reason. There can be no difficulty for anybody who wants to identify a person. It has already been said how the caste system is eating into the very vitals of our society and what harm it has caused to the society through so many centuries. So, this vestige of such ignominies should be removed as early as possible. The Bill is a simple one. All that we want to do is simply to do away with the mentioning of the caste and sub-caste in the names. Yet, in a way it is a very significant one. There will no longer be the necessity for mentioning the name of a caste to which a particular person or a particular person belongs. The Statement of Objects and Reasons says:

“While India is a secular State recording of castes and sub-castes of parties mentioned in a deed for registration in States is anomalous. This Bill is intended to remove that anomaly”.

So, the Bill has not come a day sooner. It should have come much earlier, just after the attainment of Independence. Then they might have reviewed their laws. But only recently we find that they have set up a Law Commission, and that has come after eight years. In our laws, there are so many things which are out-of-date and which are not in consonance with the new spirit in which we

want to move forward and which are not in consonance with the spirit of the articles of the Constitution.

It has been urged that the mere mention of the caste may not harm anybody and may not mean any insult, but then what is the necessity of retaining it? If the surnames of the people are mentioned and their addresses, etc., are given, then there is no difficulty at all in identifying the persons in the case of any difficulty arising out of the absence of the mention of caste.

The provision regarding the mention of caste in documents, etc., has come into the law simply because those people who had a dominating voice in society in earlier days always liked to have the names of their castes mentioned. They took pride in being called as the sons of Brahmins, the sons of Kayasthas and so on, and that they belonged to Brahmin families or Kayastha families and so forth. Caste came to be mentioned because of that sentiment. It is an unjustifiable sentiment. Because of that sense of false vanity, these things found their place in law. So, it is high time that we did away with all such things, and wherever this stigma attaches to any law or anything that we are doing, we must give it the go-by. So, I appreciate the attitude of the hon. Minister who has agreed to accept the Bill. With these few words, I give my wholehearted support to this Bill.

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): Before I make some observations on this Bill, I would like to know the exact effect of the proposed amendment that has been put forward. You will see that, as suggested by the hon. Minister of Legal Affairs and accepted by my friend **Shri S. C. Samanta**, clause 3 of the Bill, as it exists in this amending Bill, would be dropped.

Mr. Chairman: It will have to be negatived by the House.

Shri Dabhi: Yes; so, my point is that the Bill will lose its effect. Even if it is passed, the whole effect of

[Shri Dabhi]

this Bill would be lost. Now, if any man goes to the Sub-Registrar and does not give his caste, then his document would not be registered. But now, if this Bill is passed, the only effect would be that a person would not be required to give his caste if he does not want to give it. But if he does want to give his caste, then the Registrar is not bound to reject that document. If the man says that he belongs to a particular caste and that his caste may be mentioned in the document, I think the Sub Registrar would not have the power to refuse registration of that document. I think my hon. friend perhaps is jubilant over what has been accepted by the Government but the effect is practically not of much importance. We want to do away with caste from our society. We have adopted the ideal of a socialistic pattern of society, and there must not be any place for any caste or sub-caste. Our Prime Minister and all our political leaders consider casteism as one of the evils which should be uprooted.

Shri Pataskar: This Bill may not be accepted by the House.

Shri Dabhi: It may or may not be. We do not want our castes to be mentioned, but the effect of this Bill is not what has been desired by the Member. That was my point.

I would here give one instance. The Bombay High Court has gone further in this matter. It has issued a circular to all the courts that if anybody gives his caste-name, then the caste should not be written in the records while recording things in evidence. That is the proper step. Of course, I cannot oppose this Bill. Of course, it goes a little towards the removal of caste.

My hon. friend Shri Ramachandra Reddi was afraid about identification of the persons. I do not know what difficulty there will be in regard to identity. We give the person's address,

profession and several other details. So, there will be no difficulty in identity. His purpose is also served, because this Bill would not prevent anybody from giving his caste-name and having it recorded in the documents.

I am for removing the mention of caste from any Government record. For that purpose I brought in a Bill. Shri N. B. Chowdhury waxed eloquent over this Bill. But unfortunately, on that occasion, he and his party opposed my Bill.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: That was for a different purpose.

Shri Dabhi: Anyhow, I cannot oppose this Bill. But to my mind, it does not serve the purpose much.

4. 50 P.M.

श्री बास्मीकी (जिला बुलन्दशहर, रक्षित अनुसूचित जातियां) : मैं श्री सामन्त जी के इंडियन रजिस्ट्रेशन अमेंडमेंट बिल के पीछे जो भावना है उसका आदर करता हूँ। उन्होंने जातिगत भावना की और जाति पात के बन्धनों की बात कही। आज भी देश में इन जाति-पात के बन्धनों की जंजीरें बहुत कड़ी हैं। मैं यह जानता हूँ कि महर्षि दयानन्द सरस्वती, महात्मा गांधी, स्वामी विवेकानन्द जी, सन्त कबीर और नानक आदि के प्रयत्नों से ये बन्धन कुछ ढीले हुए हैं, लेकिन अभी भी ये बन्धन बहुत कड़े हैं। इसी विचारधारा को लिये हुए श्री दामो जी का भी एक बिल था, लेकिन उसका दूसरा रूप था। यह बिल जो इस समय सदन के सामने है यह भी एक छोटा सा बिल है और इसमें यह बात रखी गयी है कि सरकारी कागजात और डॉक्यूमेंट्स में जाति का नाम मशन न किया जाये। यह बात सुनने में अच्छी लगती है। लेकिन किसी बिल के द्वारा सरकारी कागजों में जाति का नाम घटाने या बढ़ाने से केवल एक कानूनी ढंग की कार्रवाई होती है और वह कोई बहुत बड़ी बात नहीं होती। आज

भी अगर हम देखें और ध्यान से देखें तो हम पायेंगे कि हमारी बुद्धि में, समाज में, हमारे समाज की अस्थियों में, मज्जा में और कण-कण में यह जाति-पात की भावना मौजूद है। हमारे बापू जी ने अपने प्रयत्नों से इस भावना को हटाने का प्रयत्न किया था और हमारे नेता भी जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने अपनी भोजमयी वाणी से इस जाति-पात पर कुठाराघात किया है और उसको तोड़ने का प्रयत्न किया है और ये बन्धन टूट रहे हैं। लेकिन अभी आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि समाज में इस तरह की भावना पैदा हो जाये कि कोई जाति-पात का विचार ही न करे और यही भावना हो जाये कि

“हरि को भजे सो हरि का होई,
जाति-पात पूछे नहि कोई।”

लेकिन आज अभी यह भावना मौजूद है कि चाहे कोई अछूत कितना भी पढ़ जाये चाहे एक चमार का लड़का डिप्टी कलक्टर भी हो जाये फिर भी कहा यही जाता है कि यह तो चमार का लड़का है। अभी समाज में ऐसा विचार है। श्री सामन्त जी की जो भावना इस बिल के पीछे है वह बहुत ऊंची है। लेकिन जब तक यह रिजर्वेशन का प्रश्न है तब तक मैं समझता हूँ कि जाति का नाम देना ही पड़ेगा। वकीलों के लिये स्कूलों में बच्चों की फीस माफ होने आदि के लिये भी अभी जाति का नाम देना पड़ता है। यह बात नहीं है कि यह बात केवल हरिजनों और परिगणित जाति वालों तक ही सीमित है, दूसरी जाति के लोगों को भी अपनी जाति का नाम देना पड़ता है। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी वह समय नहीं आया है कि इन बातों को हटाया जाये। मैं जानता हूँ कि पिता के नाम के द्वारा और उसकी रहन की जगह के द्वारा भी एक आदमी की पहचान की जा सकती है। लेकिन मौजूदा व्यवस्था

में जैसा कि मैं ने पहले कहा, जाति का नाम रखना आवश्यक है। यद्यपि समाज में घीरे २ इन जाति-सूचक शब्द, नाम व चिह्नों को हटाना है।

यह मैं जानता हूँ कि जो चारों वर्ग पैदा हुए उनके पीछे एक सच्ची समानता की भावना थी। लेकिन आज समाज बहुत टूट फूट चुका है और वह भावना जीवित नहीं रही है। लेकिन फिर भी मेरा विचार है कि अभी समय इतना परिपक्व नहीं है कि जातिगत नाम को हटा दिया जाये। मैं जानता हूँ कि हमें एक ऐसा वातावरण पैदा करना है जहाँ भेद-प्रभेद न हों क्योंकि हमारा देश एक सिम्पलर स्टेट है और सारे संसार में उन्नति कर रहा है। इसलिये इस तरह के जातिगत नाम अछूते नहीं लगते। लेकिन फिर भी जैसी परिस्थितियाँ अभी इस देश के अन्दर हैं उनके रहते हुये जाति का नाम जाहिर करना पड़ता है। मैं उन आदमियों में से नहीं हूँ जो कि यह चाहते हैं कि सदा के लिये रिजर्वेशन चलता रहे। लेकिन हम लोग जो कि पिछड़े हुये हैं यह चाहते हैं कि हमको उन्नति करने का पूरा मौका मिले और हम सब के बराबर तक आजाये और समाज में यह भावना पैदा हो जाये कि कोई यह न सोचे कि कौन ब्राह्मण है, कौन क्षत्रीय है, कौन वैश्य है, कौन चमार है, कौन भंगी है, तब यह रिजर्वेशन खत्म कर दिया जाये।

आज इस काम को पूरा करने के लिये बलशाली प्रचार की आवश्यकता है। जन-जन के हृदय में अस्पृश्यता की छाया को दूर करने की आवश्यकता है। मैं कानून में विशेष विश्वास नहीं करता। कानून तो एक आधार मात्र है। उससे किसी विचार धारा को खड़ा होने में कुछ सहारा मिल सकता है, लेकिन इस काम के लिये तो एक जनमत बनाने की ज़रूरत है। आज भी जनता में गाँवों के अन्दर जाति-पात की भावना बहुत दृढ़ है। चाहे कानून द्वारा

[श्री बाल्मीकी]

भाष कागज़ों से इस नाम को भले ही हटा दें लेकिन यह भावना बराबर बनी हुई है। आज गावों में यह हल है कि अगर कभी गवाही देने का मौका आता है तो लोग सोचते हैं कि यह लोधा है, या ब्राह्मण है या चमार है। इसलिये सभापति जी मैं आपके जरिये यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज देश में ऐसी भावना की आवश्यकता है कि कोई यह सोचे भी नहीं कि किसी में क्या जाति है। लेकिन अभी समाज की जाति-पात के बन्धन काफी दृढ़ता से मौजूद हैं और इनको हटाने के लिये काफी प्रयत्न की जरूरत है। इस छोटे से बिल से यह उद्देश्य सफलीभूत नहीं हो सकता मैं नहीं समझता कि इस बिल के अनुसार जाति के नाम हटा देने में कहां तक इस भावना को बदलने में सहायता मिलेगी। मैं जानता हूँ कि जाति-पात के बन्धन देश के लिये हानिकारक हैं क्योंकि हमारा देश एक सिक्वलर स्टेट है और धर्म-निरपेक्ष राज्य है। मैं जानता हूँ कि यह अच्छा नहीं लगता कि ऐसे देश में भी जाति के नाम लिखे जायें। इन जातियों के पीछे जो जाति-जाति में मानव-समानता की वैदिक भावना थी वह मैं अनेक बार यहां बतला चुका हूँ। यदि वह भावना देशवासियों में पैदा हो जाये तो बहुत अच्छा हो। यह मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारे यहां बहुत से लोग इस विषय में बहुत उदार विचार रखते हैं जैसे कि हमारे मिश्र जी बैठे हैं। ये मेरे खिले के ऊंचे दरजे के ब्राह्मण हैं और मैं नीचे दरजे का हूँ। लेकिन १९५२ में चुनाव के समय अखबारों में यह खबर निकली कि कन्हैया लाल मिश्र और रघुवर दयाल बाल्मीकी सफल घोषित किये गये और इसी प्रकार इन्हीं नाम से ब्राँडकास्ट हुआ। यदि लोगों में ऐसी भावना हो जाये तो यह समस्या हल हो सकती है।

अभी काका कालेलकर जी ने लोदी हरिजन कॉलोनी में भाषण देते हुये कहा

था कि मैं सारे ब्राह्मणों को भंगी बनाऊंगा, तो मैंने कहा था कि मैं भी सब भंगियों को ब्राह्मण बनाऊंगा, । लेकिन मुझे बातों की कोई खुशी नहीं होती। यह जातिगत भावना हम को ऊंचा नहीं ले जा सकती। इस से हम संसार के सामने छोटे बन जाते हैं। हमें अपने देश के लोगों की इस भावना को बदलना होगा और इसके लिये बहुत प्रयत्न करना होगा। तभी हम इस सदियों की लानत से मुक्ति पाकर समाज को ऊंचा उठा सकते हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ।

Shri D. C. Sharma: I congratulate my esteemed friend, Mr. Samanta, for two reasons. I congratulate him in the first place because he is a very lucky man whose Bill has found favour partly with our Minister of Legal Affairs.

श्री बाल्मीकी: सामन्त जी की जाति क्या है

Shri D. C. Sharma: Usually, the fate of Private Members' Bills and Resolutions is woeful, if not tragic. But, Mr. Samanta brought this Bill under some auspicious star, so that it has been partly accepted by our Government. I congratulate him for that.

Shri S. C. Samanta: My hon. friend should remember that I waited for a long period of 4½ years.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I know my friend waited for 4½ years; but, I can point to Bills which have been there for the last 25 years and which have not had any good luck. I think Mr. Samanta's Bill, though small, is a significant Bill and a Bill of far-reaching importance. Sitting in this House, we may not realise what its repercussions will be. But, I can assure the House that this Bill is going to affect lakhs of persons in the whole of India and it is not a small matter. I do not want to go into the merits or demerits of casteism. I know casteism is a hydra-headed monster and it has

fallen to the lot of my friend, Mr. Samanta, to pull at least one of its heads out.

4:50 P.M.

I also know that it will not be possible for this monster to grow two heads when one has been pulled out. We have pulled this head out once for all. Casteism has been opposed by many reformers, by Swami Vivekananda, Swami Dayanand, Mahatma Gandhi and by Guru Govind Singh. Guru Govind Singh enjoined on his followers not to mention their caste anywhere. I can tell you that some of my Sikh friends have followed that principle very loyally and faithfully. Here is my hon. friend Sardar Teja Singh. He does not like to call himself by any caste to which he may belong. He calls himself Sardar Akarpuri. Akarpur is the name of his village. That is how he distinguishes himself from others. In the Rajya Sabha, there is a Member called Sardar Uddham Singh. He calls himself Nagoke. Many people may not know what is meant by Nagoke. That is the name of his village. Our friends the Sikhs have got over this difficulty in this way. I think they have done well. At least they have tried to give the go-by to this casteism. I may tell my hon. friend Shri Ramachandra Reddi that we are not doing anything sensational or extraordinary by doing so. What happens in the voters' list? I do not know what is the practice in other States. But, I know, in my State, my name is not given as Dewan Chand Sharma. My name is Dewan Chand. The caste is not mentioned. Still, people are able to know who this Dewan Chand is. I think this may be the practice elsewhere also. If the caste is omitted from these records, I think there will not be any difficulty.

Again, I may tell you that in some Universities they have laid down that the caste of the student should not be mentioned. Formerly, there used to be a definite place for mentioning the caste. There were so many scholar-

ships which were given only on the basis of caste. Now, in some Universities they have decreed that the student should not mention his caste. I may tell you, and I think you know it already—some of these castes have come to have a particular bad odour.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara): May I interrupt for just a minute for seeking some information? I would like to know the implications of this Bill.

An Hon. Member: It is too late now.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: For example, is it that 'Dewan Chand Sharma' should not be written or 'Dewan Chand, Sharma, Caste Hindu, brahmin' should not be written?

Mr. Chairman: The word 'brahmin' shall not be written.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Shri D. C. Sharma was making a mistake that the name should not be there. At least in this Bill what is mentioned is, only D. C. Sharma, Hindu, 'brahmin'—the word 'brahmin' should not be there. Hindu can be there.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I was saying that in the voters' list, they omit 'Sharma'. They have only put down Dewan Chand. Still, it is possible to identify who that Dewan Chand is.

If you read section 2(1), definition, you will find that the persons who framed this section, had some kind of not a high notion about us: It says:

“‘addition’ means the place of residence, and the profession, trade, rank and title (if any) of a person described, and, in the case of an Indian, his caste (if any) and his father's name, or where he is usually described as the son of his mother, then his mother's name.”

If he were a non-Indian, he can be known by the place of residence, by his profession, etc. In the case of an Indian, caste has to be given. This

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

was a stigma, if I can describe it as such, attached to us. I am glad that this is being done away with. Of course, father's name must be given; where usually a person is described as the son of his mother, his mother's name should be given. All these things are there. Caste was particularly mentioned in the case of India. That means, an Indian and his caste are indissoluble. This is a thing against which we must raise our voice.

I was saying that it is good that we do not mention our caste. It is good. Why? Because, I do not want to mention the names of the castes—some of the castes have come to acquire a kind of bad odour. That bad odour may not exist so far as persons belonging to that caste are concerned. But, when these persons are mentioned with reference to other persons of other castes, they do not give them the respect that they deserve. For instance, it may be said that the person belongs to such and such caste and therefore, he need not be taken seriously, or his word need not be trusted. I think this is to be found not only in my State but may be found all over India. I do not want to go into this question at length.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: (Meerut Distt.—South): It is found all over the country.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am glad to hear this from Pandit K. C. Sharma. This thing should be done away with.

I may tell you that there used to be hostels for students of this caste and students of that caste and so on. We are building up a University at Chandigarh. The University is going to have a big campus. The Punjab University will have its home in Chandigarh. A caste organisation wrote to the Vice-Chancellor saying that it wanted some land to be set apart for them so that they could build a hostel for the students of their

own caste. Of course, the hostel was to be known after the name of the caste. They also said that they would admit into the hostel students from other castes also. But, the University put down its foot on it and said; No; we want hostels for the students of all castes; we won't like to have a hostel which is described as a hostel for such and such a caste. I do not want to give the name of the caste which was intended in the case of that hostel. We are on the march. The lessons of history are not lost upon us. The lessons of the great reformers are not lost upon us. The lessons of our Constitution to which Shri S. C. Samanta has referred in the Statement of Objects and Reasons are not lost upon us. It is a small measure, no doubt. I may say that the approach of Shri S. C. Samanta is fabian. But, fabian socialism in England achieved something. In this matter also we may achieve something. Therefore, this is a very good Bill. I do not understand why,—I think the hon. Minister of Legal Affairs will kindly enlighten us on this point—he wants clause 3 to be omitted. Clause 3 only elaborates the point which is mentioned in clause 2. If it remains, it will be more effective. I would therefore appeal to him.....

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: He is reading paper. He cannot, I think, expand like this.

Shri Pataskar: I am finding out some reference. I am listening to him also.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am used to lecturing to persons who have turned deaf ears to what I say. But they are mostly in this House. That is the fate of these Private Members' Bills. We lecture to persons who do not have the ears to hear what we say.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): No reflections should be cast.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I would make an appeal to the hon. Minister that he should again consider whether it will not serve our purpose better if clause 3 of Shri S. C. Samanta's Bill is retained. I think that would make the Bill more effective.

With these words, I commend this Bill to the House. I know this Bill is going to have favourable winds and a smooth sailing. I hope therefore it will get to the harbour as early as possible. Most of the Private Members' Bills are wrecked on the way, and they are not heard of any more. But I hope this Bill will be passed, and it will be a Bill which will reform Hindu society to some extent.

Shri Pataskar: On a point of information. When the hon. Member Shri D. C. Sharma was speaking, it is true that I was trying to look up for some item in the newspaper. It is not that I wanted to turn a deaf ear to what the hon. Member was saying. Yesterday, I remember to have read somewhere a reference by Mr. D'Cunha of Portugal to this matter, wherein he had a jibe at us on account of the caste system prevailing in our country. I just wanted to ascertain that for the purposes of this Bill. Otherwise, I was intently listening to my hon. friend.

Shri D. C. Sharma: When I referred to deaf ears, I did not refer to the hon. Minister, but I referred to deaf ears in general.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das): I thought he was referring to his career as a professor.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I rise to support the Bill which has been brought forward by my hon. friend Shri S. C. Samanta. The principle of the Bill is very laudable, and I have no doubt that all Members of this House will support it.

As has been pointed out already by the previous speakers, caste has been a curse in this country. The evil intentions of caste have been emphasised in this country for centuries and

even ages. We are all well aware of the evil effects of this caste system. We know also that many of the interpreters of our *shastras*, while interpreting them have tried to defend the caste system. But those of us who have had the privilege of studying the *shastras* know very well that the caste system in this country was not meant for propagating the idea of caste or community which is practised. According to our *shastras* a person was considered to belong to a particular caste only on account of his profession or virtues and not on account of his birth. But unfortunately that is not the position today; if a person is born in a certain family, he is considered to belong to a particular caste, irrespective of whether he practises those virtues or not, which are enunciated in our *shastras*.

One hon. Member—I think it was Shri Dabhi—has said that we should make an offence under clause 3 a penal one. I personally do not feel that this is a matter where we can resort to penal measures. This can be brought about only through social reforms.

We have seen that the caste system is very deepseated in our country. In spite of the reformers and others, we still continue to practise the caste system not only in our social behaviour but also in political behaviour. That is a very unfortunate thing. I therefore feel that merely by passing this legislation we cannot remove the idea of caste from the minds of people. We can do so only through social reforms.

In the present Bill, we are seeking to omit mention of caste names in deeds for registration. Likewise, I would like Government to bring in some legislation by which the reference to caste will be omitted from our passports and also from our Government records. That would be a good beginning towards the removal of caste to some extent. We talk so much about classless society, casteless society and so on. Nowadays, it has

[Dr. Suresh Chandra]

become a sort of fashion to talk like that. We also talk of the socialistic pattern of society. If we are to have a casteless and classless society, and a socialistic pattern of society, it is essential that we should try to remove caste-ism from our country. Our Prime Minister has repeatedly stated that caste-ism has to be removed in the set-up of a socialist society.

I have not been able to follow the objection raised by my hon. friend Shri Ramachandra Reddi, namely that if caste is abolished, there may be certain difficulties in South India with regard to administration, and there might also be corruption. I feel that the hon. Minister should go into the matter carefully and see that such difficulties are not created.

I would not like to say anything further; but I would only emphasise that Government should bring forward another legislation by which we could do away with reference to caste in passports and in Government records. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend Shri D. C. Sharma, in the voters' lists and also in the universities, the caste name need not be written, because the persons concerned can be recognised.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Dist.—South): If a Harijan has to file his nomination paper, he has to declare that he is a Harijan candidate belonging to the Scheduled Castes.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: But the idea is that they should not have to mention. Even without any reference to it, he can be identified, and we can find out whether he is a Harijan and if so to which Caste he belongs.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: The Constitution itself provides it.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: In some of our universities and other places, we have started caste hostels. There are *gowda* hostels, *reddi* hostels, *Brahmin* hostels and so on. I personally feel that it is not proper to have such caste hostels.

Mr. Chairman: That is outside the scope of this Bill. Let us confine ourselves to the Bill that we are discussing now. Already, we have spent more than an hour on this Bill.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: The principle of the Bill is, as has been pointed out by the Mover himself that caste-ism should be removed from our country. That is why I wanted to go into the whole thing.

I have nothing against this Bill, and therefore I support this Bill

Shri Raghavaiah (Ongole): May I seek a clarification? With regard to the definition of 'caste' in the original Act, may I know whether the term means something that is synonymous with religion? For example, suppose it is stated: "Raghavaiah, Caste-Hindu" and "Raghavaiah, Caste-Hindu Brahmin". What is the exact definition?

Mr. Chairman: He will explain it.

Shri Pataskar: I will try briefly to explain this measure which, of course, is very simple, to my mind. But at the same time, it clearly indicates the trend in which we ought to progress in conformity with our ideal

The position is that under the Indian Registration Act, as it was originally framed, there was a definition of the word 'addition'. It was:

"'addition' means the place of residence, and the profession, trade, rank and title (if any) of a person described, and in the case of an Indian, his caste (if any) and his father's name, or where he is usually described as the son of his mother, then his mother's name:"

This probably is due to the fact that in those days all the Indians, citizens of this country when the foreigners came and were in charge of the administration, were supposed by them to belong to some caste or other, and therefore, for the purpose of identification, they laid down that in every

document, the caste should be mentioned. Naturally, that provision has still continued so far as the description to be given to a person in the document is concerned. As I mentioned on the last occasion, some State Governments—and I am very glad to say that U.P. is one of them, in conformity with the principles of our Constitution and our policy,—have by circular or some such device tried to say that in all documents it is not necessary to mention the caste. The result is that it was open to the Sub-Registrar, if this definition of the word 'addition' is allowed to stand as it is, to reject a document because it does not comply with the requirements under the different provisions. That was discussed last time and even then I suggested that Government would be prepared to consider the question that in the year, 1955 it does not look well that on our Statute-book there should be a provision by which in every document which is brought forward for registration, the caste must be mentioned, because that amounts to recognition of caste. We are all agreed that casteism has been one of the banes of our society and we have been trying by all possible means to see that this distinction disappears. It was from that point of view, as we found in the past, that marriage laws were liberalised. This caste was not only common to Hindus, because there the word is 'native', that means, all people. I can say that even in places like Goa, so many people had become Catholic Christians. I remember about 20 years back that they themselves, in spite of the fact that they had become Christians, used to observe the caste system in this form, because I knew a gentleman called Saldana; he used to say 'Religion-Catholic Christian', 'Caste-Brahmin'. That is what I remember to have heard. So it does not pertain only to Hindus. We know that this caste system had taken deep root and it was probably on account of this that this was used. I referred to this incident because only two days back, there was a statement by D' Cunha of Portugal which he made, of course,

on account of the present imbroglio regarding Goa. He said that if Goa goes to India, then it will only become caste-ridden. I only want to take this opportunity to state that there are many castes also among the Catholic Christians in Goa. Of course, what we want to do in this country is to obliterate all traces of the caste system, as far as we can by the process of evolution.....

Shri N. Rachiah (Mysore-Reserved-Sch. Castes): On a point of information. The Hon. Minister said that even among Christians, there are castes. Does the hon. Minister mean that there must be caste system and it should be recognised by Government?

Shri Pataskar: I am sorry the hon. Member has not been able to follow me. I am one of those who believe that the caste system has been a cause of trouble in our country throughout. It was not only confined to a particular group, but it has taken such deep root that it has continued even after the change of religion. That was the only point. I did not want to justify it. Last time when it was discussed here, I said that it was a concurrent subject; we might take sometime to consider it. An assurance was given and the hon. Member had withdrawn the Bill. Now, I feel it is time that we remove this rule from our Statute-book which makes the mention of caste compulsory. It should not be necessary to mention the caste. I know, as the hon. Member, Shri Ramachandra Reddi, pointed out that what happens in villages is that in many cases people are still living as if divided in castes and therefore, the caste name is, in many cases, confounded with the surname. A person may be called 'Ramakrishna Mohar'. As a matter of fact, 'Mohar' is a caste. But he does call himself at the present moment like that. The point is that we do not want to prevent anybody from calling himself by any name, but on the Statute-book there should not be provision by which

[Shri Pataskar]

mention of caste is made compulsory. That is what is tried to be omitted.

Minister, it may be practised actually, Minister, it may be practised actually, to the detriment of so many people. Then why not continue it?

Shri Pataskar: I deny that. I do not know what I said to suggest that people should observe caste. I never said that. As a matter of fact, what I said was that the provision in the Act now about compulsory mention of caste in documents should be removed.

Shri N. Raghiah: Though there is a provision in the Constitution that there should be no discrimination still we find in hotels, hostels and so on, there are caste distinctions and name-plates.

Shri Pataskar: We have passed the Untouchability Offences Bill for that purpose. All that offence has been made cognisable now. That point, I think, need not agitate us now, at any rate, so far as this Bill is concerned. My point is that so far as this particular Act is concerned, it is incongruous that there should be a provision that a man must compulsorily mention his caste in documents, and it should be removed. That is why we accept that amendment.

Then there is a further clause, clause 3, which says:

"If any document duly presented for registration mentions the caste of the persons described therein, the registering officer shall refuse to register the document, unless the person executing the document removes therefrom all references to caste mentioned therein".

Now, I do not accept this. In villages, as we know, suppose there is a confusion between a caste and a surname. If an ignorant or illiterate man has used it, it should not be open to the Registrar to throw it away simply because he interprets that caste has been mentioned. That is

why I say it would not be in the interest of the general public that we should provide further that in case in a document caste is mentioned, it should be rejected. If we do that, that will cause hardship to many persons. That is the reason why I do not accept it.

I hope that in course of time, by the removal of this provision about compulsory mention of caste in all documents, no document writers will insert it. At the present moment, the position is that they have to mention it; otherwise, the document is liable to be rejected by the Sub-Registrar because it does not comply with a certain formality. Therefore, the first is necessary but the second is to penalise. As my friend, Shri Dabhi also said, I do not think it necessary. What we object to is that a man should be made compulsorily to mention caste in any document.

I am sure that though the Bill is a small one it will go a long way in giving an indication of our mind that we are firmly resolved to see that casteism finds no place in our social system and it is from that point of view that I am prepared to accept it. It may be passed without any further delay.

As regards the question posed by some people, I would say that it is wrong to suppose that Government does not want that any Private Member's Bill should be passed at all. There was a Bill introduced by Shri Kazmi in 1954 which was passed. Whenever it is possible, Government is prepared to accept a Bill whether it comes from a Private Member or from Government. The difficulty in the case of Private Members is this. So far as the Government is concerned, they have got the machinery at their disposal and they can think out bigger problems. At the same time, we welcome as much any efforts made by any private Member to in-

introduce legislation which is in the interests of society. Government is always willing to accept it. It is in that spirit that I accept this clause 2—this Bill with deletion of clause 3 and with suitable modifications in clause 2. I think this Bill should be passed by the House today. It will go a long way in improving the statute in a particular manner from the point of view of public interest.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): I want to ask some questions.

Mr. Chairman: There is the third reading.

Shri Raghavachari: The hon. Minister spoke about clause 3. I want to say that my attitude is the same as the hon. Minister but I want to point out some additional difficulty in the way of accepting clause 3.

Mr. Chairman: That is being omitted.

Shri Raghavachari: Then, I have no objection. I only wanted to point out this. It is stated that:

“If any document duly presented for registration mentions the caste of the persons described therein,....”

it must be refused.

Mr. Chairman: That is being removed.

Shri Raghavachari: Then, I have no objection.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Registration Act, 1908, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2— (Amendment of Section 2, Act XVI of 1908).

Shri Pataskar: The words within brackets “(hereinafter referred to as the principal Act)” are unnecessary in clause 2. So I will move an amendment to delete those words.

I beg to move:

In clause 2, omit “(hereinafter referred to as the principal Act)”.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

In clause 2, omit “(hereinafter referred to as the principal Act)”.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: Before you put it to the vote of the House....

Mr. Chairman: I am not putting it to the vote. I am placing before the House the amendment of the hon. Minister.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: The amendment proposed in clause 2 is that the words ‘his caste (if any) and’ shall be omitted, from the original section 2. This section reads:

“ ‘Addition means the place of residence, and the profession, trade, rank and title (if any) of a person described, and in the case of an Indian his caste (if any) and his father’s name....”

By this clause we are only removing ‘the caste (if any)’ and we are maintaining ‘in the case of an Indian’. What I want to point out is that when this Registration Act was passed there was a difference between Indians and non-Indians. We are all Indians now and the Indian Citizenship Bill has been passed. So, why have this distinction so far as the Registration Act is concerned? We should remove the whole thing after the word ‘described’, that is, ‘and in the case of an Indian his caste (if any) and’. The very idea of distinction should have no place in the Act. So, I wanted to suggest to the hon. Minister that the other words after ‘described’ should also be omitted. If we accept this suggestion, the whole thing will be clear. It will read—‘means the place of residence, and the profession, trade, rank and title’ etc. The whole feeling of Indian and non-Indian should go away.

Shri Pataskar: So far as this Bill is concerned, it may refer to Indians and non-Indians because there may be a document which may be executed in favour of a person who is a non-Indian. Therefore, we need not create more complications here.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: There is another thing. In the case of a non-Indian why should there not be the father's name? Why make this distinction in the case of an Indian?

Shri Pataskar: The hon. Member is only trying theoretically to suggest something. At any rate, I am not aware as to how non-Indians describe themselves. But, I am not worried about it. I wanted to say that so far as an Indian is concerned, his father's name and in the case where it is described as the son of so and so—the mother—the mother's name should be there because there are places where they are so described. In the case of foreigners, the place of residence, profession, rank and trade etc. would be enough for our purposes. I thought this is a small matter and we need not recast the whole thing.

Shri Raghavaiah: My hon. friend, who spoke before me, said that three lines may be removed, trade, profession etc. I agree with the deletion of these three lines but I would add that the father's name should also be included after the words, 'profession, trade, rank and title (if any)'. Why should we make a distinction between an Indian and a non-Indian? Why should we say that the father's name should be there in the case of an Indian and not so in the case of a non-Indian? Take the case of two persons having the same trade, profession etc. and the same name. A the son of B and A the son of C. If there is not the father's name there will be confusion. In order to avoid such a kind of confusion, I do not understand why the addition of the father's name along with the other three terms be not made in the previous line. This distinction between Indian and non-Indian should go.

Mr. Chairman: The point about Indian and non-Indian has been explained already. Does he want that the father's name should be there?

Shri Raghavaiah: It should be there.

Mr. Chairman: Nobody has objected to that.

Shri Raghavachari: We should address all our arguments to the Member in charge of this Bill and not to the hon. Minister.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: But he is helping the Member.

Shri Raghavachari: So far as the suggestion made by my hon. friend that the phrase "in the case of an Indian" should be omitted is concerned, it will certainly make a better piece of legislation in the interests of the country's honour. Otherwise it looks as if there is something of a difference between an Indian and a non-Indian in this respect. If the phrase "in the case of an Indian" is taken away along with the other phrase, it will certainly add and will not take away any effect from the Bill that the gentleman in charge of it has proposed. Therefore, I would make a request to the gentleman in charge of the Bill that the omission of the phrase "in the case of an Indian" will make better reading and also make it a very good piece of legislation. It will be really very desirable that we remove the difference between the requirements of an Indian and those of a non-Indian. I request Shri Samanta to agree to drop that portion also.

Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad Distt-North): I agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken. The section was enacted in 1887 and since then many of the Indians who called themselves educated and had received English education have begun to add a surname after their names; in fact, the son of Shri Pataskar will be Pataskar just as the son of Edward is also Edward. There is not much difference and there is no point why the father's name should be added in the case of an Indian and the father's name should be omitted in the case of a non-Indian. My submission is that if you remove the father's name even from the description of 'Indian',

it will not cause much difference because there are a large number of people who have added a surname after their name and their sons are also called after the same name.

Mr. Chairman: Is it your proposition that the father's name should be omitted?

Mr. Mulchand Dube: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Nobody has suggested that. The only thing proposed is that in addition to the words in the parenthesis the words "in the case of an Indian" should also be omitted because there should be no invidious distinction between an Indian and a non-Indian. The hon. Minister, I understand, has not given much thought to that point.

Shri Pataskar: There is no question of any invidious distinction. We are proud of being Indians, and there is nothing invidious about it.

In the next place, if the object of the Bill is to remove the anomaly, I accept it. But if you go on amending the whole section for the purpose of proper wording or whether the father's name is not necessary at all, I think that would be really going out of the way. I do not know what complications will be created in the Act; I have not examined the position.

Mr. Chairman: Anyhow, he has accepted this Bill for consideration today in view of certain elimination that has been proposed. Let us take it as it is, and especially as there is no such amendment before me which is acceptable to the Government, let me put clause 2, with the omission of the words in the parenthesis "hereinafter referred to as the principal Act".

The question is:

"In clause 2, omit "(hereinafter referred to as the principal Act)".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 3— (Insertion of new section 19A, Act XVI of 1908).

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: So, clause 3 is omitted from the Bill.

The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

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

Shri S. C. Samanta: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill as amended be passed."

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: Let me say a few words on the Bill. I have already indicated my support to it. It has been described by Shri Sharma that the caste system is a hydra-headed monster, that it has spread its tentacles in all walks of life, in administration, services, etc., that it has corrupted our social life and is a hinderance to our progress. So everything to which this stigma attaches should be given the go-by. Now I would like to make only one observation. It is very good that we have removed the provision to mention the name of caste. At the same time, when we have heard so much about untouchability and the removal of any slur that is still continuing on certain classes of people, we must on this occasion strongly emphasise the fact that merely a measure of this type will not carry us far, and if we really want to abolish untouchability altogether....

Mr Chairman: You are just repeating what you have already said on the Bill.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: I only want to add that Government should see that other measures are also brought forward for the proper rehabilitation of those people who are still suffering in the hands of those who have a dominating voice in the society, and only in that way we can build up a society where there will be rapid progress, and nobody would have any grievance of social injustices.

Shri N. Rachiah: I do not know whether the hon. Minister has accepted that casteism should go, but I certainly welcome the principle of the Bill. What I was arguing with the Minister was that we have got in our society not only four castes but many castes. In our daily life, a brahmin practises as a brahmin and feels for a brahmin and similarly a sudra feels for a sudra. The Shastras say that there are four castes, but there are many more castes in actuality. Unless we try to remove such feelings and such writings, casteism will not be removed. Simply because we pass this will and remove this word here, it will not remove casteism. Even now the hon. Minister, Shri Pataskar, was saying that he was proud of being an Indian. I am more proud of being an Indian. Still what is it that we are practising? There are four castes—there is the advanced caste like the Brahmins and the two other castes. Finally, there is the Shudra caste. According to the removal of casteism, either all should become Brahmins or Shudras. That is the interpretation. When that feeling is not there, if we simply remove this by way of legislation in the documents or in the statute-book, I do not think it is something much useful. Every man, if he belongs to this or that caste, high or low, small or big, rich or poor, should make a determination: "I shall be impartial and honest and I shall not discriminate.", then it is something. That is the oath that we

have taken actually here. How many hon. Members, how many Hindus, if they do not mistake me, are practising it in their daily lives. (*Interruptions.*) My friend Shri Raghavaiah said something. He is a communist but he belongs to a superior class. He comes to the platform and says that he is a communist. He is a caste Hindu. If he comes to my constituency, I know he cannot get even one vote.

Mr. Chairman: Personal references should be avoided.

Shri N. Rachiah: He referred to me.

Shri Raghavaiah: I never referred to him.

Mr. Chairman: Nobody referred to him individually. It should be the practice of this House not to refer to any other Member disparagingly. He ought to maintain that. A general statement is another thing.

Shri N. Rachiah: I think you perhaps did not hear it; he referred to me. That is why I gave a reply.

In every town and village, there are hotels and places of public resort where it is written 'For Brahmins only'; 'For Lingayats only', 'for certain others only', etc. Such boards should be removed. We are already in the ninth year of our Independence and Government has not taken any steps in this direction. I think that the hon. Minister will take immediate action to see that such boards and exhibitions and demonstrations are removed in the best interests of the country. There must be honest efforts on the part of everybody to remove this morally and psychologically also. That is what I want. I support this Bill.

Shri Pataskar: This is a Bill which is very important in one way. I am very glad that our friend, Shri Samanta, has been able to remove from the statute-book something which was certainly very wrong.

As regards my friend, Shri Rachiah, I can very well realise the feelings of those who, on account of this caste system, had been subjected to intolerable positions for centuries past. I think we must bear a little with our friends like Shri Rachiah. I am not at all angry with him. I can only assure him that so far as the Government is concerned, they are doing their best. If anybody takes a view of the things for the last few years, they have been trying to do their utmost to remove this blot on our system. It has been the cause of interminable disputes and factions. In fact I would go to the length of saying that it was probably on account of this tendency that we came to lose our independence. Apart from that, Government have abolished it in the Constitution. The other day we passed the Untouchability (Offences) Bill. It is not only with respect to untouchables. Even among the others, there are castes and sub-castes. What are the remedies? We have to carry public opinion with us. You cannot have a legislative enforcement in every house. If he dispassionately looks at it, what is the Hindu marriage law? It says that the marriage between any two Hindus, to whichever caste they may belong, is valid. A few years back, all these marriages were regarded as invalid. We are trying our level best with all the machinery at our disposal that this slur on our society vanishes.

As I said, the only significant part of this Bill is that it is a pointer to the way in which we are proceeding and the way in which we want public opinion to be educated. Apart from its effect on the documents, the discussion that has taken place in this House with respect to this small Bill, will give an indication to the public in general the way in which all of us are unitedly proceeding to remove this drawback. That is the significance of a measure like this and I am very glad that my friend, Shri Samanta, has brought forward this Bill.

Shri S. C. Samanta: I am thankful to the House and the Government; they have been kind enough to accept this important amendment and I hope in future Government will bring a comprehensive Bill so that this blot will be removed from the country. We as Members will also try to remove this from the society.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

MOTOR VEHICLES (AMENDMENT)
BILL

(SUBSTITUTION OF SECTION 65 ETC.)

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):
I beg to move: .

"That the Bill further to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, be taken into consideration."

By this Bill I seek to provide some statutory provisions for regulating the service conditions of the workers in transport industry.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Distt. South): I think Government has already introduced a Bill about this.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: That relates to a different section. This Bill is for regulating the service conditions of the transport workers.

Sir, while I move this Bill I have got the full support of Shri Raja Ram Shastri who is the President of the All India Motor Workers' Union.

6 P.M.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. It is six o'clock. The hon. Member may continue his speech next time. There will be no Question Hour tomorrow and the debate begins at eleven o'clock.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 17th December, 1955.
