

**Mr. Speaker :** The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Third Report of the Rules Committee laid on the Table of the House on the 25th April 1956."

*The motion was adopted and the Lok Sabha agreed to the amendments to the Rules of Procedure as recommended by the Rules Committee.*

**Mr. Speaker :** The motion is adopted and the House agrees to the amendments to the Rules of Procedure as recommended by the Rules Committee.

#### STATES REORGANISATION BILL—contd.

**Mr. Speaker :** The House will now resume further discussion of the motion moved by the Home Minister on the 23rd of April for reference of the States Reorganisation Bill to a Joint Committee. The hon. the Home Minister will now reply to the debate.

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant) :** Sir, we have had ample time to study the way discussions have to be profitably conducted in this House during the last hour and a half. I heave a sigh of relief that I have the opportunity of saying a few words now.

Sir, the discussion on the motion which I had the privilege of placing before this House on Monday suggesting the reference of the States Reorganisation Bill to a Joint Committee has taken almost three full days and during the course of the debate more than fifty speeches were delivered. The points that have arisen as a result of the long debate do not call for any detailed examination at this stage. We are not taking any final decision and all that is necessary is to take note of the comments and suggestions that have been made and the views that have been expressed so that the members of the Joint Committee may have the benefit of the opinions expressed by hon. Members of this House.

The debate has, however, served a very useful purpose. I was glad to notice a distinct change in the atmosphere and the temper of the House and the Members. On the whole, the debate was conducted at a high level, with dignity and decorum but for one or two lapses.

2—99 Lok Sabha

The matters under discussion had convulsed the country at one stage and had caused considerable commotion at certain places. Time, however, has had a mellowing effect. The atmosphere at the time we discussed the proposals which were mostly alike to those contained in this Bill in December last was murky. Several of the speakers struck notes of disappointment, pessimism, disquiet and even concern. The circumstances have agreeably changed to a certain extent.

We have heard the speeches delivered during the last three days. There was a manifest feeling of achievement and those who did not agree were actuated by a deep sense of sincerity and earnestness. But, on the whole, it can justifiably be claimed that the scheme embodied in the Bill had met with the general approval of this House. Most of the controversy centred round the City of Bombay. I do not propose to refer to that at least just now. The question has been discussed not only in this House but also outside threadbare in all possible aspects and all the pros and cons have been, I think, examined by the people who are interested in this vital problem. But if you leave aside that problem of Bombay which has become almost baffling and to which the solutions proposed so far have not appeared, at least to some of the hon. Members and to certain sections of our people, as satisfactory and conducive that question of Bombay still continues to loom large, but if for the time being; we put it out of the way, that we find that the proposals contained in the Bill have the general support of this House. It is a matter of gratification not only to me, but it should be so also to the hon. Members that the ticklish, intricate, delicate and complicated questions relating to the reorganisation of States and matters incidental and consequential thereto have been by and large satisfactorily settled. The controversies with regard to most of the matters have been set at rest.

I should like hon. Members to imagine for a moment the formidable character and the magnitude of the task in which we are all engaged. We are virtually redrawing the administrative map of India and it must be a heartening experience that with the aid of the democratic process, the sagacity, the goodwill and the co-operation of hon. Members of this House and other public men we have been able to reach conclusions which are embodied in this Bill and

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

which have the blessings of the bulk of the people in the country.

Sir, sometimes it is said—and some of the hon. Members in the course of the discussion also made observations to this effect—that it would have been safer if we had adhered mechanically to the recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission. I want safety. I stand for it, but not at the cost of the public weal and general good of the people. We have attached considerable weight to the recommendations of the Commission and, as the hon. Members may be remembering we had made every effort to keep the country, to the extent it was possible, in a receptive mood on the eve of the publication of the report of the Commission. It was our endeavour that the recommendations might be received with sympathy and respect. But we could not abdicate our functions. While we were throughout persuading the people to be prepared for a cordial reception of the recommendations, we had to take account of public opinion and to see that the final decisions were made with the general approval of the people concerned and also of the community at large. So, certain changes had to be made. I would like those who were of the opinion that the proposals of the Commission should have been accepted as they were, to see whether the position today would have been better or worse if those recommendations had been bodily incorporated in the Bill.

First of all comes the Commission's proposal for a bilingual State for Bombay. I have expressed my views about it more than once. But our friends from Maharashtra not only did not like that proposal but they would not look at it even. They had almost an unbounded aversion for it. In the circumstances, to impose it on them would have been hardly wise, useful or helpful for that calm atmosphere which we need in the country for its development and growth. That had then to be discarded. We had also other proposals. But so far as this particular view is concerned, it was replaced by the suggestions for the formation of the State of Maharashtra with Vidarbha, the State of Gujarat and a Centrally administered Bombay. So far as the formation of Maharashtra with Vidarbha is concerned, it was welcomed by our friends in Maharashtra and everybody in Maharashtra liked the change. Would it have been to our ad-

vantage if Vidarbha, as proposed by the Commission, had been kept separate? According to the recommendations of the Commission, Vidarbha was to be formed as a separate State, not for any limited period but for an indefinite period of time. In the circumstances, if we had stuck to that recommendation, I think we would have taken a very serious risk.

Then, in the place of that recommendation, we persuaded Vidarbha to join Marathwada and other districts of Maharashtra so that there may be a composite Maharashtra State. So far as that goes, there is no objection to such a State from any quarter and all have hailed it with satisfaction. Then, we suggested a composite State of Gujarat in which Saurashtra and other districts of Bombay State were included. That too has been on the whole received with satisfaction.

With regard to Bombay, I have little doubt that with the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat, the proposal for a Centrally administered Bombay is less open to objection even to the friends from Maharashtra than the original bilingual State suggested by the Commission without Vidarbha. We would have been glad if we had succeeded in having a bigger bilingual State for Bombay and Maharashtra and Gujarat. That would have fulfilled the dreams of some of the visionaries. Besides it would have brought the day of fruition and fulfilment nearer in other States also, but so far, we have not succeeded. I had a scheme which was outlined by Shri S. S. More, one on which he has bestowed ample thought, and it would have been a matter of genuine pleasure to me if even this scheme had been accepted. But even that has not materialised. I do not want to say more about Bombay, but this much I can say. The formation of the States of Gujarat and Maharashtra, on the whole, is regarded as an improvement, congenial to the inner being of the two communities, over the original proposal that had emanated from the Commission. In the circumstances, we can count upon their generosity and indulgence so that the two States consisting of the fine elements of Indian nation may constructively and co-operatively act together to raise the stature of the common man not only in their respective States but in the whole of India as has been their practice and their custom in the past. So, the change made has been for the better.

Now, let us see what are the other changes we have made. The Commission had suggested that the residuary State of Hyderabad called Telangana should be kept separate from Andhra for five years and might be even for a longer period. That State of Andhra-Telangana has now been evolved and this united State will come into existence along with the others on the 1st October, I hope. This again has given satisfaction to the people of Andhra. They had been looking forward to this consummation of their aspirations and they are naturally happy that this has come.

While I am speaking of the unification of Telangana and Andhra, I might also refer to Bellary. With the inclusion of Telangana with Andhra, they can have not craving and no greed for a small additional bit of territory. So, we do not feel any serious need for the transfer of Bellary. Bellary had been allotted to Mysore or Karnataka by the award of Misra and also by Wanchoo. That also in a way had been agreed to by the leaders of Andhra at an earlier stage. Even the Commission had suggested the transfer of Bellary to ensure the implementation, maintenance and proper management of the Tungabhadra Project. That has been fully ensured and we have undertaken this responsibility on ourselves. So, this should give satisfaction to all concerned.

Himachal Pradesh has been kept separate. Hon. Members are aware that when the States Reorganisation Bill was circulated, there was a small paragraph in the explanatory note to the effect that ultimately Himachal Pradesh would be merged with Punjab. Even that has caused enough of discontent in Himachal. They cannot think of ultimate merger even with Punjab. That indicates the depth of their sentiments. In the circumstances, the change that we have made, keeping Himachal Pradesh separate for some time—I cannot say for how long—is certainly a step which satisfies the cravings and yearnings of the people of Himachal and must on that account be considered satisfactory.

The other change that we have made relates to the State of Punjab. Punjab and Pepsu will be a fine compact State now. We have decided to set up two regional Committees there, in accordance with the scheme which I had the privilege of placing on the Table of the House some time ago. The festering sore has been healed and Punjab which had vast potentialities and which deserv-

ed to occupy the foremost place in this country had suffered because of a cleavage between two important sections of people living in that land of heroes. When this cleavage is removed and healed, then we can look forward to an era of co-operative and sustained endeavour for the progress and advancement of this State of Punjab. I was told that some people would like to call these two regions "Eastern" and "Western" instead of "Punjabi-speaking" and "Hindi-speaking". I think there will be no objection to that. An enquiry was also made whether applications could be presented in the courts in both languages. According to our Constitution, applications can be presented in any of the 14 languages in any court and in any office in our country. So, there need be no doubt on that score.

I have referred to the principal changes that we have made. We have so far kept Tripura separate from Assam. We have done so at the instance and on the request of the people of Assam as well as Tripura. But there has been a shift in opinion and I would not be surprised if both of them come to agree about the inclusion of Tripura in Assam. But, that will be for the Joint Committee to consider.

I have referred to the changes and I make bold to say that all that we have done has led to a large measure of agreement. The scheme that is embodied in the Bill has now the support of almost all people who are connected with most of these proposals. As I said, controversy has centred round the city of Bombay. That I am leaving aside. So far as the other items are concerned, there is general agreement and that should hearten us in going forward in the direction which we have chalked out for ourselves, so that the aim which we have may be achieved as speedily as may be possible.

In the course of the discussion on the Bill, references were made to certain other matters also. I think I have dealt with the questions pertaining to the readjustment of boundaries. The Bengal-Bihar merger proposition was also the subject of some criticism. I think all this powder and shot is being aimed at something which does not exist today. We do not yet know whether it will materialise or not.

**Shri Nambiar (Mayuram):** So, is the merger proposal given up already?

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** I do not know ; you know more than I do. So far as I am concerned, I await the proposals of the States concerned. Whatever is done, so far as the merger or unification or union is concerned, it will not be possible to take any step in that direction except with the willing consent, the initiative and at the instance of the two States affected by it.

**Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal) :** Do "States" mean "Chief Ministers" ?

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** The Chief Ministers are there to be guided by and to guide the people of their respective States.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur) :** May I know whether a detailed procedure will be laid down to ascertain the will of the people ?

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** The will of the people will be ascertained as we have been trying to ascertain it in other cases ; and at least the conclusions that are reached will show that they are in accord with the will of the people.

**An hon. Member :** Question.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** Why question ? You have lack of faith in yourself. Otherwise, I do not see why one should not hope that ultimately what is evolved will be so evolved only with the full consent of the citizens of the two States, I mean of course, the bulk of the people ; a few stray individuals here and there have their own vagaries or idiosyncracies, that is a different thing. But a large body of public opinion should be with the proposals. Otherwise, they cannot materialise in a fruitful way. I do not really understand why there is so much of excitement over this today when the whole thing is in a fluid state and ample thought is being given by every one who is interested in the problem, so that the ultimate result may be really satisfactory and may conduce to the progress of both the States. But, that is a matter of habit. Sometimes people cannot be prevented from fishing in waters if they see them troubled. So far as that matter goes, as I have said in the explanatory note, we will wait for the decision that may be reached by those States. Then a Bill will be introduced regarding those States. The Joint Committee has little to do with that matter today.

The zonal councils came in for some comments in the course of the discus-

sion here during the last three days. As hon. Members may be remembering, when the suggestion for zonal councils was made by the hon. Prime Minister in the course of his speech in December, it was hailed almost by all sections of the House as an effective antidote to the spirit of separatism, parochialism, and fanatical linguism which had been displayed during those days. This proposition had almost unanimous support of the House. We had a meeting of the Chief Ministers of the States and it was, so far as I remember, also welcomed by all of them or almost all of them. A suggestion has been made by some Members that statutory powers should be given to the zonal councils. I think that such a step would be pernicious. The autonomy of the States should be maintained. While the zonal councils can enable the representatives of the States to meet together to discuss matters of common interest and in order to foster and facilitate the process of development, the final word should rest with the States. The zonal councils should not impinge upon the orbit of authority of the States.

**Shri S. S. More :** Is the scheme of your zonal councils identical with the council visualised in article 263 ?

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** I do not know. The scheme is before you now, in the States Reorganisation Bill. It is slightly different from that inasmuch as the zonal councils are of a purely advisory character. Under this clause, there may be occasions when the body so formed may also carry some authority. We examined that. We found there was that possibility.

**Shri S. S. More :** That Council is meant for advice.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** If that difference does not exist, the two are alike. But, we have guarded against that possibility. I think there was need for that caution.

Some arguments were advanced, some with considerable vigour about the Centrally administered areas. I would have been surprised if sitting here in Delhi, all had forgotten Delhi, the big city which has a historical place in our annals. So, we all are anxious that the administration of Delhi should be conducted in an efficient, smooth, satisfactory, progressive manner.

**Shri Nambiar :** Not democratic ?

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** Also democratic as the entire administration of this country which is subject to the control, supervision, regulation and guidance of this House, is conducted on democratic lines. But, I may also state that I am myself anxious that so far as it may be consistent with the objective which I have just stated, the people may be associated with the administration of local affairs of Delhi. By local affairs I do not mean exactly what is meant by the subjects which come within the scope of local self-government. So, I share that desire too. I hope that they and we all will keep the real objective before us in framing a satisfactory scheme. It is after all the welfare and wellbeing of the common man, the security of the State and the maintenance of the dignity of the Metropolis which all have to be taken into consideration in framing the scheme for Delhi. One does not want only wish to restrict the authority of the people. Ultimately they are the source of all authority and the sovereigns of the land.

Something was also said about other States which are to remain under direct Central care. What I have said would generally apply to them. Manipur also has been pressing for some sort of a mechanism in which the people would have some little say. That will be borne in mind when we deal with this question. The Centrally administered areas are of various types and various grades and today they have the proud privilege of having Bombay in their list. So, they should not feel in any way depressed because they come within the category of Centrally administered areas. I would any day like to be an inhabitant or a citizen of any area which could be deemed to be at par, with Bombay, the greatest city in our country.

**Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi) :** Because of the feeling that Bombay is not going to be there permanently.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** I have not been able to follow. I think we may better talk outside, because the time is limited.

**Shri Radha Raman (Delhi City) :** What I meant, Sir, was that I am afraid Bombay is going.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** Going where? Going to Madras?

**Shri Radha Raman :** It is not going to be a Centrally administered area.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** Whether it goes to Maharashtra or whether it is to be Centrally administered, it will still be Bombay and we will have the privilege of regarding it as one of the most glorious cities in our country.

There was some suggestion made about the setting up of a boundary commission. We would very much like the new States that are being carved, to settle their boundaries by agreement. But, wherever necessary, we have the power under the Constitution to appoint boundary commissions and there would not be difficulty in suitable cases in taking such a step.

Certain observations were made about High Courts too. In the Bill, a different scale of salaries has been provided for certain States, such as Mysore and Travancore-Cochin. There, the judges are getting a lower salary than in other States. Rajasthan too comes within that category. Rajasthan wants the scale that is at present in vogue in other States to be extended to Rajasthan too. If the other two States express a similar desire, we will certainly be prepared to meet with their wishes. So, people have to persuade them to agree to this arrangement.

There is another matter concerning the High Courts, to which reference has been made. The Bill does not provide that every judge of the High Court will be reemployed in the new States. But there are judges of various types, and some of them who were serving in the old States before their merger were getting salaries amounting to a few hundreds of rupees only. The Chief Justice of India or some other judicial authority will perhaps like to be satisfied whether all those judges should be appointed on the new scales of salary, and whether they would all be sufficiently proficient and competent to discharge the duties of judges of the High Court. But otherwise, we have the intention of reemploying everyone, and also to take into account the service that has been rendered by them so far.

Some proposals have been made about zonal States. It has been suggested that all the States which are included in a zone should have one Governor, one Public Service Commission, and one High Court. I do not know if such a uniform rule would be practicable, because in some cases, the States which would come within a particular zone would be too many. But wherever the

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

States wish to have a common Governor or a common High Court or a common public Service Commission, we shall be prepared to comply with their wishes. But the wishes of the States will have to be taken into account in taking final decisions with regard to these matters.

The Raja Sahib of Patna referred to Seraikella and Kharswan. And in that connection, he said that the outbursts of violence should not come in the way of these States being transferred to Orissa. Even if there be no argument in support of the proposal, then the violence by itself may be regarded as an adequate argument in his view, because he has not refrained from inciting people for organising breaches of the law. And it is really regrettable that things should have taken such tragic, unfortunate and unseemly turn in Orissa, as nobody could ever have expected in that quiet and peaceful State.

**Shri R. N. S. Deo** (Kalahandi—Bolangir) : Who was responsible for inciting them to violence ?

**Some hon. Members** : You.

**Shri R. N. S. Deo** : Would the Home Minister appoint a tribunal to go into this question, and punish the guilty persons ?

**Pandit G. B. Pant** : I think it is one of the fashionable ways of shielding oneself and seeking some sort of refuge, to suggest the appointment. . . .

**Shri S. S. More** : Is this sort of unilateral accusation another fashionable way ?

**Pandit G. B. Pant** : This is not a unilateral accusation. So far as my statement goes, that is not disputed.

**Shri R. N. S. Deo** : It is disputed. I dispute that statement. I challenge that statement.

**Pandit G. B. Pant** : I have to say that a number of speeches were delivered asking people to break the law, and to break legitimate and lawful orders. If that is disputed, I should like to know.

**Shri R. N. S. Deo** : The incitement was made by Congressmen, by the reported resignation of the Congress Ministers, and by the Congress newspapers which came out with editorials like 'Sabash Congress'. That is how the incitement was made.

**Pandit G. B. Pant** : I am not holding a brief for the Congress. If the Congress did so, it did a wrong thing.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta** (Calcutta South-East) : The less said, the better.

**Pandit G. B. Pant** : I think at certain times it is better to have the whole thing out than to secrete it. I think that it was a very sorry and sad chapter in Orissa. And whoever pleads that violence should not come in the way of anything being done, having seen all that has happened there, is taking a tremendous risk. No responsible citizen can disregard the evil course that the country is bound to take, if violence leads to results which people want to achieve, if not in other ways, then through violence.

So far as other matters are concerned, such as those pertaining to services and so on, I do not think it is necessary for me to take more time of the House. The Bill will go to the Joint Committee, and it will be examined in all its aspects. As I have said, so far as the proposals contained in the Bill are concerned except as regards the city of Bombay, there has been little criticism. Whatever has been said is more of a helpful and friendly sort, of co-operative effort than condemnation of what has appeared in the Bill. I hope that the Joint Committee will further improve it, and by the time we reach the journey's end, we shall have solved the problem to the satisfaction of every sensible citizen of India.

It is a great task. It is a difficult task, and it is a delicate task. It is necessary for all of us to join hands, so that the new map of India may fully indicate the wisdom, the sagacity, and the far-sightedness of the people of this land and of the hon. Members who have the privilege and the opportunity of sitting in this House today. I hope that when this map appears in a concrete shape in the course of the next few months, it will fulfil the hopes and dreams of all of us, and it will lead the country on to a position which it deserves to occupy and enable all of us to work together for the uplift, the cultural, the material, the spiritual and the economic advancement of every citizen living in this land.

**Mr. Speaker** : I will first put the amendment to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That in the motion—  
after 'and 17 members from Rajya  
Sabha', add :

'with directions to include in the  
Bill such provisions for the amend-  
ment of the First and Fourth  
Schedules to the Constitution as  
may be necessary'."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** I beg to move  
two amendments to the list of names, as  
two Members, Shrimati Ammu Swami-  
nadhan and Shri V. N. Tivary are not  
in a position to serve on the Committee.  
In place of Shri V. N. Tivary, the name  
of Shri Algu Rai Shastri may be to  
be substituted and in place of Shrimati  
Ammu Swaminadhan, the name of Shri-  
mati Tarkeshwari Sinha may be substi-  
tuted.

I beg to move :

(i) That in the motion—  
for "Shri V. N. Tivary" substitute  
"Shri Algu Rai Shastri"

(ii) That in the motion—  
for "Shrimati Ammu Swamina-  
dhan" substitute "Shrimati Tar-  
keshwari Sinha".

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi** (Hamirpur Distt.)  
May I know what is the reason for  
which these Members have withdrawn  
from the Committee ?

**Shri Radha Raman :** They are not in  
Delhi.

**Mr. Speaker :** It is open to them to  
accept or not.

**Pandit G. B. Pant :** As regards Shri-  
mati Ammu Swaminadhan, she had her-  
self suggested that some lady Member  
should be there. In the circumstances,  
she thought that it would be awkward  
for her to be there; she also said that  
she might not be here when the Com-  
mittee met.

Shri V. N. Tivary said that he would  
not by himself alone like to be there.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi :** May I know the  
reason . . .

**Mr. Speaker :** What is this knowing  
about ?

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi :** The object has  
not been fulfilled. I want to know whe-  
ther any steps have been taken to ful-  
fil that object. Because he was the soli-

tary Member from a particular State  
on the Committee he felt that he would  
not be able to voice the grievances of  
his State. So many things are said in  
the S.R.C. Report. I want to know  
whether steps have been taken to satis-  
fy that demand.

**Mr. Speaker :** When a motion for ref-  
erence of a Bill to a Joint Committee is  
made, any hon. Member can speak on  
the subject-matter; he can say that so  
many hon. Members ought to be there;  
he can make further representations. But  
at this stage, it is not open to an hon.  
Member to ask for the reasons why a  
Member is not sitting on the Commit-  
tee. If the hon. Member wants four  
other members from a particular State  
to be there, he could have asked for it  
earlier. In stead of putting a question to  
the hon. Minister now, he could have  
said that Shri V. N. Tivary did not like  
to be alone and there should be four  
others along with him. There could  
be no objection to that at that stage. But  
when Shri V. N. Tivary refuses to stay  
there except on his own terms, how can  
we catch hold of his hands and keep  
him there ?

**Shri R. D. Misra** (Bulandshahr  
Distt.): On a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker :** Let me place the am-  
endments first before the House. Then  
I will hear the point of order.

**The Minister of Commerce** (Shri  
Karmarkar): It is a point of disorder.

**Mr. Speaker :** Amendments moved :

(i) That in the motion—  
for "Shri V. N. Tivary" substitute  
"Shri Algu Rai Shastri".

(ii) That in the motion—  
For "Shrimati Ammu Swamina-  
dhan" substitute "Shrimati Tar-  
wari Sinha".

What is the point of order ?

**श्री धार० डी० मिश्र :** जब यह बिल यहाँ पेश  
किया गया और उस पर डिस्कशन शुरू हुआ तो  
यहाँ पर यह कह दिया गया कि यू० पी० वालों  
को तो कुछ कहना ही नहीं है और उन को  
बोलने का मौका भी नहीं दिया गया। यहाँ पर  
हमारी स्टेट की तरफ से एक किताब बाँटी गई।  
जो हमारे लेजिस्लेचर ने यूनेस्कोस बात कही  
उसको भी यहाँ रखने का मौका हम को नहीं  
दिया गया। यहाँ अक्सर यह कहा जाता है कि  
यू० पी० तो सारे हिन्दुस्तान पर डामिनेट करता

[श्री आर० डी० मिश्र]

है। यह ठीक है कि यहां पर यू० पी० के ८६ मेम्बर हैं, लेकिन हम कभी भी यह नहीं चाहते कि हम किसी पर डामिनेट करें। मैं तो कहना चाहता हूँ कि यू० पी० भी तमाम देश का एक हिस्सा है और उसको भी सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लिये कुछ कहने को हक है। लेकिन बम्बई तक पर उस कुछ कहने का मौका नहीं दिया गया। उस के बाद जब कमेटी बनाई गई तो उस में भी एक ही आदमी रखा गया, यह समझ कर कि यू० पी० वालों को उस के ही सामने कुछ ज्यादा रखना नहीं है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यू० पी० वाले इस मामले में कुछ कहने एन्टाइटल्ड नहीं हैं ?

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no point of order. There may be 80 Members from U. P. One Member was chosen. The hon. Member forgets that the hon. Home Minister is equal to all the hon. Members put together.

**Shri R. D. Misra:** He is a member of the Government of India. He cannot plead anything for U.P. as such. Neither he nor the Prime Minister can say anything about it. Our point of view cannot be put by us before the House because the Chair does not allow us to speak.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. It is not so. The hon. Member was not so vehement during the debate as he is now after the close of the debate.

**Shri R. D. Misra:** I was not allowed to speak during these three days.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no desire to shut out any hon. Member or any particular section or State. Fifty-three Members have been allowed to speak I will allow other Members to speak on the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. Both of them put together will come to 80 or 85. As regards U.P., the only point was that some Members were anxious that U.P. should be cut. I do not want to enter into controversies over this matter. Also, as much enthusiasm as was shown in the case of Bombay was not shown with respect to that matter.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt. —West cum Rae Bareil Distt.—East):** May I suggest that the Home Minister invites individual Members from U.P. to express their opinion to the Joint Committee ?

**Mr. Speaker:** It is open to the Joint Committee to invite all the 80 members from U.P. to come and sit there.

**Shri R. D. Misra:** It is not so. When the Bill to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure was referred to a Joint Committee, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava and I went there. None of us was allowed to speak even.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon):** The rules are changed now. Previously any Member could go and take part in the discussion. But according to the new rules, a Member who is not on the Committee should sit mum and should sit separately.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sorry I did not follow the change. Anyhow, I will see how it could be avoided.

**Lala Achint Ram (Hissar):** It must be avoided. It is a great handicap.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Committee can invite all hon. Members who want to make their representations. I will instruct the Chairman of the Committee to give such opportunity to hon. Members. But, of course, they must be very careful not to disturb the proceedings.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** They should be allowed to participate in the proceedings.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is left to the Committee. It can take such evidence from any Member, not only members from outside the House. I leave it to the Committee. The Committee has ample powers to invite all hon. Members who have something to contribute so far as this matter is concerned. They have only to write to the Committee to allow them to make their representations.

Now, I will put the amendments to the vote of the House.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta:** On a point of order. Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan's name came in by way of an amendment itself. Therefore, the amendment has to be put separately by way of an amendment to that amendment. The amendment regarding Shri Algu Rai Shastri's inclusion should be put by way of an amendment to the motion itself.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member was not here then. As soon as the motion itself was made, this suggestion was made and afterwards it was treated as part and parcel of the motion itself.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi:** The two amendments may be put separately.



2 P.M.

**Mr. Speaker :** The question is :

That in the motion—  
for "Shri V. N. Tjvary" substitute  
"Shri Algu Rai Shastri"

Those who are in favour will say Aye.

**Several Hon. Members :** Aye.

**Mr. Speaker :** Those who are against will say, No.

**Some Hon. Members :** No.

**Mr. Speaker :** The Ayes have it.

**Shri Nambiar :** The Noes have it, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker :** I have already declared that Ayes have it.

**Shri Nambiar :** I stood up at once and said Noes have it, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker :** No. no. The voices were overwhelmingly 'for'.

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Speaker :** The question is :  
That in the motion—

for "Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan substitute 'Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha'".

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Speaker :** Now, the question is :

"That the Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 51 members; 34 from this House, namely, Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah, Shri H. V. Pataskar, Shri A. M. Thomas, Shri R. Venkataraman, Shri S. R. Rane, Shri B. G. Mehta, Shri Basanta Kumar Das, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Shri Algu Rai Shastri, Shri Dev Kanta Borooah, Shri S. Nijalingappa, Shri S. K. Patil, Shri Shriman Narayan, Shri G. S. Altekar, Shri G. B. Khedkar, Shri Radha Charan Sharma, Shri Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Shri Ram Pratap Garg, Shri Bhawanji A. Khimji, Shri P. Ramaswamy, Shri B. N. Datar, Shri Anandchand, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri P. T. Punnoose, Shri K. K. Basu, Shri J. B. Kripalani, Shri Asoka Mehta, Shri Sarangadhar Das, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri Jaipal Singh, Dr. Lanka Sundaram,

Shri Tek Chand, Dr. N. M. Jaisooriya, and Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha and 17 members from Rajya Sabha, with directions to include in the Bill such provisions for the amendment of the First and Fourth Schedules to the Constitution as may be necessary;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 14th May, 1956;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### CONSTITUTION (NINTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant) :** Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 51 members; 34 from this House, namely—"

and these are just the same which were mentioned when the last motion was put by you to the vote—

"Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah, Shri H. V. Pataskar, Shri A. M. Thomas Shri R. Venkataraman, Shri S. R. Rane, Shri B. G. Mehta, Shri Basanta Kumar Das, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Shri Algu Rai Shastri, Shri Dev Kanta Borooah, Shri S. Nijalingappa, Shri S. K. Patil, Shri Shriman Narayan, Shri G. S. Altekar, Shri G. B. Khedkar, Shri Radha Charan Sharma, Shri Gurmukh Singh Musafir, Shri Ram Pratap Garg, Shri Bhawanji A. Khimji, Shri P. Ramaswamy, Shri B. N. Datar, Shri Anandchand, Shri Frank Anthony, Shri P. T.