

contain a list which will not dis-qualify, so that all other bodies will come under the ban That should be done

Sir, you have ruled my amendment as dilatory

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. That is history now

Shri A. C. Guha: History also repeats itself, so if I repeat

This matter has been before this House for a number of years The Constitution was passed in 1950 For eight years, we have been able to do without passing an Act of this sort If there is some more time taken to have a more logical, more rational, more perfect Bill that would fulfil the obligations of article 102, we should wait for that and the House will surely welcome such a Bill But, the Bill as it is, I think, should not be proceeded with This Bill does not fulfil the obligations of article 102 This Bill will not give any clear direction to the Government and will not give any clear indication of the policy of the Government even to the Members There are so many other Committees I do not know which of the Committees will come under the ban Somebody may say that it is a banned body As you have stated in your note, the law should be clear and unambiguous This is not a clear and unambiguous Bill So, I request the hon Minister in charge of the Bill to withdraw it and come before the House with a more logical and more practical Bill, so that the Members also may get real guidance and the House may also give proper guidance to the Members

In conclusion I wish to say that in framing this Bill we should not follow the pattern of the UK Our economy is of a different pattern from that of the U.K We cannot just follow their pattern. If we are really to

have a welfare State, surely Members of Parliament and Members of the legislatures will have to participate in different bodies for social work, for educational work, for health work, and they will have to be members of statutory and non-statutory bodies Moreover, if we are to have a socialist pattern of society, a number of Government enterprises will have to come into being and there also it is better that we depend on the legislators and public men rather than on the bureaucracy and men from the private sector That would be a worse remedy So, I hope Government will withdraw this Bill or radically amend it and come before the House with a realistic attitude and a properly framed Bill

Mr. Deputy-Speaker. This will be continued on Monday Now we take up Private Members' Business

14.32 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

TWENTY-NINTH REPORT

Sardar A S Saigal (Janjgir) I beg to move

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-ninth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 19th November, 1958"

Mr Deputy-Speaker. The question is

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-ninth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 19th November, 1958"

The motion was adopted