Ch. Ranbir Singh : In view of the fact that the Hon. Minister for Law has just expressed that co-operative societies may not be covered by the Public Companies Act, and as far as my information goes, I am definite that cooperative societies are registered under a different Act, may I know whether the shareholders of co-operative societies which hold contracts under any Government will be disqualified for contesting the elections or not ?

Several hon. Members: Not disqualified.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to know from the hon. Members who have moved amendments if any of them want to withdraw their amendments or they want me to put them to the House.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Sir, the matter of co-operative societies requires a little clarification. Dr. Ambedkar says that co-operative societies were not excluded. What is the meaning of the word 'exclusion' ; we do not understand. Will the director of.....

Dr. Ambedkar: There is no disqualification. None of the ' disqualifications would apply to them.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I beg for leave to withdraw the amendments.

Amendments were by leave withdrawn.

***Clause 9.** (*Disqualification for membership of electoral colleges.*)

Amendment made:

In clause 9, for the words "subject to any disqualification for membership of Parliament under any of the provisions of this Act" substitute the following:

"disqualified for being chosen as a member of either House of Parliament under any of the provisions of article 102."

—[*Dr. Ambedkar*]

---

*P. D., Vol. 12, Part II, 28th May 1951, pp. 9578-80.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 9, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 9 as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 122. (*Major corrupt practices*)

Dr. Ambedkar: I beg to move:

(i) In part (a) (i) of the proviso to sub-clause (2) of clause 122, after the words "injury of any kind", insert the words "including social ostracism and ex-communication or expulsion from any caste or community".

(ii) For sub-clause (6) of clause 122, substitute the following sub-clause :

"(6) The hiring or procuring, whether on payment or otherwise, of any vehicle or vessel by a candidate or his agent or by any other person with the connivance of a candidate or his agent for the conveyance of any elector (other than the candidate himself, the members of his family or his agent) to or from any polling station provided under section 23 or a place fixed under sub-section (*1*) of section 27 for the poll:

Provided that the hiring of a vehicle or vessel by an elector or by several electors at their joint costs for the purposes of conveying him or them to or from any such polling station or place fixed for the poll shall not be deemed to be a corrupt practice under this clause if the vehicle or vessel so hired is not propelled by mechanical power: Provided further that the use of any public transport vehicle or vessel or any tramcar or railway carriage by any elector at his own cost for the purpose of going to or coming from any such polling station or place fixed for the poll shall not be deemed to be a corrupt practice under this clause.

Explanation.—In this clause the expression "vehicle" means any vehicle used or capable of being used for the purpose of road transport, whether propelled by mechanical power or otherwise, and whether used for drawing other vehicles or otherwise."

Mr. Chairman: Amendments moved.

Dr. Ambedkar: I also beg to move:

(iii) For the Explanation to part (8) of clause 122, substitute the following:

"Explanation.—For the purposes of this clause—

(a) a person serving under the Government of India shall not include any person who has been declared by the Central Government to be a person to whom the provisions of this clause shall not apply;

(b) a person serving under the Government of any State shall include a patwari, chaukidar, dafedar, lambardar, zaiidar, shanbagh, karnam, talati, talari, patil, village munsif, village headman or any-other village officer, by whatever name he is called, employed in that State whether the office he holds is a whole-time office or not, but shall not include any person (other than any such village officer as aforesaid) who has been declared by the State Government to be a person to whom the provisions of this clause shall not apply."

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved :

These are all agreed amendments

*** Mr. Chairman :** Amendment moved :

In the amendment proposed by Dr. Ambedkar, in part (b) of the proposed Explanation to part 8 of clause 122, omit the words "Patil, village headman or any other village officer".

Shri Kamath : I have got amendments in supplementary list No. 3 to Consolidated List No. 2. I have got several amendments there but I will move only one of them. In Supplementary list No. 6 to Consolidated List No. 2 also I am moving only one of my amendments. And in supplementary list No. 6 to Consolidated List No. 2 also I have several amendments, but I am moving only one. I am not moving the rest. That is to say. I shall move amendment No. 5 in supplementary list No. 3 to Consolidated List No. 2, amendment No. 3 in supplementary list No. 4 to Consolidated List No. 2, and amendment No. 2 in supplementary list No. 6 to Consolidated List No. 2.

I will take No. 6 in supplementary list No. 3 first. I beg to move :

(i) In part (a) (ii) of the Proviso to part (2) of clause 122, for the words "an object of divine displeasure or spiritual censure", substitute the words "a victim of a divine curse'.

Dr. Ambedkar: I do not understand the difference between the two.

Shri Kamath: Now, Sir, I would like to point out that this apparently has been taken from the English law on the subject and also perhaps from the Indian Penal Code which

---

*P. D., Vol. 12, Part II, 28th May 1951, pp. 9582-83.

also borrowed it originally from English law. But in the English law the words used are "spiritual undue influence", and there it is clear because in Christian religion the words "spiritual censure" or "spiritual injury" have got a definite connotation. With regard to this "spiritual undue influence" it was held in England—where certain Roman Catholic priests exercised their religious influence on voters in a manner inconsistent with their religious duties as minister of religion—it was held to be "undue influence". "A priest may counsel, advise, recommend and point out the true line of moral duty and give the opinion about the candidate, but he may not appeal to superstition of the people he approaches." Now, Sir, India. I am not quite sure in my own mind .....

8-00 P.M.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not wish to interrupt, but I am total unable to follow what is happening in this House. I do not understand the relevance.

Shri Kamath: That is due to the time. I suppose. The Prime Minister is tired.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I just point out that I should like to understand, and I am not supposed to be unintelligent.

Shri Kamath: Nobody dare say so.

***Shri Sarangdhar Das:** The next amendment I have given notice of is to delete the proviso. I beg to move:

Omit the proviso to part (6) of clause 122.

I had given notice of this amendment to delete the proviso in the Bill saying:

> "Provided that the hiring of a vehicle or vessel by an elector or by several electors at their joint, costs for the purpose of conveying him or them to or from the polling station shall not be deemed to be a corrupt practice under this clause."

This proviso is right under sub-clause (6) of clause 122.

---

*P. D., Vol. 12, Part II, 28th May 1951, pp. 9590-91.

Shri Santhanam : His point is met by Dr. Ambedkar's new amendment because all mechanically-propelled vehicles have been excluded from this proviso. Therefore, a substantial part of his point has been met already.

Shri Sarangdhar Das: I do not agree. If my amendments are accepted then all the involvements in the Law Minister's amendment should go. Motor transport should be entirely banned. That is my amendment to the Bill as amended by the Select Committee. It is a very radical amendment.

Sir, I commend my amendment to the House.

Dr. Ambedkar: I do not accept it, Sir.

The motion was negatived.

***Ch. Ranbir Singh:** I beg to move:

In the Explanation to part (8) of clause 122, omit the words "chaukidar, dafedar, lambardar, zaildar".

Dr. Ambedkar: I do not accept the amendment.

Shri Satish Chandra (Uttar Pradesh)**:** I support the previous three speakers. I myself happen to be a lambardar. I have about ten villages in my zamindari and for each of them I am supposed to be the lambardar. Fortunately there is no co-sharer in most of them. I may be the owner of the entire village, but because I pay the land revenue to the Government I am called a lambardar according to Government revenue terminology. I have never imagined in my life that I am a Government servant or that I am in any official capacity connected with Government. Anybody who has to deposit land-revenue in the government treasury is known as lambardar in Uttar Pradesh. I do not know what is the system in other States. But in Uttar Pradesh any person who deposits land revenue in the government treasury either solely on his own

*P. D., Vol. 12, Part II, 28th May 1951, pp. 9592-95.

behalf or on behalf of his co-sharers in the village is known as lambardar. I do not know, in what sense exactly this word is inserted here. But if the word lambardar here means a zamindar who is responsible for the payment of land-revenue in Uttar Pradesh or elsewhere, it must be omitted.

Dr. Ambedkar: I would like to say a word about this. I do not quite understand why my friend Pandit Kunzru got into temper over this. He was a Member of the Select Committee. This clause was introduced by the Select Committee. It was a unanimous clause. All the Members of the Committee represented their different States. I can speak with authority, say, for instance, about Bombay or about Madhya Pradesh. I cannot speak with authority with regard to the other States. These names and categories of people were introduced by the Select Committee, by Members from the different States who knew what they were talking about. At any rate I take it that they knew what they were talking about. I did not include it on my own responsibility and I do not know how he charges me with the sort of thing about which he gave an utterance. (*Interruption.*) I have not done it. It was done by the Select Committee. The Punjab Members, the U.P. Members, they were all present and they said that lambardar should be included. I never included the lambardar on my own. But if the view of the House is that the lambardar is in no sense an official, I am quite prepared to omit it. But they must take the responsibility. I cannot take the responsibility. I have not examined the revenue laws of different States to find out if the lambardar is an official or not. If the view of gentlemen here who can speak with authority about their States is that lambardar is not an official. I have no objection to omit it. I have no interest in this.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: My hon. Colleague has more or less explained the position. We are not wedded to this long list of appellations half of which I have never heard of in my life. These were given by the Select Committee and they were adopted. We are perfectly prepared now or at the third reading

to go through the list very carefully in consultation with Members and to take' out such of them as ought not to be there.

Shri Bhatt: 'Patil' stands in a similar position.

Dr. Ambedkar: It will be possible to find out from the various States whether any of them are Government officials. But with regard to Patil I can say that I know it—and nobody knows more about Patils than I do.

Dr. Deshmukh : You do not know about Madhya Pradesh.

Dr. Ambedkar: I know about Madhya Pradesh also.

Some hon. Members : rose—

Mr. Speaker: We are now prolonging discussion of a point which deserves consideration but which can be disposed of by mutual goodwill and compromise in no time. What I would suggest therefore, to the Law Minister, if the House agrees and he agrees, is that we cannot settle just at the moment as to whether the lambardar should be taken out or the Patil should be taken out or other persons should be taken out. After all, as the hon. the Leader of the House has stated, these are various appellations by which these people are known. Members may informally discuss the matter. It is more or less a matter of form really and it may be taken up after two or three days when we take the Bill for third reading.

Dr. Ambedkar: It can be reserved till then.

Mr. Speaker : It need not even be reserved for that purpose. They can pass this clause. They are only formal matters and not matters of substance, the substantial thing being that, a government official holding an office of profit should not be there. I do not think we need take time over these things.

Dr. Ambedkar: What interest have I against the lambardar ? I am not a lambardar.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Dr. Ambedkar: I am an inferior village officer, if you want to call me under the Watan Act in Bombay.

Dr. Deshmukh: On a point of order, may I know what will happen now because you hurriedly put my amendment to vote and it was rejected by the House. Now that better sense is dawning on the House and everybody. I am grateful for the speech of my hon. Friend .....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is spoiling his own case by saying that better sense is prevailing in the House. That is not the way of compromise, of a peaceful settlement of affairs.

***Clause 123.**—(*Minor Corrupt Practices*)

Amendment made:

For sub-clause (5) of clause 123, substitute the following:

"(5) The systematic appeal to vote or refrain from voting on grounds of caste, race, community or religion or the use of, or appeal to, religious and national symbols, such as, the national flag and the national emblem, for furtherance of the prospects of a candidate's election."

Mr. Speaker: There is no other amendment, I think.

Shri Kamath: I have two amendments. Nos. 5 and 6 in Supplementary List No. 4 to Consolidated List No. 2. I am moving No. 5 only.

The motion was adopted.

I wish the draftsman would pay some attention to this to see whether it could not be modified so as to bring into within its purview, any person besides a candidate or his agent.

Dr. Ambedkar: I shall look that matter up.

Shri Kamath: If the draftsman will look into it, I would not press it.

Mr. Speaker: He may look into it. The motion was adopted.

Clause 123.—As amended was added to the Bill.

***Clause 124.**—(*Illegal practices*)

---

*P. D., Vol. 12, Part II, 28th May 1951, p. 9598

*P. D., Vol. 12, Part II, 28th May 1951, pp. 9599-9606.

Dr. Ambedkar: I beg to move :

To sub-clause (1) of clause 124, add the following:

"*Explanation*.—Any such expenses as aforesaid incurred or authorised by any institution or organisation for the furtherance of the prospects of the election of a candidate supported by such institution or organisation shall not be deemed to be expenses incurred or authorised within the meaning of this clause."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved.

Shri Kamath: I beg to move:

In part (2) of clause 124, omit the words "of any building".

I raised this point to the Select Comittee, but it was not considered at any length and not much attention was paid to it. I would state my difficulty precisely and briefly. I know of some buildings in Madhya Pradesh where the lower floor is converted into a wine or liquor shop and the upper floor has been leased out to certain persons or to students or to other people for different purposes. Can a meeting be held on the top floor of the building ?

Dr. Ambedkar: There is no such fear at all.

Shri Kamath: But it is open to doubt and I would like the Hon. Minister to omit the words "of any building" and thus avoid difficulties which it may be difficult to solve. The wording may be reconsidered so that the matter may be placed beyond the shadow of a doubt.

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved :

In part (2) of clause 124, omit the words "of any building".

Pandit Kunzru wanted to sav something ?

Pandit Kunzru: I was going to submit that the amendment proposed by Dr. Ambedkar is a very serious character and we ought to be given, in fairness time to consider it fully and to propose amendments to it. A mere perusal of the amendment shows that it will have a vital effect on many provisions of the Bill, and will seriously alter the balance between candidates of different parties. I suggest, therefore that we should be given time to consider this amendment. This is the only clause after all, that has not been passed and nothing will be lost and everything will be gained. I think,

if we are given more time to consider it and propose amendments to this provision.

Dr. Ambedkar: The position is quite clear. There is nothing which need give rise to any doubt. As a matter of fact, some people had doubts as to what kinds of expenditure may be included in the election expenses and it is this sort of provision that I was able to think of in order to remove their doubts. If my friend has any other suggestion to make, I would like to hear.

Mr. Speaker: What about Shri Kamath's amendment ?

Dr. Ambedkar: About the words "of any building" there need be no doubt. The words need not be omitted. There is no doubt about the matter at all.

Shri Kamath: This point was not discussed fully and it was added only at the last moment.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Sir, I have to move my amendment No. 153 for dropping sub-clause (3) of clause 124.

Mr. Speaker: He may move it.

Shri Santhanam: It may be put separately. Part 3 may be put separately instead of moving it and making a speech.

Dr. Ambedkar: My amendment may be put.

Mr. Speaker: At the time of voting I shall see to it.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I beg to move:

"Omit part 3 of clause 124."

My object in doing so is that issuing of any circular, placard or poster having a reference to election which does not bear on it the names and address of the publisher and printer is an illegal practice.

Mr. Speaker: If I mistake not, such provisions do occur in the election rules even to-day.

Dr. Ambedkar: Yes, there is nothing new.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: This entails a very serious consequences. If it will not do any harm to anybody, it should

not be an illegal practice. There is sufficient punishment awarded there but why should an innocent candidate be penalized, if some persons without his knowledge publish a circular saying 'vote for so and so' on the day of election and that would entail in the election being invalidated and his being punished with disqualification.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I wish to say that I do not think that we are in a position to delete this clause but all the same there is great force in the argument advanced by my friend Mr. R. K. Chaudhuri that if a person does this sort of thing, it should not affect the candidate unless the candidate has knowledge of it or he is conniving at it. It would be better to make it illegal under section 124.

In regard to section 99, this should not have any effect on the candidate. This was the general view in the meeting wherein this question was considered. I would therefore request that section 99 should be open for consideration later.

Dr. Ambedkar: That may be considered.

Mr. Speaker: That means this clause may be put as it is.

Pandit Kunzru: I strongly appose the amendment put forward by Dr. Ambedkar. You will see from the amendment that proposes is not that a party would carry on general propaganda in favour of its candidate. But that a party should be free to do what it can in support of particular candidates. That a party should in a general way, support its own candidates is recognised everywhere but that it should support particular candidates and that the expenditure incurred by it not on carrying on general election propaganda but in support of a particular candidate should not be shown in the return of the election expenses of that candidate raises a very important issue. In England too the rights of the various parties to incur expenses in connection with their propaganda is recognised. But the expenditure incurred in support of any particular candidate is according to the exposition of Dr. Ambedkar, to be shown in the return of the election expenses of that candidate. Is there any reason why we should follow a separate practice

9-00 P.M.

here ? It is obvious that it will give rise to graft and that it affects vitally many provisions of this Bill. That is why I ask, Sir, that the debate on this clause should be postponed so that we should be given more time to examine it and to put forward any amendments that we might think would secure the desired result without leading to a highly undesirable situation.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Hon. Minister want to say anything ?

Dr. Ambedkar: I have nothing to add to what I have said.

Mr. Speaker: Then I will put the amendments to vote. I will first put Mr. Kamath's amendment. The question is:

> In part (2) of clause 124, omit the words "of any building".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Then there is an amendment of Mr. R. K. Chaudhuri for deletion of paragraph 3.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I think that is accepted ?

Dr. Ambedkar: No, no. I do not accept it.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Then I want leave of the House to withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: I have not placed it before the House, so it falls through. Then I have to put to vote Dr. Ambedkar's amendment. The question is : (as shown on page 618-19).

> To sub-clause (1) of clause 124, add the following:
>
> "*Explanation*.—Any such expenses as aforesaid incurred or authorised by any institution or organisation for the furtherance of the prospects of the election of a candidate supported by such institution or organisation shall not be deemed to be expenses incurrd or authorised within the meaning of this clause.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That clause 124, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 124, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 132, 139 and 150

Mr. Speaker: Then there are clauses 132, 139 and 150. There are no amendments to these, so I will put them together.

The question is:

"That clauses 132, 139 and 150 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 132, 139 and 150 were added to the Bill.

Clause 167.—(*Power to make rules*)

Mr. Speaker: Now there is the amendment of Dr. Ambedkar to clause 167.

Dr. Ambedkar: I have moved it already. There was no criticism about it and I should like briefly to explain my position with regard to that With regard to this clause two or three questions were raised. One was with regard to an officer who has been transferred from the constituency in which his name had appeared in the register to some other place. The question was: what provision was going to be made for his voting ? The second question was with regard to a candidate who goes from one State to another State for the purpose of seeking election. There also, the same question was raised. Finally, there was the question with regard to a candidate who is moving in his own constituency for the purpose of canvassing and who is not present or who is not likely to be present at the polling booth where he is entitled to vote.

I asked the draftsman; the draftsman thinks that it is unnecessary to make a provision in this particular clause in my amendment because there is ample room in the general provision contained in clause 167 for making rules to cover all these cases. Therefore, it will be possible for the Election Commissioner under the rules to deal with these cases by rules and it is unnecessary to make any amendment here.

Shri Ethirajulu Naidu: I would like to mention clause 59 which deals with this particular matter. Would the Law Minister consider the advisability of making an amendment to clause 59 ? That clause refers to, *"Special Procedure for voting by certain classes of persons."*

Dr. Ambedkar: No, that is a separate clause altogether pertaining to those who are outside the country.

Shri Kamath: A reply is due to the amendment moved by me regarding the rules to be laid before Parliament.

Dr. Ambedkar: With regard to that the position is this. As everybody in the House knows, we are trying to do our level best to have the elections in November-December. Now, if the procedure suggested by my hon. friend Mr. Kamath, that the rules shall be placed on the table of Parliament and that they shall not have operative force and until Parliament has approved them, is adopted, it is quite clear that we may not be able to achieve the purpose we have in view, namely that the elections should take place in November-December. On that ground alone it seems to me rather difficult to accept the amendment that he has moved. But if he would be content with the assurance that Government will place the rules before Parliament, I am prepared to give that undertaking.

Shri Kamath: After they are placed before Parliament, will Parliament be competent to modify them ?

Dr. Ambedkar: I cannot give a categorical answer to that also—I feel some difficulty. It is this. Supposing, for instance, Government does take action under any rules that are framed and subsequently Parliament alters it. Then, what would happen to action already taken under the rules as framed ? Therefore it would be very difficult to tie down the hands of Government by any such condition as Mr. Kamath proposes.

Shri J. R. Kapoor: May I move an amendment to clause 167. I beg to move:

> After part (g) of sub-clause (2) of clause 187, insert the following new part (gg):

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What is the No. of the amendment.

Shri J. R. Kapoor: I gave notice of it some time back.

Mr. Speaker: I am not waiving any further notice.

Shri J. R. Kapoor: I am inclined to think that this may perhaps be accepted by the Hon. Minister.

Dr. Ambedkar: If it relates to contract, it has already been defined in the Contract Act.

Mr. Speaker: Is Government prepared to accept the amendment ?

Dr. Ambedkar: I cannot accept any amendment now.

Shri Kamath : If my amendment is negatived will it mean that Government will not place the rules before the House ?

Dr. Ambedkar: I have already said that Government will always be prepared to place it before the House.

Shri Kamath: If that assurance is given, I will not press my amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Kamath wishes to have leave of the House to withdraw his amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Now I will put Dr. Ambedkar's amendment. The question is:

> After part (c) of sub-clause (2) of clause 167, insert the following:
>
> "(cc) the manner in which votes are to be given by a presiding officer, polling officer, polling agent or any other person, who being an elector for a constituency is authorised or appointed for duty at a polling station at which he is not entitled to vote ;".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is :

> "That clause 167, as amended, stand part of the Bill. The motion was adopted.

Clause 167, as amended, was added to the Bill.

New Clause 34A

***Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** I beg to move :

After clause 34, insert the following new clause:

> "34A. (1) Any candidate aggrieved by an order accepting or rejecting the nomination paper of the candidate shall be entitled to file an appeal to the District Judge of the District in whose jurisdiction

*P. D., Vol. 12, Part II, 19th May 1951, pp. 9607-10.

the scrutiny of the nomination papers took place within four days of the passing of the order. The copy of the order shall accompany the petition of appeal if obtained or may be filed before the appeal is heard.

(2) The District Judge shall follow the procedure prescribed for hearing the appeals in the Code of Civil Procedure Act of 1908 and pass his final orders within fifteen days of the date of order cither accepting or rejecting the nomination paper.

(3) The District Judge shall forthwith send a copy of his order to the Returning Officer who shall immediately publish the same as prescribed under section 36.

(4) The decision of the District Judge shall be final and shall not be questioned subsequently by any election petition or otherwise."

In the original Bill this was the proposal of Dr. Ambedkar himself that so far as nomination is concerned it ought to be finalised and no election to petition should be allowed on the basis that at the time of nomination no proper order of acceptance or rejection was made. This is in keeping with the general sense of the House also. All the Members perhaps without exception want this, so that after the polling takes place and a person goes through the election no question may arise when the nomination may again be questioned. Before so many expenses are incurred and everything is gone through we should see that the nomination is finalised. I have therefore given a set of rules under clause 34A whereby the nomination may be finalised and there may be no election petition in regard to the proper acceptance or rejection of a nomination.

Dr. Ambedkar : I am very sorry that I have to oppose this amendment. As my friend, Pandit Bhargava said, it was I who first set in motion the idea of dividing the election into two parts, one relating to nomination and the other relating to actual poll. The Select Committee, however, without considering the matter came to the conclusion that that procedure should not be adopted. They found that there may not be sufficient time for a candidate whose nomination has been challenged on the ground that he is disqualified to produce evidence within the stated time in order to get a decision in his favour. At this very meeting, I think, Members will remember that the Chief Election Commissioner was

present; he was specially called to discuss this matter and he expressed himself opposed to this idea of having the nomination finalized before the election started. Thereafter I have also consulted him and he is absolutely of the opinion that elections would be delayed considerably if this procedure was adopted. Now, we are all agreed that the elections should take place in November-December, no matter what happens, and as the responsibility is cast upon the Election Commission to carry through this programme, it is rather very difficult for me to override the view that the Chief Election Commissioner has taken on that ground. I am sorry to say that I cannot accept the amendment, but I should like to say one thing to the House, namely that this law which we are making is not a law to be for ever. If we are not able to adopt this particular amendment for the present election, there is nothing to prevent us from having it introduced in this Act at a later stage, so that the new procedure may be followed in the next election. This law can be amended, added and substracted from. For the moment in view of the fact that we are all determined to have the elections in November-December, it seems quite impossible to introduce any such measure which may produce a dilatory effect.

Mr. Speaker : Do I put the amendment to the House then ?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: My amendment may be put to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved.

The motion was negatived.

Clause 1.—(*Short Title*)

Prof. K. T. Shah: I beg to move:

Re-number clause 1 as sub-clause (1) of that clause and add the following sub-clause as sub-clause (2):

"(2) This Act shall be translated into the principal languages of India as prescribed by the Constitution, and shall be published in every State of the Union in its regional language or languages as well as in the national language of the Union and English, within six weeks of its enactment into law:

Provided that all technical terms as defined or used in this Act shall be in Hindi with English equivalents in brackets in each case and that they shall be the same in all regional languages with their equivalents wherever available in brackets in each regional language.

Dr. Ambedkar: I have great sympathy with this amendment and I have no doubt that the various State Governments will take into consideration the suggestion contained in this amendment. But, I cannot see how I can agree to put it in the statute itself. Therefore, I must oppose it.

Mr. Speaker: The question is "That clause 1 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted

Clause 1 was added to the Bill. The title and enacting formula were added to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Now the House will have to adjourn. The House them adjourned till half past 9-00 of the clock on Tuesday, the 29th May 1951.

●●