

ARTICLE 67 (*reopened*)

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari** : Sir, I move:

“That clause (9) of article 67 be omitted.”

This clause (9) reads as follows:—

“When States for the time being specified in Part-III of the First Schedule are grouped together for the purpose of returning representatives to the Council of States, the entire group shall be deemed to be a single State for the purposes of this article.”

Sir, this will no longer be necessary and a contingency like this will be adequately provided for in article 3-B because I think there will be no necessity for providing for small States in the present state of the States, which are in Part-III. So clause (9) of article 67 may be omitted.

**Mr. President** : Does anyone wish to say anything about it?

The question is:

“That clause (9) of article 67 be omitted.”

The amendment was adopted.

ARTICLE 83 (*reopened*)

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari** : Sir, I move:

“That for sub-clauses (a) and (b) of clause (2) of article 83, the following be substituted:—

‘he is a Minister either for the Union or for such State’.”

Actually these sub-clauses (a) and (b) are fairly lengthy and this amendment, it is considered would serve the purpose.

**Mr. President** : Does anyone wish to say anything about it?

The question is:

“That for sub-clauses (a) and (b) of clause (2) of article 83, the following be substituted:—

‘he is a Minister either for the Union or for such State’.”

The amendment was adopted.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari** : Sir, I move:

“That in paragraph (iii) of sub-clause (d) of clause (3) of article 92, for the words ‘exercises or immediately the words ‘exercises jurisdiction within any area included in the territory of India or which at any time’ be substituted.”

Sir, this refers to article 92 which incidentally deals with the subject of the annual financial statement and here it is a matter which deals with pensions payable to judges and this amendment is considered necessary in view of the present circumstances. Therefore, Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** : The question is:

“That in paragraph (iii) of sub-clauses (d) of clause (3) of article 92, for the words ‘exercises or immediately’ the words exercises jurisdiction within any area included in the territory of India or which at any time’ be substituted.”

The amendment was adopted.

ARTICLE 100 (*reopened*)

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari** : Sir, I move.

“That clause (2) of article 100 be omitted.”

Sir, article 100 deals with restrictions on discussion in Parliament and this particular clause (2) reads thus:

“In this article the reference to a High Court shall be construed as including a reference to any court in a State for the time being specified in Part-III of the First Schedule which is a High Court for any of the purposes of Chapter IV of this Part.”

This is no longer necessary in view of the action taken by this House this morning. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President :** The question is:

“That clause (2) of article 100 be omitted.”

The amendment was adopted,

ARTICLE 248B (*reopened*)

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari :** Sir, I move :

“That in clause (2) of article 248B, after the word ‘Governor’ the words ‘or Rajpramukh of the State’ be inserted.”

An explanation for this is hardly necessary.

**Mr. President :** The question is:

“That in clause (2) of article 248B, after the word ‘Governor’ the words ‘or Rajpramukh of the State’ be inserted.”

The amendment was adopted.

ARTICLE 263 (*reopened*)

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari :** Sir, I move:

“That in clause (2) of article 263, after the word ‘Governor’ the words ‘or Rajpramukh’ be inserted.”

This clause deals with the custody of the Consolidated Fund of the States, and this change is necessary in view of the House having passed Part VI-A.

**Mr. President :** The question is:

“That in clause (2) of article 263, after the word ‘Governor’ the words ‘or Rajpramukh be inserted.”

The amendment was adopted.

SEVENTH SCHEDULE (*reopened*)

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari :** Sir, I move:

“That in List I of the Seventh Schedule, after entry 43, the following entry be inserted:—

‘43 A. Courts of wards for the estates of Rulers of Indian States’.”

Sir, in the present set-up of the States, and in view of the fact that there are a number of Rulers, who are no longer Rulers in the real sense but have only estates, imposes a particular liability on the Central Government in regard to the administration of those estates, should that be necessary by virtue of the minority of those who own the estates or some incapacity for one reason or another of such persons, and the provision that is now being put in, is analogous to entry 25 of List II by which the provinces hitherto have been exercising jurisdiction over estates of zamindars and owners of other big estates where minority or other factors had supervened. The same provision is now sought to be put in with regard to the estates of Indian Rulers. This power has necessarily to be exercised by the Government of India and it cannot be entrusted for various reasons to the Governments of the States concerned.

**Mr. President :** The question is:

“That in List I of the Seventh Schedule, after entry 43, the following entry be inserted:—

43 A. Courts of Wards for the estates of Rulers of Indian States’.”

The amendment was adopted.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari :** Sir, I move :

“That in List II of the Seventh Schedule, to entry 25 the following words and figures be added:—

‘subject to the provisions of entry 43 A. of List I.’”