

CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY OF INDIA

Wednesday, the 17th November, 1948

The Constituent Assembly of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock, Mr. Vice-President (Dr. H. C. Mookherjee) in the Chair.

TAKING THE PLEDGE AND SIGNING THE REGISTER

The following Members took the pledge and signed the Register :

1. Shri B. H. Khardekar (Kolhapur State).
2. Shri A. Thanu Pillai (Travancore State).

DRAFT CONSTITUTION—*contd.*

ARTICLE 1—*contd.*

Mr. Vice-President : (Dr. H. C. Mookherjee): We shall now go on with the amendments. Amendment No. 126 — Prof. Shah.

Prof. K. T. Shah (Bihar : General): Mr. Vice-President, Sir, I beg to move:

“That at the end of sub-clause (c) of clause (3) of article 1, the following be added:
or as may agree to join or accede to or merge with the Union’.”

The clause, as amended, will read:

“such other territories as may be acquired or as may agree to join or accede to or merge with the Union.”

I think this is a very simple amendment. It tries to include within the territories of the Union not only those which are at present in it, or which, under the provisions of this Article, come under its scope; but also those which after the Constitution is passed may agree to join, or accede to, or merge with, the Union. I confess that I am not very enamoured of the term ‘acquired’. I do not suggest that acquisition is necessarily by conquest. I agree that acquisition may take place by other means than conquest. I have, therefore, not suggested any alteration of the word “acquired”.

At the same time, however, I feel that the term is not sufficiently inclusive. It does not take account, for instance, of the addition to the territory by voluntary agreement, or by accession of States, which, at the time the Constitution is passed, had not yet acceded and or were not merged with the Union. I have in mind two particular instances which have led me to table this amendment. There are neighbouring territories even today which are independent States, with which, however, we have much affinity. They may find in a closer union with us much greater chance of their own advancement or prosperity; and as such it is possible that they also may like to join this Union, and take all the benefits that joining with such a great State, with such resources as we have, may bring to them as well. There is in this suggestion no intention of coercion or conquest by any use of force, or aggressive designs upon any neighbouring territory, in an amendment of this kind. This is only a provision that, without any necessity to amend the Constitution, if some such contingency arose, we could simply under the existing provisions accept the joining or accession of such States as today are independent, sovereign States in their own name, in their own right; and which may yet feel the necessity of much closer union than any treaty or alliance may provide.

[Prof. K. T. Shah]

I trust, therefore, that this provision which is only permissive and facilitating the joining of other States, will find no objection in any part of this House.

Then there is the accession of States, which, at the time I put in this amendment, had not acceded to the Union. Everybody would understand the example I have in mind. Even now I am not clear whether that particular State has, in point of technical, constitutional law, actually acceded to the Union even today. Whatever that may be, here is a provision that the territories of the Union will include also such a State if and when it accedes.

The third contingency is of merger. This contingency of States completely identifying themselves to the point of sacrificing their own identity and becoming part and parcel, integral units, of this Union should I suggest also be provided for so that in the long run the Union should consist of parts which I hope would be equal *inter se*, making the components of the Union.

These three contingencies I have sought to provide for by this amendment, *viz.* States joining voluntarily, States acceding—which have not yet acceded, and States becoming merged in the Union, may arise at any time; and so I do not think this amendment will in any way be objectionable in any part of the House. The merger problem is ticklish, rather delicate, and we do not yet know what final shape this great development will take. But whatever that shape may be, the integrity of the Union, the integral association, if I may put it that way, of States which are still retaining somehow their separate identity, will help to make this Union territory much more uniform under single jurisdiction and the parts thereof much more equal *inter se* than is the case today. On these grounds, therefore, Sir, I think this amendment ought to commend itself to the House.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar (Bombay: General): Sir, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Vice-President : The question is:

That at the end of sub-clause (c) of clause (3) of article 1, the following be added:—

“or as may agree to join or accede to or merge with the Union.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Vice-President : As regards the next amendment, No. 127, standing in the name of Sardar Hukam Singh, I do not think it arises out of Article 1. It may be discussed at the proper time and place.

I think the same objection applies also to amendment No. 128, standing in the names of Shri B. A. Mandloi and Thakur Chhedi Lal. It can be discussed hereafter.

Now we come to amendment No. 129. Professor K. T. Shah.

Prof. K. T. Shah : Mr. Vice-President, Sir, this amendment which stands in my name is as follows:

“That the following proviso be added to article 1:

‘Provided that within a period not exceeding ten years of the date when this constitution comes into operation, the distinction or difference embodied in the several Schedules to this Constitution and in the various articles that follow shall be abolished, and the member States of the Union of India shall be organised on a uniform basis of groups of village Panchayats co-operatively organised *inter se*, and functioning as democratic ‘units within the Union’.’”

This also is part of the general idea I am trying to propagate. It tries to realise the ideals which I hope will commend themselves to the House, namely that, in the long run, this Union must consist of locally autonomous units, equal *inter se*, which will be the strength as well as the salvation of this country in my opinion.

Sir, it appears to me that in the various Schedules as well as in the various articles that follow, there is an obvious distinction between not only the old-time Provinces as they were called, but the old-time States whose designation is now sought to be applied to all the Members of the Union which are amongst themselves clearly not on an equal footing.

Now, there may be reasons why at the present time it is not possible to make them all, with one stroke of the pen so to say, equal by themselves and amongst themselves. I recognise the difficulty. I notice, however, that even in the Constitution, and in the reports of the Experts Committee and others, the intention obviously is to see that even though at the present time there may be these difficulties, within a given period—I have given here the period of ten years—within a given period these differences, should disappear, and the country reorganised on a uniform basis. These differences, at the present time, hinder not only the uniformity of jurisdiction of authority and of working but I suggest it will also impede the developing of the country for lack of this very uniformity. Whatever, therefore, may be the heritage of the past, and whatever may be the restricting, conditioning factor of today which compels us to recognise these inequalities between the member States, I suggest that we must make up our mind, and this Constitution should provide that these differences, these inequalities, these variations, must disappear, and that too within a pre-determined, within a given period of ten years.

The ten-year period suggested is sufficiently long not to cause any difficulty in smoothing away the present differences. The ten year period would be sufficient to readjust the tax systems, the ten year period would be sufficient to readjust if necessary the judicial systems, the legal and fiscal systems, the ten year period would be sufficient to readjust all differences in communications, transport, and other common factors which at the present time do cause a great deal of variation, and, in my opinion, a great deal of hardship, impediment and heart-burning as between the various units. To give you but one instance, it has been recently held by many people that the existence of the States as independent jurisdictions leads to considerable evasion of taxation; or, what is worse, that it leads to an artificial attraction of industry from one area into another, where the taxes are believed to be lower or where other facilities for the growth of industry are easier or greater. These arise not from the inherent qualities, resources, or peculiarities of those regions; these arise not from the natural differences that cannot be abolished by human effort; they arise simply and solely because there are varying jurisdictions, which permit all these differentiations to go on accumulating.

As I have already suggested, their presence is bound to work against the best long range interests of the country, which seeks to march forward, which seeks to make a uniform plan for all-round development within a given period. And therefore it is but right and proper that we should try and eliminate these traditional differences, so that within the stated period we should attain the goal that we have in view.

I have already stated that these differences are of human creation. They are legacies of the past. But as these are impediments in the way, they must be removed at the earliest opportunity. The period of ten years is long enough for making constructive efforts to readjust and make more or less uniform the various units that compose the country as between themselves.

In trying to reconstruct and readjust these various units, I have further suggested that they should be re-organised. The moment we have an opportunity to do so, we must re-organise them into autonomous village groups, which would have more natural geographical affinity amongst themselves and

[Prof. K. T. Shah]

more economic sympathy amongst themselves than happens to be the case in the *ad hoc* creations which we call either provinces or States.

We have in this regard a burning problem already causing considerable amount of difficulty in the reconstruction of the units or provinces on what is called linguistic basis. The constitution of the provinces on a linguistic basis is not by itself a guarantee that the intrinsic unity of each region or group will be properly developed; and, what is more, that the principle of democratic self-government of the *people*, by the *people*, for the *people*, would be equally promoted, if these various units are reconstructed on any other basis but that of local unity, local affinity, and local identity of interest. It is for that reason that I am suggesting the re-grouping, the reconstruction and the re-adjustment on a village basis.

The constitution of the villages on a co-operative basis, enabling them to make common cause, make of them a sort of internal republics so to say,—*imperium in imperio*, if I may use the expression,—would be the best guarantee for the development that we have in view. They would be able to take note of the local resources, the local talent, and the local possibilities much better than any distant Government, like the one at the Centre or even at the provincial headquarters even of the size that many of them in our country are.

Sir, remarkable is the emphasis that our great leaders have laid upon the re-vitalisation of the villages. As such I think I am following very honoured foot-steps, if I put forward this ideal before you, and invite you to consider the possibility of re-developing the State in the only manner in which in my opinion it can be assuredly developed, *e.g.*, on the basis of co-operative village reorganisation, forming groups sufficiently strong and big to enable them to progress among themselves, and realise the ideal of a better standard of living that we have been hoping and striving for all these years. I commend this proposition to the House.

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar (Madras : General): Sir, I agree with the suggestion that, early or late, we must re-organise this country on a system of village panchayats. But today there are not such panchayats. That being so, if today we are told that within a period of ten years, to be provided for in the Constitution itself, all distinction should be abolished, it would not be a practical proposition. Myself and Professor Ranga have given notice of an amendment to the Directive Principles to the effect that the State shall take care to see that village panchayats are re-organised and re-established every-where, so that, as far as possible, in the interests of democracy, the villages may be trained in the art of self-government, even autonomy. In that way there may be development of villages. But, in the substantive portion of the Constitution itself, to say that the distinction between State and State should be abolished and the whole country re-organised on the village autonomy basis, is a different thing. We cannot do this immediately. The villages are unfortunately torn by factions and there is nothing like responsibility there now. Under the circumstances I do not want to say anything more than what Dr. Ambedkar has said. He is a bit too pessimistic; I do not agree that we can never reform the villages and develop them for self-government. We must be able to reform the villages and introduce democratic principles of government there. It will all take time. Therefore, now to say that all the existing differences should be abolished at once, is too much to accept. We also expect that, with the indefatigable energy shown by Sardar Patel, the distinction between the States and Provinces will automatically disappear. But let us not rush matters too much. The differences are disappearing fast and popular Governments are coming into existence everywhere. At this rate I am sure that before ten years elapse there will be no difference between either

Prof. K. T. Shah or any one sitting on the other benches as regards the ultimate goal that we should reach.

The only question is about the method and pace with which this object should be achieved. I would appeal to him not to press the amendment. We are all engaged on the common task of attaining the absolute sovereignty of the people including those in States. We must devise different methods to suit local needs and conditions. This country will ultimately consist of a number of village republics, autonomous as far as possible, knitted into a number of States with a Union at the Centre. We do derive all authority from the people who must be trained in the art of government and the responsibility must flow from them. But this amendment is premature. I therefore request Professor Shah not to press his amendment. If he does not do so, I am sorry I shall be obliged to oppose it.

Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena (United Provinces : General): Sir, in this amendment, Professor Shah has enunciated two important principles: one is that after ten years he expects the Government of India to attain a particular shape and hopes that it shall be organised on the basis of groups of village panchayats, organised *inter se*, and functioning subordinately to the Union. Sir, with these two principles I think most Members will agree. I have myself given notice of certain amendments wherein I have stated that after ten years, many of the principles embodied in the Constitution would be in operation and would have the force of law. Similarly, also we have provided elsewhere in our amendment that the present system of village administration should be organised on the basis of village panchayats. It was pointed out to the House the other day that we want the Republic of India to be based on small village republics having autonomy. But I do feel that the law as it stands here is vague and should be amplified. Therefore I suggest that instead of putting this in this omnibus form, Mr. Shah should bring in amendments to the various clauses where these should be inserted. I personally agree with the two principles, firstly, that the distinction embodied in the several schedules should be abolished, and secondly, that village panchayats should find a place in the Constitution and that everywhere a uniform method of forming village panchayats should be adopted. In fact in the Gandhian Constitution which is proposed by Professor Aggarwal, he points out that Mahatma Gandhi wanted that there should be village republics. He envisaged that for about every 20,000 people there should be a panchayat and these units should elect the Taluk panchayats and the district panchayats. I agree that these panchayats should find a place in the Constitution and should also have some voice in the election of the Upper House, but I think in this place it is not proper to say that the distinction embodied in the schedules should be abolished. That, I think is going too far, apart from its being very vague. Instead of this, I would suggest that Mr. Shah should table amendments to the various schedules when they are taken up. I hope Mr. Shah will not press his amendment.

Maulana Hasrat Mohani (United Provinces : Muslim): Sir, I beg wholeheartedly to support the amendment proposed by Professor Shah where he says that the member States of the Union of India shall be organised on a uniform basis of groups of village panchayats co-operatively organised. I would like to go a step further and say that instead of making the village panchayat a unit, we should make a village Soviet as the unit of our Constitution. It will not be out of place to point out to you that I approached Mahatma Gandhi and presented to him the Soviet Constitution and discussed with him all the points contained in that Constitution. He agreed that at least accepted two principles of that Soviet Constitution. One of those two principles was, "No work, no vote". The second thing was that our unit must be a village Soviet and he said that the Constitution of the Soviet was quite similar to the Constitution of

[Maulana Hasrat Mohani]

the All-India Congress Committee here, as we have got village Congress Committees which elect representatives to the Tehsil Congress Committees; the Tehsil Congress Committees elect their representatives to the District Congress Committees, the District Congress Committees to the Provincial Congress Committees and the Provincial Congress Committees to the All-India Congress Committee. The same process has been adopted by the Soviet Constitution. Every village there is a self-sufficient Village Soviet. It sends its representatives to the higher Soviets. If we give up this idea of the village panchayats and accept the village Soviet as our unit, all these absurdities which exist in the Constitution by way of provision for minorities, etc. will disappear. With this suggestion, I wholeheartedly approve and support the amendment proposed by Professor Shah.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar : I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Vice-President : I will now put the amendment to the vote. The question is :

That the following proviso be added to article 1 :—

“Provided that within a period not exceeding ten years of the date when this constitution comes into operation, the distinction or difference embodied in the several Schedules to this Constitution, and in the various articles that follow shall be abolished, and the member States of the Union of India shall be organised on a uniform basis of groups of village Panchayats co-operatively organised *inter se*, and functioning as democratic units within the Union.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. Vice-President : The next one is number 130. Mr. Mandloi.

Shri B. A. Mandloi (C. P. & Berar : General): Sir, I am not moving it.

Mr. Vice-President : Let us now go back to the amendments which we did not take into consideration on Monday. No. 83.

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar : I suggest that these may be allowed to be held over and that article 1 may be put to the vote now.

Mr. Vice-President : Please allow me to proceed. No. 83 deals with script and language. This may be discussed at the proper time when we discuss the question of language and script under article 99. Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad.

Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad (West Bengal: Muslim): Sir, I move:

“That at the beginning of the heading above article 1, the word and Roman figure ‘CHAPTER I’, be inserted.”

Sir, I submit this raises an important question of drafting. Honourable Members will find that in the Draft Constitution chapter numbers are not continuous. There are many places where there is no chapter number but there are some cases where there are several chapters and they are numbered separately. The result of this is some amount of confusion. If we number the chapters consecutively apart from the Parts to which they appertain, the advantage will be that, if we refer to a particular chapter, it will be enough indication of the chapter belonging to that particular Part. If we however retain the existing numbering, the result would be that we have to say Chapter I of Part III, Chapter III of Part IV, etc. I submit, Sir, it would be more advantageous to adopt running chapter numbers in the Draft Constitution. That would be highly advantageous from a practical point of view. Sir, I have before me many samples of Indian enactments. The practice in India has been uniform in this respect, though I must point out so far as the existing Government of India Act is concerned, the present draft follows the practice in England. There is in that Act no contiguous running chapter numbers as in Indian practice.

Coming, Sir, to the various enactments, with which everybody is familiar, namely, the Civil Procedure Code, the Criminal Procedure Code, the Evidence Act and all other Acts, Members will find that these Acts are divided into several parts. The chapter numbers are not individually and separately numbered and although there are several parts, the chapter numbers are continuous. The result is an enormous simplification in the matter of citation. In the Criminal Procedure Code and in the Penal Code and in other Acts, we refer to certain chapter number without reference to the parts to which they belong. I submit this is the universal practice in India. There are many other Acts which are divided into Parts but the chapters bear running numbers. Considered, therefore, from the point of view of established practice in India and the point of convenience in the matter of citation, I think the chapters, irrespective of the Parts to which they belong, should bear consecutive numbers. This is a matter of convenience and I thought it my duty to place my views before this House. With these few words I commend my amendment to the acceptance of the House.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar : Sir, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Vice-President : The question is:

“That at the beginning of the heading above article 1, the word and Roman figure ‘Chapter I’, be inserted.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Vice-President : I find that so far as item No. 85 is concerned the first part of it may be moved as the other portion has been disposed of already. I therefore call upon Mr. Lokanath Misra to move the first part.

The Honourable Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (United Provinces : General): Sir, I move that we now pass on the Article 2 and postpone discussion on the remaining amendments to Article 1. So far we have not been able to reach unanimity on this important point. I am not without hope that if the discussion is postponed, it may be possible to find some solution that may be acceptable to all. So, nothing will be lost. After all we have to take the decision, today, tomorrow or the day after: nobody will suffer thereby, but if we can find something that satisfies everybody, I think the House will feel all the stronger for facing the tasks that lie ahead of it. I hope there will be no difference of opinion on this point and I do not see why there should be any opposition from any quarter. After all, we will take the decision. Nobody else is going to add to or diminish the strength of any section or of any group here, and we are not here as sections or groups. Everyone of us is here to make the best contribution towards the solution of these most intricate, complicated and difficult problems and if we handle them with a little patience, I hope we will be able to settle them more satisfactorily than we would otherwise. So, I suggest that the discussion on the rest of the amendments to Article 1 be postponed.

Shri H. V. Kamath (C. P. & Berar : General): Mr. Vice-President, Sir, I appreciate the arguments that have been advanced by my honourable Friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant. I only wish to know from you, Sir, for how long a time these amendments Nos. 85 to 96 both inclusive are going to be held over. It will create, I submit, Sir, a very bad impression in the outside world and in our own country, if we go on postponing the consideration of the amendments dealing with the very first word in the very first clause.

Honourable Members : No, no.

Shri H. V. Kamath: And if we go on postponing the consideration of these amendments indefinitely, it would certainly create a bad impression. I want to know, therefore, for how long it will be held over.

Shri R. K. Sidhwa (C. P. and Berar : General): Sir, I am rather surprised at the argument advanced by my honourable Friend, Mr. Kamath that if we

[Shri R. K. Sidhwa]

postpone this matter indefinitely the outside world will be rather surprised. On the contrary, if we come to a satisfactory solution and a unanimous decision on this matter, the outside world will have really a very high opinion of this House. I feel, therefore, that the suggestion made by my honourable Friend Pandit Pant should certainly be accepted unanimously. I am rather surprised that of all persons Mr. Kamath should have come forward to speak in this manner. What Pandit Pant stated was really a very fine solution and I was expecting from this House that instead of creating any kind of dissension, if we really come to a unanimous decision, it will be really a record in the history of this Constitution. I therefore, very heartily and strongly support the motion moved by my honourable Friend, Pandit Pant.

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar : I support the suggestion made by Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.

Seth Govind Das (C. P. & Berar : General): Sir, I wholeheartedly support Pandit Pant's proposition. The House very well knows how clear I am for naming our country BHARAT, but at the same time, we must try to bring unanimity of every group in this House. Of course, if that is not possible, we can go our own ways; but up to the time there was any possibility of reaching a unanimous decision by any compromise, that effort must be made. Sir, I support this proposition, and I hope that by the efforts of our leaders, there will not be any division on fundamental points like this, and not only this proposition, but other propositions also, like that our national language, national script etc., we shall be able to carry unanimously. I, therefore, support the views just expressed by the Honourable Pandit Pant.

Shri H. V. Kamath : I only wanted to know for how long the amendments will be held over.

An Honourable Member : It may be a day, a week or a fortnight.

Mr. Vice-President : I hold that a discussion of these few clauses should be held over till sufficient time has been given for arriving at some sort of understanding. This will be to the best interests of the House and of the country at large.

Shri Lokanath Misra (Orissa : General): Sir, I have a submission to make. If it is your decision, Mr. Vice-President, Sir, that my amendment is not to be moved, or that it is to be held over, I have no objection. Of course, I agree that my amendment consists of two parts, changing the name of India, and some other things. I am very glad that this change of the name is being held over so that we may come to some unanimous decision which will be pleasant to all. But, I submit, I should be allowed to move the rest of the amendment. That is in no way similar to the amendment moved by Professor K. T. Shah. If I had really known that, I would have said what I have to say when he moved that amendment. I, therefore, request you kindly to allow me to move the rest of the amendment, without amending the name of India.

Mr. Vice-President : Apart from the language employed, I consider that what is said in your amendment is substantially the same as what was said in the amendment of Professor K. T. Shah. It has been discussed. It cannot be discussed again.

Shri Lokanath Misra : That is taking one by surprise.

Article 2

Mr. Vice-President : The next motion is:

That Article 2 stand as part of the Constitution.

Shri H. V. Kamath : Article 1 may be put to vote.

Mr. Vice-President : That Article has been postponed. It cannot be put to vote now till all the amendments are considered.