

[The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar]

would be a State also. In order to distinguish the sense in which we have used the word we have thought it desirable to speak of 'State' and also 'the State'. Honourable Members will find this distinction also made in Article 12 of the Constitution. There we say:

"No title shall be conferred by the State;

No citizen of India shall accept any title from any foreign State."

There we do not use the words "the State"; but in the first part we use the words 'the State'. We do not want any of the authorities, either of the Centre or of the provinces, to confer any title upon any individual. That being the distinction, the House will realise that the retention of the words 'the State' in Article 28 is in consonance with the practice we have adopted in drafting this Constitution.

**Mr. Vice-President :** I shall now put these three amendments to vote. The question is:

"That in article 28, the words 'unless the context otherwise requires' be omitted."

The amendment was negatived.

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

"That in article 28, for the word 'requires' the word 'indicates' be substituted."

The amendment was negatived.

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

"That in article 28, for the words 'the State', the word 'State' be substituted."

The amendment was negatived.

**Mr. Vice-President :** I shall put Article 28 to vote. The question is:

"That article 28 form part of the Constitution."

The motion was adopted.

Article 28 was added to the Constitution.

### Article 29

**Mr. Vice-President :** The House will now take up Article 29 for discussion. Amendment No. 847 for the deletion of Article 29 is out of order.

Professor K. T. Shah may now move his amendment.

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

"That for article 29, the following be substituted:

'29. The provisions contained in this Part shall be treated as the obligations of the State towards the citizens, shall be enforceable in such manner and by such authority as may be deemed appropriate in or under the respective law relating to each such obligation. It shall be the duty of the State to apply these principles in making the necessary and appropriate laws.' "

In submitting this motion to the House, I would in the first place express my sense of keen appreciation of Dr. Ambedkar's remarks made a few minutes ago, wherein he not only insisted that we should not leave such matters as mere pious principles, but also should make them a sort of directive, which, though the word mandatory is not used, may amount to that state. I was a little unhappy when, on a previous occasion, the learned Doctor was pleased to say that the Constitution was not a document for embodying such principles. It seems that the course of conversion operates very swiftly with a brain so alert, an intelligence so sharp a mind so open to new ideas as that of the learned Doctor. That is why I am very happy to express my sense of keen appreciation for the rapid conversion that he has exhibited today in agreeing to find

a place for enforcement in the Constitution. In fact he has gone a step further: and, though he does not admit their place in the name or designation of the Constitution, he has been pleased to make that as a positive thing, the enforcement of such principles, fundamentals as they are called, in the Constitution.

Having expressed this, Sir, I hope that Dr. Ambedkar would also see the advisability of accepting my amendment that this article 29, which I regard as an insult to the entire Constitution, be substituted by what I have suggested.

Sir, article 29 makes it quite clear, in the opening phrase, that no court can enforce these ideals. That is to say, the only authority that we are going to set up in the Constitution, to give effect to whatever hopes and aspirations, ambitions and desires, we may have in making these laws and in laying down this Constitution, is from the very start exempted, exonerated and excused from giving effect to one of the most cardinal, important and creative Chapters of this Constitution. We have suffered from a hundred years of exploitation; we have suffered from a hundred years of denial and exclusion. Now that we are coming into our own, we insist—I hope the House will join me in the intention—that the night of darkness shall pass away and that from the very first rising of the sun on the horizon, even from the first glimpse of dawn, we shall make up our minds, we shall gird up our loins to give effect to all the hopes that our leaders in the past have expressed.

Sir, certainly it would not be in consonance with such a hope as this to lay down, at the very outset, in a Chapter like this, that no court shall be entitled to give effect to our hopes and aspirations. If I may say so without any offence, it is a kind of provision which encourages the Court and also the Executive not to worry about whatever is said in the Constitution, but to act only at their own convenience and on their practicability, and go on with it. It looks to me like a cheque on a bank payable when able, *viz.*, only if the resources of the Bank permit. I do not think that any authority connected with the drafting of this Constitution would approve of such a provision being incorporated in the Negotiable Instruments Act authorising the making of a cheque payable when able. It seems to me that unless my amendment is accepted, this Chapter would be nothing else, as it stands, but a mere expression of some vague desire on the part of the framers that, if and when circumstances permit, conditions allow, we may do this or that or the third thing. There is nothing mandatory,—with all deference to those who have spoken in support of the retention of the word ‘directive’ in the title of the Chapter—or compulsory, included in the various provisions. Sir, in the absence of any such mandatory direction to those who may have the governance of the country hereafter, it is quite possible that all these things for which we have been hoping and striving all these years may never come to pass, at any rate within our lifetime. This is an attitude which no lover of the people would care to justify, would dare to justify.

I suggest, Sir, that many things look impracticable until they are tried, and become practicable if they are tried. Nothing in practice is practicable until it is tried. Take even the elementary right to education which every civilised Government is now undertaking to provide for the children of the nation. Even this right to compulsory primary education has been provided for in such a clumsy, half-hearted and hesitating manner that one wonders whether the framers of this Draft were at all anxious that the curse of ignorance that has rested upon us all these years should be removed at all. The provision made here just permits the State, even within the period of ten years, only to “endeavour” to give effect to this aspiration. Even there it is not compulsory, even such an elementary right as the right to primary education for every child in the nation is not mandatory. As such I feel Sir, that unless some change is made, unless you make these preemptory obligations mandatory duties of the State, the State or the constituent parts of it may not at all attend to these duties of the State. These are most elementary duties in my opinion, duties

[Prof. K. T. Shah]

which are most primary duties, if I may say so, most sacred that no one should try to insult this House by suggesting these are not practicable.

Then, Sir about the absence of any sanctions as another learned friend put it. An old English writer—it was Walter Bagehot, I think,—who wrote in a classic chapter of his book on the English Constitution that Parliament votes every year large sums of money to the Crown, but there is no sanction or authority for anybody to compel the Crown that the sums shall be spent. I agree. There is no constitutional authority laid down so far in the unwritten Constitution of England that the sums voted shall be spent. But does anyone think that because there is no legal sanction, any Minister in his senses would for a moment suggest that these sums need not be spent, or that the so-called prerogatives of the King like dismissing any officer of the State would be used now arbitrarily as they had been in the past?

I mention this illustration, Sir, merely to emphasis the fact that it rests with you whether or not you are resolved that no longer shall the curses that have rested upon us so far will continue, for a moment longer than we can afford or than we can possibly help. It is no use putting down these mere pious hopes and aspirations or general directives that may be enforced if and when circumstances permit. It is possible that circumstances will never permit until you compel them to permit you. That is why from the very start I would lay down that these shall be mandatory, compulsory obligations of the State, which every citizen will have the right to demand should be fulfilled, and if today you think of no sanction, if today you can devise no means by which they can be enforced except perhaps by the periodic general elections when Ministries may be turned out for not fulfilling these duties, then it is up to you to devise something. Where there is a will—to repeat the trite old saying—there will always be a way. It is either bankruptcy of intelligence if you say that you cannot find a way; or it is really a genuine lack of desire to make good what we have been hoping and striving for.

There may be many in this House—I am sure Dr. Ambedkar is the foremost amongst them—who will remember that when the late Gopal Krishna Gokhale first brought forward the Bill for compulsory primary education, the then officials of the then Government of India gave all sorts of reasons why such a step was simply impracticable. One of the arguments was that an expenditure of three crores spread over ten years, that is rupees thirty lakhs a year, was too heavy a burden for the Government of India's finances at that time to bear. But within four years of that, however, they were wasting not three crores but more than thirty crores over the war in which we had no concern and about which we were not consulted.

That was the case when we were powerless, when we were helpless in our own country. That position, however, is changed today, and I hope the Ministers of the new Government of India, the Ministers of the Government of free India, the legislators of the Republican India, will not now rest content with merely expressing these pious wishes. If there are difficulties in the way, they are only meant to be overcome. These difficulties should not be allowed to stop our progress at any cost. Hence it is that I would like to invite the House to agree with me that the provisions contained in this Chapter must be regarded as the Obligations of the State towards every citizen and *vice versa*. Every citizen should have the right to compel the State to enforce these obligations by whatever means may be found practicable and effective, and conversely the State also should have the right to see that every citizen fulfils his obligations to the State.

There is only one more word that I have to say and I have done. My Honourable Friend Mr. Rohini Kumar Chaudhary expressed his keen sense of

appreciation yesterday for the gang of thieves who are operating between Calcutta and Delhi, and he warned me they may do so also between Bombay and Delhi. I am deeply grateful for the solicitude that he had expressed on my account as well as on that of another Honourable Member. I can only assure him that his apprehensions are groundless, because I am not in the habit of just travelling in a railway compartment with my amendments in an attache case under my head. I carry them mostly in my own head. Unless therefore the thieves take a highly expert surgeon with them, who can remove the amendments from my brain; they cannot take away my amendments; and the House will not be spared—certainly Mr. Rohini Kumar Chaudhary will not be spared—the necessity of going through these amendments. May I also add without any offence that the loss of these amendments is not the loss of Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad or myself. It is the loss of the House, because those of us who have come here and put forward these amendments are not doing them for fun or mischief, but have put brains and intelligence into them.

**Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad** : I wish to speak on my amendment, though I do not wish to move it.

**Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** : A similar amendment for substituting the words “every State” for the words “the State” was moved and negatived.

**Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad** : It depends upon the context.

**Mr. Vice-President** : If you insist on speaking, you may do so.

**Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad** : I won’t take more than one minute, Sir.

**Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** : I submit that the President has always got the right to disallow in order to avoid frivolous amendments. This matter has already been considered by the House. It has been disposed of and except for the purpose of taking the time of the House, there seems to be nothing else behind it. I submit that there is no substance in Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad’s amendment, and if it is still being persisted, then I want your ruling.

**Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad** : I very much regret that my attempt to explain is being regarded as dilatory.

**Mr. Vice-President** : I suggest you proceed without paying any attention to what he says.

**Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad** : Sir, I beg to move:

“That in article 29, for the words ‘the State’, the words ‘every State’ be substituted.”

I fully admit the force of the remarks of Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, but I am compelled to place before the House a certain difficulty. Article 29 says that it shall be the duty of the State to apply these principles in making laws. Then the State means one State, but here there are a large number of States.

**The Honourable Shri K. Santhanam** (Madras: General): May I ask the honourable member to see Article 29 where “the State” has been defined as having the same meaning as in Part III of this Constitution. Therefore in article 29 also the State is the same thing.

**Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad** : I was pointing out the difficulty in the draft. We have already been placed in a straight jacket by accepting the words “the State” and the straight jacket is pursuing us in the clauses. I should say the words “every State” are more appropriate. The fact that we have accepted the definition does not prevent us to avoid the absurdities in the following articles. I submit that the expression in the context is absolutely absurd.

**Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena** (United Provinces: General): I am not moving my amendment, but I want to speak on the Article as a whole. Sir, this Article has been the subject of many amendments and the purpose of most of the amendments is that this Chapter should have some sort of binding force. I

[Prof. Shibban Lal Saksena]

have also given notice of an amendment which is No. 861 in the printed list and which says that "After a period of ten years, these directive principles of State Policy shall become the Fundamental Rights of the People and shall be enforceable by any Court". After a very careful consideration of the various Articles in this Chapter, I feel that it will not be proper to lay down such a tall order. In fact, the Drafting Committee has itself laid down a period of ten years for compulsory Education up to fourteen years of age and three years for separation of Executive from Judiciary and some such other things. So something has been done in this direction. What I really want is that these Directive Principles in this Chapter should not merely remain a pious wish. My Honourable friend, Prof. K. T. Shah, also wanted that these fundamental principles should guide the state in their legislation. I wish to assure him that the very fact that this chapter forms part of the Constitution, gives such a guarantee and it will surely be open to every legislature to point out when an Act is brought before the Assembly that it is in conflict with the principles laid down in this Chapter. So, the mere fact that they are being included in the Constitution shows that every legislature will be bound to respect these directive Principles in the Constitution and therefore, any act which offends the directive principles shall be *ultra vires*. Although every citizen will not be able to go to a court of law for enforcement of these principles, yet the President of every Assembly will be within his rights to rule out any Bill and say that this Bill can not be moved, because it is against the fundamental directive principles of the Constitution itself. I therefore, think that this chapter is not merely a chapter of pious wishes, but a chapter containing great principles. A perusal of article 31 will show that very many high principles have been enunciated here and I hope Prof. Shah will also admit that if these principles are acted upon in both the Union Legislature and the State Legislatures, we shall have a State which will almost be acting as if these principles were fundamental rights which were enforceable by a court of law. Of course, every individual will not be able to go to a court of law to get their enforcement, but every legislature will be able to rule out any Bill which offends these principles. I therefore, think that my amendment which was intended to put a sort of time limit to make the State go on with their implementation at a rapid pace, so that all these directive principles may become incorporated in Acts of Parliament in ten years, may create difficulties by its rigid time limit. I hope my purpose will be realized by the fact that this part shall be a part of the Constitution and every legislature will be required to respect the principles contained in it and to see that no Act is passed which is against the principles enunciated in this chapter. I therefore, think that those friends who term this Article merely as a chapter of pious wishes are not correct. This is a very important chapter which lays down the principles which will govern the policy of the State and which, therefore, will ensure to the people of the country the realisation of the great ideals laid down in the preamble. I therefore hope that the opposition which my friend, Prof. Shah, has voiced through his amendment will not be pressed. Sir, I therefore support this Article.

**Mr. Hussain Imam** (Bihar: Muslim): May I ask if there will be no discussion on these amendments except by the movers?

**Mr. Vice-President** : If you had caught my eye, I would have given you an opportunity.

**Mr. Hussain Imam** : I thought that after the amendments have been disposed of by putting them to vote, discussion would be allowed.

**Mr. Vice-President** : No. It was decided yesterday that honourable members can speak both upon the amendments as well as on the article.

**Mr. Hussain Imam** : By a discussion other members of the House will also get an opportunity.

**Mr. Vice-President :** Why did you not stand up?

The question is:

“That for article 29, the following be substituted:

‘29. The provisions contained in this Part shall be treated as the obligations of the State towards the citizens, shall be enforceable in such manner and such authority as may be deemed appropriate in or under the respective law relating to each such obligation. It shall be the duty of the State to apply these principles in making the necessary and appropriate laws.’ ”

The motion was negatived.

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

“That in article 29, for the words ‘the State’, the words ‘every State’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

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

“That Article 29 stand part of the Constitution.”

The motion was adopted.

Article 29 was added to the Constitution.

**Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur** (Madras: Muslim): Sir, I said that I will speak on this Article. I stood up, Sir.

**Mr. Vice-President :** I did not see you. Can you not speak on Article 30?

**Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur :** Article 29 is the most important Article.

**Mr. Vice-President :** I am unable to go back. I shall give you an opportunity to speak on Article 30.

**Shri Amiyo Kumar Ghosh** (Bihar: General): Sir, may I know the correct procedure? When a clause is put to the House, is it not the right of a member to speak either in favour of the clause or against it?

**Mr. Vice-President :** Certainly.

**Shri Amiyo Kumar Ghosh :** But, I think, Sir, no such opportunity has been given in this case. The amendments were put to vote. When the clause was put to vote, several gentlemen stood up to oppose the entire clause. I think the correct procedure is, after the amendments have been put to the vote and they are lost, the entire clause is put to the House. At that time a member has got the right to oppose it or support it; he may speak on the entire clause. That is the correct procedure.

**Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar :** Sir, yesterday you gave a ruling and it was accepted that instead of having two different sets of discussions, there may be one discussion once for all both on the amendments and the Article, and that after the amendments are put to the vote, the Article may be put to the vote without any further discussion, and declared carried or otherwise. That was your ruling and we have been following it. Separate discussions, one for the amendments and another for the Articles are not necessary.

**Shri Amiyo Kumar Ghosh :** That was not a ruling for the entire Constitution; that was specially meant for Article 3. I think Mr. Ayyangar is laying down a new principle.

**Mr. Vice-President :** That was the procedure adopted. (*Interruption.*) Kindly allow me to speak. Shall I proceed? (To B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur, who stood up) Do you want to say anything? I am prepared to make way in your favour.

**B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur :** Sir, I am very sorry to note that Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar is taking upon himself very frequently the duties of the Vice-President himself. (*Interruption.*)

**Mr. Vice-President :** Order, order.

**B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur** : Sir, he has been giving instruction to the Chair every now and then. In fact.....(*Interruption*).

**Some Honourable Members** : Withdraw.

**B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur** : I am quoting a fact, Sir. Just now.....

**Shri K. Hanumanthaiya** (Mysore): Sir, he is casting aspersions on an honourable member.

**Mr. Vice-President** : Order, order.

**B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur** : I am just quoting facts. He has said just now that the ruling of the Chair is that the questions on the amendments and also questions opposing the clause itself should all be discussed together. As a matter of fact, when Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig came here and wanted to speak against the clause itself, he was told by the Chair that the proper time for him would be when the clause itself is before the House after the amendments are over. Whatever it is, it is for the Chair to decide the question.

**Shri Biswanath Das** (Orissa: General): Sir, on a point of order. It is to be very much regretted that an honourable member jumps up and goes on to draw the attention of the Vice-President and the honourable members of the House to certain questions which should have been noticed by the Vice-President himself. The very fact that the Vice-President has not taken notice of these goes to show that either he himself desired them or they were his rulings. It is none of the business of the Honourable member to point out to this House or to the Honourable the Vice-President the way in which he should have acted himself. I am sorry to say that it is a reflection on the Chair. Therefore, I would request you, Sir, not to tolerate, much less to allow such disturbances of the proceedings.

**Mr. Vice-President** : May I suggest that Mr. Ayyangar merely repeated a procedure which had been adopted with the approval of the House in conducting our proceedings. I do not consider that Mr. Ayyangar was wrong in reminding us about what had passed yesterday. I deeply regret that these things should not have been appreciated in the proper spirit by the honourable member speaking. I want that we should work together in complete harmony and that no misunderstanding should spring up. We must come here with clear and open hearts, prepared to trust one another. In democracy it always happens that the minority can only put forward its point of view and try to persuade the majority, and submit to the ruling of the majority. That is what democracy means as I understand it in my poor and in adequate way. Surely, the business of the House can hardly be conducted unless certain rules are followed and followed faithfully, in the spirit and not merely in the letter. As I have already said, if Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig had caught my eye, I would have surely given him an opportunity to speak. In fact, if honourable members will only scrutinise the way in which I have tried to conduct the proceedings of the House, they will find that I have gone out of my way in affording facilities to certain groups which at the present moment feel that they were not sufficiently strong to make their voices heard. That has been my policy, and in that policy, I am grateful that the majority community has lent me its unstinted support. In these circumstances, I would beg you, Mr. Pocker Sahib, to kindly resume your seat and allow me to conduct the business of the House in the way that seems best to me and not to cast reflections, which pain me, either on Mr. Ayyangar who is there to help us, or on myself, who am trying my very best so far as my poor abilities go, to conduct the business to the entire satisfaction of the House. Will you please resume your seat?

**B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur** : Sir, I do not want to say anything more except to thank you for the kindly way in which you have expressed your anxiety to give every facility to people who are in the minority. I must also apologise to you if you take it that I in any way meant any reflection on you

or on Mr. Ayyangar. I only wanted to bring to your notice how we misunderstood what you stated and that we thought that we had further opportunities after all the amendments are discussed. I am thankful to you, Sir, for the way in which, you have expressed your anxiety to give opportunities to the minority to express themselves.

**Mr. Vice-President :** May I make one suggestion? When such a kind of understanding has been given by me namely that an honourable member will speak on a particular occasion, for the time being, he may occupy a front seat so that he may not experience much difficulty in catching my eye. Let me assure the House once again that I shall do whatever lies in my power to give every possible facility to the members of the minority communities.

**Mr. Hussain Imam :** May I ask for elucidation of your ruling, as I was not present when this ruling was given. Therefore I want for the guidance of the House that it should be elucidated first. My own impression was that by your ruling what was meant was that members who were speaking on amendments should not claim a second right of speech on the main motion itself. It was never meant that as soon as an amendment is moved and the mover of the article says whether he accepts or rejects it, the discussion ends. That only means that the discussion as far as that particular amendment is concerned is ended, but the discussion on the main article can continue and in that connection I will remind you that I stood up as soon as Dr. Ambedkar had intimated his opinion on the amendments and therefore I was perfectly justified—and I had caught your eye—to express my opinion on the article. It is on that restricted line that I want your ruling as to whether my understanding is correct or I am wrong.

**Mr. Vice-President :** Let me explain it. First of all the amendments are moved and members moving them can also speak on the clause as a whole. Then there is opportunity given to Honourable members to discuss the amendments as well as the article itself and after that Dr. Ambedkar replies and that closes the discussion. That is how I have tried to understand it and that will be the procedure which will be followed hereafter.

**Mr. Hussain Imam :** It is not clear whether the discussion on the general article itself closes. The discussion on the amendment can close, not the general discussion.

**Shri Ram Sahai** [United State of Gwalior-Indore-Malwa (Madhya Bharat)]: \*[Mr. President, I would like to submit that many members do not like to express their views on the amendments that are moved here and to participate in the debate on them, because they consider them to be meaningless, useless and devoid of any utility. If it continues, the result would be no discussion on the original clause. Therefore, I submit, Sir, that since members do not like to speak on the many amendments that are being moved here, they simple fall through. In my opinion, it is much more necessary to speak on the original clause and consider it fully.

Therefore I would submit that the amendments that are useless and are moved for no reason should be ruled out and we should devote ourselves to a fuller consideration of the original clause.]

**Mr. Mohamed Ismail Sahib** (Madras: Muslim): Mr. Vice-President, Sir, while I appreciate the consideration you have been showing to the House, to the various sections of the House, I want this point to be made clear. Now suppose several amendments are being moved to a certain article. Then those amendments are discussed and afterwards replied to by the Honourable Mover of the Resolution. I want to know whether after the reply is given by the Honourable Mover I mean the Law Minister, the article is not before the House for general discussion. Because the amendments may relate only to certain parts of the article. There may be other parts on which honourable members

---

\* [ ] Translation of Hindustani speech.



[Mr. Mohamed Ismail Sahib]

might have something to say. Therefore I request you to make it clear whether after all the amendments are disposed or, Members have got a right to speak on the article itself.

**Mr. Vice-President :** What I said was this; suppose there are four amendments. They are moved one after another. Between the moving of the amendments and the reply by the Chairman of the Drafting Committee there is an interval during which other members may participate in the discussion and they might talk not only about the amendments but about the clause itself.

**Mr. Mohamed Ismail Sahib :** My point is after the amendments are disposed of by the House, whether the members have not got the right to speak on the article as amended or not as amended—that is what I want to know. The members should in fairness be given an opportunity to speak on the article.

**Mr. Vice-President :** They have that opportunity.

**Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar :** Mr. Vice-President, that opportunity means once again after Dr. Ambedkar has spoken?

**Mr. Vice-President :** No.

**Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar :** It is rather strange that persons who have been in Legislatures should make this objection. We know that the Resolutions are first moved and then all amendments are asked to be moved on the particular clause or resolution. Then both the resolution and the amendments are open for discussion. Thereafter the amendments are put to vote and then the clause is put to vote. There is no scope for a general discussion once again on the clause. There should be no departure from this practice which is followed in the Dominion Legislature.

**Mr. Vice-President :** I do not think it is profitable to continue the discussion. The ruling is final. I shall not permit further discussion.

**Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan** (United Provinces : Muslim): After the amendment has been moved.....

**Mr. Vice-President :** I am afraid you fail to appreciate the fact that the decision has been given. I am not prepared to reopen the discussion.

**Nawab Muhammad Ismail Khan :** In order to facilitate discussion, after amendments have been moved the Chair may please say that the article is now open to general discussion so that people may rise to speak on the motion.

### Article 30

**Mr. Vice-President :** The motion before the House is:

“That article 30 form part of the Constitution.”

The first amendment stands in the name of Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad. This is out of order. The second amendment is in the name of Mr. Damodar Swarup Seth.

**Shri Damodar Swarup Seth** (United Provinces: General): Sir, I move that for article 30, the following be substituted:

“30. The State shall endeavour to promote the welfare, prosperity and progress of the people by establishing and maintaining democratic socialist order and for the purpose the State shall direct its policy towards securing:—

- (a) the transfer to public ownership of important means of communication, credit and exchange, mineral resources and the resources of natural power and such other large economic enterprise as are matured for socialisation;
- (b) the municipalisation of public utilities;
- (c) the encouragement of the organisation of agriculture, credit and industries on co-operative basis.”