

**Mr. President :** There have been two amendments which have been adopted to this article 88. I shall now put the amendment article to the House.

The question is:

“That article 88, as amended, stand part of the Constitution.”

The motion was adopted.

Article 88, as amended, was added to the Constitution.

---

### Article 89

**Mr. President :** I think amendment No. 1662 is a verbal amendment and it is covered by the other provisions in the Draft Constitution.

**Prof. K.T. Shah :** It is a much more strong assertion of an undoubted privilege or right of the lower House. I do not see why it should be put negatively.

**Mr. President :** That right is there. It is not taken away by the provisions of the constitution.

**Shri H.V. Kamath :** Sir, at the outset I have to reiterate what I had to point out yesterday that I sent these as two separate amendments but unfortunately they have been lumped up in one. I have no desire to find fault with the office which is working at high pressure. I ask your permission to move the second part of the amendment only.

I move:

“That in clause (1) of article 89, for the words ‘not be introduced in the Council of States’ the words ‘be introduced in the House of the People’ be substituted.”

**Mr. President :** Is it not an amendment of a formal nature?

**Shri H. V. Kamath :** I freely admit Sir that it is an amendment of a formal nature and so I shall leave it to the Drafting Committee for consideration.

(Amendment No. 1664, was not moved.)

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

“That in article 89, for the words ‘thirty days’ wherever they occur the words ‘twenty one days’ be substituted.”

The idea is that after a money Bill has been passed by the House of the People it shall be transmitted to the Council of States for its recommendations. In actual practice the period of time involved might not be even more than a week. Thirty days is intended as an outside limit. At the time some of us framed this amendment, we were a little chary of suggesting a lower time-limit, than twenty-one days but I believe that a fortnight or fourteen days would be more than enough to cover all contingencies. If Dr. Ambedkar would agree and the House would give me leave I would like to substitute fourteen days instead of twenty-one days, as the former period would be more than adequate for the purpose. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President :** There are two amendments in the name of Mr. Naziruddin Ahmad (Nos. 1666 and 1667). They are amendments of a drafting nature.

So there is only one amendment to the article by Mr. T.T. Krishnamachari. The article is now open for discussion.

**The Honourable Dr. B.R. Ambedkar :** Sir, I accept the amendment moved by my Friend Mr. T.T. Krishnamachari. I would also agree to the further

reduction of the period to fourteen days. If the House will permit me to make such an amendment I should like to move that the period of twenty-one days as mentioned in the amendment be further reduced to fourteen days. I shall give my reasons for this change. In the British Parliament the House of Lords merely concurs in the financial provisions passed by the House of Commons; it has completely abrogated itself so far as finance is concerned. We are here making a departure from that position and are allowing the upper chamber to have some voice in the formulation of the taxation and financial proposals which have been initiated by the Lower House. As I said, we are conferring a privilege which ordinarily the upper chamber does not possess. At the same time we must bear in mind that the budget is a very urgent matter. Even now, as Members know, we do not give the Lower House more than six or eight days for the Finance Bill. It seems to me that to allow such a long period of thirty or even twenty-one days would result in hanging up such an important matter for a considerable length of time. If the Upper House wants to express an opinion fourteen days is a more than enough period.

**Mr. President :** The original question was:

“That in article 89 for the words ‘thirty days’ wherever they occur the words ‘twenty-one days’ be substituted.”

To that a further amendment has been moved that for ‘twenty-one days’ the words ‘fourteen days’ be substituted.”

“That in the amendment for the words ‘twenty-one days’ the words ‘fourteen days’ be substituted.”

The question is:

“That the amendment to the amendment be adopted.”

The amendment was adopted.

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

“That the amended amendment be adopted.”

The amendment was adopted.

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

“That article 89, as amended, be adopted.”

The motion was adopted.

Article 89, as amended, was added to the Constitution.

---

## Article 90

**Mr. President :** Article 90.

(Amendment No. 1668 was not moved.)

**The Honourable Shri Ghanshyam Singh Gupta (C.P. & Berar: General):** Sir, I beg to move:

“That in clause (1) of article 90, the word ‘only’ be deleted.”

This article is a prototype of Section 37 of the Government of India Act which says that a Bill or amendment providing for imposing or increasing a tax or borrowing money, etc. shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the Governor-General. This means that the whole Bill need not be a money Bill: it may contain other provisions, but if there is any provision about taxation or borrowing, etc. It will come under this Section 37, and the recommendation of the Governor General