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OFFICIAL REPORT

Twenty Sixth day of the Eighth Session of the
Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly

ANDHRA PRADIGN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

Questions and Answers

(See Part I)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE
16th February, 1959

Business of the House

[Text content in Telugu]

[Translation or summary in Telugu]
Notification issued with G.O. Ms No. 1979 General Administration (Services-A) dated 18th December 1958 amending the Madras Public Service Commission Regulations, 1950

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Notification issued with G. O. Ms No. 1979 General Administration (Services-A) dated 18th December 1958 amending the Madras Public Service Commission Regulations, 1950

*The Chief Minister (Sri N. Sanjeewa Reddy) Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification issued with G.O. Ms No. 1979, General Administration (Services-A) dated 18th December 1958, making an amendment to the Madras Public Service Commission Regulations, 1950 as adopted in Andhra Pradesh in accordance with Clause (5) of Article 320 of the Constitution.

M. Speaker: Papers laid on the Table.

Sri N Sanjeeva Reddy I beg to lay on the Table, a copy of Notification issued with G O Ms No 2016, General Administration (Services-A) dated 24th December, 1958, making an amendment to the Madras Public Service Commission Regulations, 1950 as adopted in Andhra Pradesh in accordance with Clause (5) of Article 320 of the Constitution.

Mr Speaker Papers laid on the Table


*The Minister For Local Administration and Labour (Sri D Sanjivayya). I beg to lay on the Table under sub-section (1) of Section 41 of the Madras District Municipalities Act 1920 (Madras Act V of 1920), a copy of the Notification appended to G O Ms No 11 L. A. dated 3-1-1959.

Mr Speaker Papers laid on the Table

Government Resolution Re Levy of Estate Duty in respect of Agricultural Lands in the State.

The Revenue Minister (Sri K. Venkata Rao). Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move: "Whereas by resolutions passed in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution, the levy of estate duty in respect of agricultural land in the State of Andhra Pradesh is governed by the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) passed by Parliament.

And whereas the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) has been amended by Act 17 of 1954, Act 41 of

And whereas it appears to this Assembly to be desirable that the matters specified in the amending Acts aforesaid in so far as they relate to Estate Duty in respect of agricultural land should be regulated in the State by Parliament by law

Now therefore this Assembly hereby resolves in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution that the matters aforesaid in so far as they are matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the State may be regulated in the State by Parliament by Law and for this purpose the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) may be amended accordingly

*Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora* Mr Speaker, Sir, I want to raise a point of Order Article 252 contemplates two positions. Under Article 250 also, the Parliament can make laws in respect of States, i.e. by means of authority given through a resolution passed by the Council of States, that is a case of emergency where emergency is declared by the President, and the Parliament gets jurisdiction. Under Article 252, two or more States give the power to the Parliament to make law in respect of any subject covered by the State Schedule, because this is a subject covered by item 48 of the State Schedule, Estate Duty in respect of agricultural land. So, under Article 252, there are two ways of doing it; one is two or more States giving power to Parliament to make law by means of a resolution; the second is, after such a law is made by Parliament, other States adopt it. These are the two ways in which Parliament deals with the subject. Under the first point, two more States pass a resolution authorising the Parliament to make the law, and the law is made, and the other States may follow suit by adopting that law. But here the hon. Revenue Minister places before us a resolution saying that the Parliament has already made the law — there was a resolution previously in 1953 for making that law, and to formulate some more laws the Parliament amended the previous law, and those laws are made
without jurisdiction as I understand. Because we have not passed a resolution authorising the Parliament to amend the law, a law which is already made by Parliament. And we cannot make it retrospective today by now passing a resolution authorising the Parliament to make law. It amounts to this, as I understand, Parliament has already passed those amendments without taking any such power by means of resolutions of the States. That means, it has done it without jurisdiction. Now, are we to authorise or validate those laws by way of a resolution? How far are we competent to do it? You may kindly read Art 252

“252 (1) If it appears to the Legislatures of two or more States to be desirable that any of the matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the States except as provided in Articles 249 and 250 should be regulated in such States by Parliament by law, and if resolutions to that effect are passed by all the Houses of the Legislatures of those States, it shall be lawful for Parliament to pass an Act for regulating that matter accordingly.

Therefore, first a resolution is passed and then the Parliament passes a law. There is the other contingency.

Mr Speaker Parliament has no power to pass law because it relates to agricultural matters, that is the first point. The second point is, why the Parliament passed a law when it has no jurisdiction.

Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora Originally Parliament passed the original law and subsequently it passed amendments. The hon Revenue Minister is now dealing with those amendments and is asking us by means of a resolution to authorise the Parliament to make those laws, laws which are already made. My contention is, it is void ab initio; it is a law made against the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker Can it be validated now?

Sri R, Lakshminarasimham Dora: That is the issue. Can we give retrospective jurisdiction to the Parliament?
to make that? I would like the hon Revenue Minister to clarify the position and then proceed

Sri K Venkata Rao I may submit, Sir, that the Parliament cannot pass a law which is within the jurisdiction of the States. And whenever the Parliament amends that Act, we will have to agree to passing of such amendments and for applying them within our State, and till that date the Parliament cannot bring the Act into force. That is what they have done, they have not brought this law into force, and on the other hand they have written to us as follows

"Since the levy of estate duty on agricultural land throughout your State is already regulated by the Estates Duty Act, 1953, I hope there will be no difficulty in getting the formal resolution contemplated in para (6) above, passed by your State Legislature. If you think that, for any reason, it will not be possible to get such a resolution passed by the State Legislature, the only alternative may be to get a resolution passed by the State Legislature suggesting that the Estate Duty Act, 1953 be amended by Parliament by law so as to make the principal act itself inapplicable to agricultural land in your State as from the first day of April, 1959. A draft resolution for this purpose is enclosed. I hope that such a contingency will not arise and you will be able to persuade your legislature, in the interests of uniformity in the administration of the Act, to pass the necessary resolution."

Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora I am sorry, Sir, I forgot to mention sub-clause (2) of Article 252, which deals with amendments

"252 (2) Any Act so passed by Parliament may be amended or repealed by an Act of Parliament passed or adopted in like manner"

"In like manner" means in the manner specified in sub-clause (1). So, under this sub-clause the Parliament can amend a law which was once passed. Therefore, for the Parliament also a procedure is laid down under sub-clause (1) of Article 252. I presume there are two alternatives
put before us, either to pass a resolution adopting or validating the law which is already passed or pass a resolution authorising the Parliament to amend it, in which case the Government must come with a fresh amendment, because the amendment already made being void ab initio, it is passed against the Constitution, without jurisdiction, ultra vires, etc. So, for even amendments the procedure laid down is under sub-clause (1) of Article 252 and it has got to be followed here by the Parliament and it has not done it.

*Sri N Sanjeeva Reddy* Sir, this is an All-India legislation. After all, the Government of India have to deal with different States. One State may accept and the other States may reject also; that contingency is there. Therefore, the Parliament has only made an enabling Act; if our State accepts along with other States, then that law will come into force in our State also. If, for any reasons we say we don't agree with it, the Parliament Act has not got that power to enforce that Act in our State. Therefore, Sir, I feel the Parliament Act only enables us to move this resolution if we agree. Now the resolution contemplated is just to permit or give our concurrence for the levy of this duty. If we do not choose to fall in line, we can say we do not agree with it. I don't think there is anything unconstitutional. Of course, I am not a lawyer myself and legal pandits may give their opinion.
Levy of Estate Duty in Respect of Agricultural Lands in the State

The violation of the Constitution and the enactment of the Estate Duty Act in the State led to the consideration of this matter. In view of the difficulties encountered in the procedure and the resolution of the Constitution and the executive order, the resolution of the executive order by the Governor to withdraw the Act was passed. The Governor's resolution was also passed by the Constitution under Article 36.4 (x).

The Governor, in his executive order, stated that the force of law and the power of the executive order were necessary to enforce the Constitution. The Governor's resolution on Article 36.4 (x) was passed by the Constitution under Article 36.4 (x).

The Governor was persuaded to withdraw the Act. I hope you can persuade the Assembly of this.
I am only submitting one point for your perusal. Article 252 lays down two procedures. One is permitting the Parliament to pass a law, and the second is adopting it. If two or more States empower the Parliament to pass a law, the other States may adopt it by resolution. I think, Sir, this may be construed with the latter provision. The Parliament has already passed the amendments and they have to be adopted with either of the two procedures. The second procedure is adoption and that is what has been passed by the Parliament.

Mr Speaker — Are you sure that when the amending Acts were passed, certain other States had already agreed and the proper procedure was adopted?

Sri V B. Raju — How can the Parliament pass a law unless...

Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora — Then, we can adopt it, the resolution shall be for adopting it.

Mr Speaker — The point is, if it is passed already in like manner.

*Sri K. Venkata Rao* — I request you Sir, to peruse Section 30.

"30 Act not to apply to agricultural land: For the removal of doubts it is hereby declared that nothing contained in this Act shall have effect in respect of any matter enumerated in entry 48 of List II in the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution, and estateydtr7 in respect of any estate which consists wholly or in
part of agricultural land situate in the territories which immediately before the 1st day of November, 1956, were comprised in the States specified in the First Schedule to the principal Act shall continue to be governed by the principal Act as if this Act had not been passed”

Therefore we are authorising them to do it. We are at the earlier stage, we are authorising them along with other States who have already agreed to have this legislation, and for bringing the new amendment for enforcement in our State.

_Sri V. B. Raju_ — I think this House is not competent to say whether the Parliament passed a law with proper jurisdiction or not, because it is a question to be raised in the Parliament. They have passed a law and two or more States have agreed to it. The present procedure is for adopting it.

_Mr Speaker_ — No, we have a right to go into the question of jurisdiction. It is a matter which may go to Supreme Court, and the States can say that the Parliament has encroached upon their rights and the Centre can say that the States have encroached. That is why, the Supreme Court is there. Therefore, we are not Subordinate to the Centre.

_Sri V. B. Raju_ — If you will excuse me, Sir, that was not my point. My point is this. We have got a provision in the Constitution for adoption. That is all. Whether we want to adopt or not is left to us.

_Mr Speaker_ — The question is this. Originally an Act was passed, i.e., Act 34 of 1953. That was passed under the regular constitutional procedure. Even the Government resolution reads “Whereas by resolutions passed in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution.” That means, certain other States have passed resolutions and sent them to the Parliament, and therefore, in pursuance of the rights vested in the Parliament under Article 252 it passed an Act. There is no question about it. The only thing is, the Government are now mixing two things. Subsequently, the Parliament has passed like
acts and you (Government) also say they have jurisdiction, and therefore you want to give them jurisdiction now and with retrospective effect and you say you are agreeing. The question is, whether we can agree now, if the acts were passed without any jurisdiction. But, there is the other point, it may be that other States have passed such resolutions. Therefore, I want to know—even if the amendments are passed properly, whether at least other States—two States will do for this purpose, have agreed to the amendments mentioned in the Government resolution and whether the Parliament has passed the amendments in a proper and constitutional manner. If it is a question of mere adoption by the State, then we have jurisdiction and the present resolution is quite all right. Therefore, I would rather ask the Government to get that information, if that information is available, we shall go on. Otherwise, the Government can propose certain amendments before they fall in line with the amending act and there is no objection for that and the State Government can say that their amendments also can be introduced in the light of the main amendments of the Government of India. But, what can we do now with regard to the acts already passed?

_Sir V. B. Raju_—Whether the Parliament has followed the procedure laid down under Article 252 of the Constitution or not is a matter to be raised there. Are we going to question whether the Parliament proceeded according to Article 252? Our power is only to accept or reject, or adopt or not. That is our limitation.

_Mr Speaker_—You (Government) say now “Whereas by resolutions passed in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution...” But, you don’t say, you are not bold enough to say, nor have you information, that certain other States have already passed resolutions for these amendments. You say that you agree and those amendments should be accepted.

*Sir K. Venkata Rao_*—The first thing is, the Parliament has passed this. Before they can pass, they must have the approval of two or more States for the amending acts. Else, the Bill would not have been introduced, the Bill would not have been passed, and they have sent us a
communication in which *prima facie* they state that the Bill has been passed. But, because some point was raised, they also introduced Section 30 which I have just now read

*Mr. Speaker:* Please read, what you said, again. Have they said they have passed the Amendment Act also? After all, it is not passed in one day—

*Sri K Venkata Rao:* I shall read

*Mr. Speaker:* The Acts in question are 34 of 1953, 17 of 1954, 36 of 1957 and 33 of 1958. Four Amending Acts have been passed since the original Act. With regard to the original Act, you have stated that the correct procedure has been adopted and that everything is all right. You have not at any rate stated in this Resolution that such a Resolution has been passed by certain other States. Therefore, unless you give us the full information, there is a defect. Kindly read what they have written

*Sri K Venkata Rao:* I submit, Sir, this is the letter 'As you are aware, the Estate Duty Amendment Bill, 1958 (which refers to the present things, and not to the previous things) has been passed by Parliament and had just received the assent of the President. A copy of the Amendment Act, 33 of 1958, is enclosed, for your information. In this letter, I shall deal with certain important questions which arise in the matter of applying the provisions of the Amending Act to Agricultural Lands in your State. They have sent us both the Resolutions, one rejecting and the other accepting, and we have accepted the first. My contention is simple. This letter has come under the signature of the Minister himself, and he has definitely said 'As you are aware, the Estate Duty Amendment Bill, 1958, has been passed by Parliament and had just received the assent of the President.' If it were otherwise, Sir, they would not have forwarded it to us, they would have asked for the other thing.

*Sri R. Lakshminarasimham Dora:* Sir, I may be permitted to speak—

*Mr. Speaker:* Our Secretary is pointing out that Act 33 of 1958 is an Act which is passed by the Parliament
and has received the assent of the President, but does not apply to agricultural land

*Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora* - Quite so Sir

*Mr Speaker* - If that is so, they passed their own Act.

*Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora* - Sir, I have a submission to make. We shall presume that the Parliament passed that Act 33 of 1958 according to law. We have no reason to doubt it. The Resolution placed before the House is not to adopt a law--

*Mr Speaker* - But if the Act makes no reference to agricultural land, then how can we come into the picture?

*Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora* - Yes, Sir, why should we? Why should they seek permission from us?

*Mr Speaker* - Where is the need? They can ask us--

*Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora* - That apart, my submission to you is this Parliament has passed an Act. As the hon Minister for Revenue, Sri Kala Venkat Rao has stated, let us presume that Parliament passed it according to law. The letter in which he has read out to the House says that the Parliament passed it and the President also gave the assent, but my submission is that the Resolution before the House should be in a form only to adopt, and not to authorise. If the Resolution placed before the House is so amended as to adopt a law which has already been passed by Parliament, presumed to have been properly passed - if it is not properly passed, there are Courts to check it, there is another body as supreme as ours to consider that - that will be all right. So, we shall assume that the Parliament passed it correctly

*Mr. Speaker* - Will you please read Section 30 of this Act? It is said Agricultural land is exempted. Please see that

*Sri K Venkata Rao* - That is what I have already read

*Mr Speaker* - If the Act does not apply to Agricultural land - ...
Levy of Estate Duty in Respect of Agricultural Lands in the State

Sri K Venkata Rao - That is what has been stated in Section 30. Unless we agree, they cannot apply to our State.

(Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora rose—)

Sri K Venkata Rao - I submit, Sir, that after examining all these things, the Government of India have sent a draft Resolution. It has come from them - draft 1 agreeing to it and draft 2 rejecting it. The Cabinet has not agreed to draft 1. We are placing the Resolution for approval before this Assembly. That is the procedure we have followed.

Mr Speaker - So, it looks like this. The Acts have been passed properly so far as Parliament is concerned because they have removed agricultural land from the scope of the Act. So, certain Acts have been passed by Parliament amending the original Act. They have not passed without jurisdiction. That is the point. Now, what is required is, you must make a law applying to agricultural land. Is it not?

*Sri R Lakshminarasimham Dora - Agricultural land is not the only subject here. We are not concerned with the provisions of the Act or to what it applies. A procedure is laid down in Article 252 of the Constitution. Wherever Parliament cannot make a law in respect of any subject, and it is only the States that have got to make the law, Parliament may assume the power to do it, provided two States authorise it. We are concerned only with the procedure. Let us not get into the merits of the law, to what it applies and to what it does not apply. We need not at this stage consider it. Article 252 lays down a procedure namely that wherever Parliament cannot make a law in respect of a subject which is covered by the State list, two or more States may authorise Parliament to do it, and when Parliament does pass the law accordingly, those States which have not given authority may adopt it. Here, Parliament has made a certain law, original as also amending laws. The hon. Minister has read out that the Parliament has already accomplished the fact of passing the law and he also asks us to presume that the Parlia-
ment passed it with jurisdiction, because even if we have not given them the authority, any two States out of the 14 States in India, might have given the authority. So, we shall presume that the Parliament was duly authorised to make the amendments also in which case we have to adopt.

Let the Resolution be placed before the House to adopt those laws which Parliament has already passed, otherwise it does not look nice that a law which had already been passed by the Parliament is now authorised to be passed.

*Sri P Basireddy*: I wanted to say that we cannot go into the question whether Parliament had obtained the consent of two States. They ought to have obtained the consent of two States before they passed the law. Now, Sri Lakshminarasimham Dora has been submitting that the Resolution should be in the form of adoption, but my submission is, Parliament has not passed any law so far relating to agricultural income. So, there is no question of adopting a law which has not been passed. Here, the object of the Resolution is to enable the Parliament to make the Estates Duty Act applicable to agricultural income also.

“Were comprised in the States specified in the first schedule to the principal Act, shall continue to be governed by the principal Act as if this Act had not been passed.”

Now apply that as long as pass Act, the Act is also adopt section 69 as apply conditions fulfil as if conditions fulfil as if the Act had not been passed. Adopt that resolution as if resolution adopt. 

Resolution shall be placed before the House to adopt those laws which Parliament has already passed, otherwise it does not look nice that a law which had already been passed by the Parliament is now authorised to be passed.
Levy of Estate Duty in Respect of Agricultural Lands in the State

I have read out just now the first clause. There is a subsequent communication dated 12th November. The other one is dated 8th November. The subsequent communication dated 12th November 1958 is from the Deputy Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance in which he has said, 'I shall be obliged if you will kindly refer to my letter of even No. dated 16th October 1958 and let me know whether any action has been taken on Sri Gopala Reddy’s D O letter of even No. dated the 8th October 1958 addressed to your Chief Minister. As we have to introduce a short Bill in the next Budget Session of Parliament for the application of the Estate Duty Amendment Act, 1958, to the agricultural lands in the States, it is requested that an early reply may kindly be furnished.' It is now in order.

Sri R. Lakshminarasimham Dora:— Much ado about nothing. (Laughter)
Sir R Lakshminarasimham Dora — We are not wrong. The resolution is wrong. You may please read the Resolution.

Mr Speaker — 'Whereas it appears to this Assembly to be desirable that the matters specified in the amending Acts aforesaid in so far as they relate to Estate Duty in respect of agricultural land should be regulated in the State by Parliament by law, Now therefore this Assembly hereby resolves in pursuance of Article 252 of the Constitution that the matters aforesaid in so far as they are matters with respect to which Parliament has no power to make laws for the State may be regulated in the State by Parliament by Law and for this purpose the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953) may be amended accordingly'.' There is nothing wrong about it. It is correct. We are accepting the principles of the Bill so far as they are applicable to agricultural lands for which a new law is necessary and for which we are giving consent. Therefore, there is no difficulty. We are not accepting the law, as it is. We said, 'matters in so far as they relate to'. Now, we want that they should be extended to agricultural lands by a new law. Therefore, the whole thing is in order. Now, the hon. Minister for Revenue may proceed.
Exemption limit Section 28 of probate & entire court fee deductible (50% margin is allowed) 400 lakhs. 50% of estate duty is to be wiped out by heavy levy. Probate & entire court fee deductible. Entire estate is to be exempted to the extent of 2 1/2 lakhs. No use of making gifts Inter vivos or ante Inter vivos to between living persons, parties adjust themselves. Gift tax is "gift of property, money, goods or property" to be determined whether it be made during life or after death. Distribution rules, 1958 discuss 70% of already existing assets. 1958 amendment.


Government Resolution Re

Levy of Estate Duty in Respect of
Agricultural Lands in the State

Sir, I submit the resolution which had been
last minute filed, which points out the
levy of Estate Duty in respect of
agricultural lands in the State.

Mr. Speaker — Minister has legal point
raised. He said you cannot levy first mark
singly. You must have three or four first marks
together. This was done long before. I would
like to know your pleasure on benches.

Mr. Speaker — What do you say, Dr. Chenna Reddy?

Mr. Speaker — Now, shall I give time for amendments?

(Many hon. Members said ‘Yes, Sir’)

Mr. Speaker — What do you say, Dr. Chenna Reddy?

Mr. Speaker — So, the opposition wants time for
amendments. You can give amendments tomorrow, and
we can take it up day after tomorrow (18th February,
1959).

Let us take up the other Bill.

Sri K Venkata Rao —

Actual receipts during 1956–57 Rs 15,99,000
Budget estimate and revised
estimate for 1957–58 Rs 19,10,400
Budget estimate for 1958–59 Rs. 19,10,400

Mr Speaker — Now, shall I give time for amendments?

(Many hon. Members said ‘Yes, Sir’)

Mr. Speaker — What do you say, Dr. Chenna Reddy?

Mr. Speaker — So, the opposition wants time for
amendments. You can give amendments tomorrow, and
we can take it up day after tomorrow (18th February,
1959).

Let us take up the other Bill.
GOVERNMENT BILLS

* Sri K Venkata Rao (deputising Sri N N N Reddy, Chief Minister) 

Sir, I beg to move

"That the Krishna District Road Transport Service (Validation) Bill, 1959 be read a first time"

Mr Speaker — Motion moved

Sri K Venkata Rao — Chapter IV-A of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 (Central Act IV of 1939), contains special provisions relating to State Transport undertakings. According to these provisions, the General Manager, Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation, (a State Transport undertaking) prepared and published a Scheme for nationalisation of transport service in the State of Andhra Pradesh in the Andhra Pradesh Gazette, dated 14th November, 1957. The Scheme was approved and published by the State Government after considering the objections and after giving an opportunity to the objectors or their representatives and the representatives of the State Transport undertaking, to be heard in the matter. In pursuance of the approved Scheme, the Regional Transport Authorities Krishna and Guntur, had under section 68-F, taken action and passed orders, including the issue of permits to the Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation on certain routes. The Supreme Court recently held that the order of the State Government approving the Scheme is bad in law on the ground that the State Government did not make the enquiry consistent with the principles of natural justice and judicial procedure. Consequently, doubts have been raised as to whether the actions taken or orders passed in pursuance of the said approved Scheme are valid. In order to remove all such doubts, the Government propose to validate by legislation the actions taken or orders passed under section 68-F of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, by the Regional Transport Authorities, Krishna and Guntur, in pursuance of the Scheme during the period between the 1st April 1958, and the 20th November, 1958.
2 The Bill gives effect to the above proposal and validation Bill সম্বন্ধে কোনো প্রস্তাব নেই অথবা প্রস্তাব নেই।

মন্ত্রী ইন্দুর- সংগঠন না থাকে তাই সমাধান সম্পন্ন Business Advisory Committee প্রস্তাব প্রকাশ করা হয়েছে তাহলে আমি অনৌক্ষণ্য তাদের নির্দেশনায় অনূর্ধ্বের অংশগ্রহণ করে নের।

ANNOUNCEMENT Re

Constitution Of the Business Advisory Committee

Mr Speaker—Now I announce the names of the members of the Business Advisory Committee.

1. Sri A. Kaleswararao – Chairman
   (Speaker)

2. Sri N. Sanjoeva Reddy – Member
   (Leader of the House)

3. Chef Whip to the Government
4. Leader of the Communist Party
5. Dr M. Chenna Reddy
7. Sri R. B. Ramakrishna Raju
8. Sri T. Veenaraghavulu

The Deputy Speaker is a special invitee, because he has to follow.

These are the names

শুধুমাত্র ১১.০০ মিনিটের মধ্যে Business Advisory Committee

 seeker নিয়োগ করা হলো সমস্ত Business Advisory Committees অনুর্ধ্বের নীতিনির্দেশ, আবাদ তিনি।
Mr Speaker - I must be fair. Majority will be reduced to minority. Therefore, I cannot give representation to the other groups. All the important groups are four - there is one party, and three groups. The three groups are (1) Dr. Chenna Reddy's Group, (2) Socialist Group, and (3) Nationalist Group.

Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswaraulu: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr Speaker: I am not going to change. Now, we adjourn.

The House adjourned till nine of the clock on Tuesday, the 17th February, 1959.