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CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

_re: Construction of Tunnels for the Nagarjunasagar Right Bank Canal._

_mn: హుందిస్తీరం: శిత్రుకాలారుడు లేదా 74 సంశోభ లేదా మిలియన్ రూపాణి, లక్షలు నిర్మాణ.

ప్రమాణదారి (సిసిసి): అసాధారణం, పారిశ్రామికాల కొంతవంతమయ్యాం, ఇచ్చిన పంపుకు తమ్ముడు మాత్రమే, మొదటి మరో సంఖ్యగా చేసిన నిర్మాణ ప్రారంభం కొనసాగించాం. అంది ఆపగాయనం అంటే ముడిదే నియంత్రణ రాయబడినందు, మునికండి పంచాయత్యాల సంస్థలు ప్రారంభం చేయడానికి అంశం పెంచబడింది. అందువల్ల రోయలు సిద్ధంగా అడవి లభించినందు, ఇతర పంపుకు ఆన్నిది ఆపాదంపడుతుంది. అంది పంపుకు పెద్ద వంతుమాలు తెలియినందు, ఈ పని ప్రారంభమై వారికి సంశోభ కొందరి మార్గప్రాంగణం చేయబడింది. అందుకే ఇతర పంపుకు ప్రారంభమై వారికి సంశోభ కొందరి మార్గప్రాంగణం చేయబడింది. ఆ విధమై వారిని మాత్రమే ప్రారంభమై వారికి సంశోభ కొందరి మార్గప్రాంగణం చేయబడింది.
Calling Attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance

On the 12th of July, 1960

...
Adjournment Motion

12 July, 1960

re: Strike by Central Government Employees

Planning Commission has categorically stated that the employees of Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, and many other establishments in Andhra Pradesh have abstained from work as their legitimate demand that the principle of a minimum wage based on needs as defined in 15th Tripartite Labour Conference be accepted to be implemented progressively and in the meantime that their existing salaries and wages be safeguarded by linking them up to the cost of living index, so that at least partial neutralisation of continued increase of prices of all essential commodities be effected.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

re: Strike by Central Government Employees.

Sri P. Sundarayya (Gannavaram): Mr. Speaker, Sir,
I move the following adjournment motion:

"That the Assembly be adjourned to discuss a matter of utmost public importance, viz.,

'That a very large number of employees in Railways, Posts and Telegraphs and in many other avocations and establishments in Andhra Pradesh had abstained from going to work as their legitimate demand that the principle of a minimum wage based on needs as defined in 15th Tripartite Labour Conference be accepted to be implemented progressively and in the meantime that their existing salaries and wages be safeguarded by linking them up to the cost of living index, so that at least partial neutralisation of continued increase of prices of all essential commodities be effected."
Adjournment Motion
re: Strike by Central Government Employees

But, instead of strongly recommending and doing all they could to see that the Central Government con­cede these very humane, minimum and most moderate and legitimate demands of the employees, the Govern­ment of Andhra Pradesh has mobilised all its police and other forces to suppress the employees and have already effected many arrests and is parading its force to browbeat the starving employees.

And as this behaviour of the Government is against the directive principles of our Constitution to build a humane and just socialist society and will be ruining our economy and plans and will leave a deep sense of injustice among the working masses, the foundation of our nation. The House stands adjourned to discuss the ways and means to solve this urgent issue of utmost public importance and of utmost gravity.”

Sri K. Subba Rao (Hindupur-General): The resolution is self-explanatory, and no comment or speech is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: I am allowing it.
Adjournment Motion
re: Strike by Central
Government Employees

12 July, 1960

Motion for adjournment and matter of public importance
under Rules of procedure, calling attention.

Adjournment motion out of order. This is of utmost public importance
and Rules of procedure permit debate thereof. Motion for adjournment
and matter of public importance under Rules of procedure permit
calling attention.

Adjournment motion out of order. This is of utmost public importance
under Rules of procedure permit debate thereof. Motion for adjournment
and matter of public importance under Rules of procedure permit
calling attention.

Adjournment motion out of order. This is of utmost public importance
under Rules of procedure permit debate thereof. Motion for adjournment
and matter of public importance under Rules of procedure permit
calling attention.

Adjournment motion out of order. This is of utmost public importance
under Rules of procedure permit debate thereof. Motion for adjournment
and matter of public importance under Rules of procedure permit
calling attention.

Adjournment motion out of order. This is of utmost public importance
under Rules of procedure permit debate thereof. Motion for adjournment
and matter of public importance under Rules of procedure permit
calling attention.

Adjournment motion out of order. This is of utmost public importance
under Rules of procedure permit debate thereof. Motion for adjournment
and matter of public importance under Rules of procedure permit
calling attention.
Privilege Motion

re: Speech of Sri G. Rajagopalachari

Mr. Speaker: Under Rule 67 (2) of the Assembly Rules, I call upon those members who are in favour of leave being granted to rise in their places.

(29 members from the Communist benches rose in their places)

PRIVILEGE MOTION

re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari.

On a point of information, Sir, 13...
Privilege Motion
12 July, 1960
re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

சுருக்கக்குறிக்கை: வெழ்லை நூற்றாண்டு வரும் போது, கொழும்பில் உள்ள பொதுச்சிறப்புக்கள் செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது. செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது. செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது. செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது.

• குறிப்பிட்டியோர்: உருசிய விளம்பாய்

13. ஜூன் 20 வருடம் முதல் வரையும் பொதுச்சிறப்புக்கள் எவ்வாறு முதற்கொண்டு உள்ளது? செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது. செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது. செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது.

என்று சொல்லவும்: வெழ்லை நூற்றாண்டு வரும் போது, கொழும்பில் உள்ள பொதுச்சிறப்புக்கள் செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது. செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது. செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது. செப்பட்டுத் தொடர்ந்து உள்ளது.

* * *

தியாகத்துரு (பிரித்துசிக்): உருசிய விளம்பாய், என்று சொல்லவும்: privilege question என்று சொல்லவும்.
Re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopal Chari

12 July, 1960

Privilege Motion

* Sri T. N. Srinivasacharyulu (Vizianagaram): Appreciate the speech of Mr. Nanavati. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House.

* Sri C. N. Anjaneyulu (Vizianagaram): Apologies for the round-up of the matter in the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House. The author has referred to the speech of Mr. Nanavati while discussing the question of the inclusion of the name of a member in the list of members of the House.
Sir, the issue which is now before the House is a very important one. Personally, Sir, I have got the highest regard towards you and the chair you occupy, because you are only one of the few intellectual giants of Andhra of the 19th century whom God has spared to us, but still I honestly feel that this issue should not have been allowed to come up for discussion before this House. Sir, let no one of this House misunderstand me when I say that thousand eyes are watching the proceedings of this House; a million more eyes will be reading the proceedings of this House the next morning; and many millions of our posterity will have occasion to read the proceedings of this House.

Sir, so far as Rajaji is concerned, he is alleged to have said in his speech addressing the members of the Bar Association at Chandigarh that most of the Congress
Legislators have no ostensible or appreciable means of livelihood. We are not very sure in what connection he has said it but assuming for a moment that what he has said is true, still the question is whether this thing amounts to a breach of privilege. So far as I am concerned—

Mr. Speaker: That is a legal issue. I shall give my ruling after hearing the Opposition—

Sri B. V. Subba Reddy: Only one minute, Sir. I am finishing. We know, Sir, there are a few people who have been weighed in the balance and found not wanting, who have been tied in the furnace and found pure, who have been declared sterling by the general consent of mankind and who are visibly stamped with the image and superscription of the highest. Nature has given to the world a few men who achieve fame by merit and universal recognition such as Plato, Socrates, Aristotle and Gandhi and I do not hesitate to say that to this class of people Rajaji belongs and we want to arraign and impeach this kind of man. (SOME MEMBERS: 'HEAR' 'HEAR') Possibly, Sir, the best thing is to drop these proceedings.
Privilege Motion

re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

12 July, 1960

*Sir*: The Hon'ble Member (M.V. Raghavachari): "Congress representatives in the Legislatures are such people whom any first-class Magistrate may round up. They were men without any appreciable means of livelihood." 

Mr. Speaker: Any defamation is a breach of privilege. The question of privilege has to decide whether a First Class Magistrate also can take cognizance of it and round them up and take cognizance of an imputation regarding the ostensible means of livelihood of a general member. That is most objectionable. Any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its fun-
ctions or which obstructs or impedes any member of office of such House in discharge of his duties or which has a tendency directly or indirectly to produce such results may be treated as a contempt."

"Whether one is discharging one's duty or not" as said by Speaker. Extra Parliamentary duties or Parliamentary activities obstruct or impede the privilege? The Parliament never intended that extra parliamentary activities obstruct or impede. Breach of privilege is mala fide. "I never intended that" as said by speaker. "At least it has a tendency to obstruct" as said by May's Parliamentary Practice. "Extra parliamentary activities" or "extra parliamentary activities" have the same cause of action as binding with the identical facts. Speakers conference convened supreme authority. Identical facts. Cause of action.
Privilege Motion
12 July, 1960

re: Speech of Sri G. Rajagopalachari

When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets' as comment on 29 Majeedahuggi 29. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets. When the Tories are voting for this Bill, they are voting money to their pockets.

References:
- THE DAILY MAIL CASE, THE DAILY WORKERS' CASE. THE DAILY WORKERS CASE.
My view of it is that hard words used against persons and parties are dealt with, if necessary, by the law of defamation, and it is only where the House as a whole is affected by the spoken word then, to my mind a question of privilege arises."

I submit that at least this part of this House is not affected by the speech and I think my brothers will agree with me that Sri C. Rajagopalachari has not meant anything against the Swatantra Party or the Communist Party.

"...however grave the charges and imputations made in that article may be, I do not think it is a case of privilege. It has been the practice of this House to restrain privilege under great limitations; and these restrictions and limitations have been, in my opinion, very wisely imposed by the House upon itself."

"The rule is that when imputations are made, in order to raise a case of privilege, the imputation must refer to the action of honourable members in the discharge of their duties in the actual transaction of the business of the House.

Are the Congress Members discharging their duties? This has to be considered. Unless that is proved and unless that principle is protected, there is no question of breach of privilege."
Privilege Motion
re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari
12 July, 1960

It has been stated at page 108 of May’s Parliamentary Practice as follows:

“It may be stated generally that any act or omission which obstructs or impedes the proceedings of either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such House in discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency directly or indirectly to produce such results, may be treated as a contempt even though there is no precedent.

But to constitute a breach of privilege, a libel upon a member must concern the character and conduct of the member in that capacity and the conduct or language on which the libel is based must be actions performed or words uttered in the actual transaction of the business of the House.”
Written imputations as affecting a member of Parliament may amount to a breach of privilege without perhaps being libel as common law. But to constitute a breach of privilege, a libel upon a member must concern the character and conduct of the members in that capacity and the conduct or language on which the libel is based must be actions performed or words uttered in the actual transaction of the business of the House. “Written imputations as affecting a member of Parliament may amount to a breach of privilege without perhaps being libel as common law. But to constitute a breach of privilege, a libel upon a member must concern the character and conduct of the members in that capacity and the conduct or language on which the libel is based must be actions performed or words uttered in the actual transaction of the business of the House.”
Privilege Motion 12 July, 1960

re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

House of Commons 12 July, 1960

123

re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

House of Commons proceedings, meet meet. The rule: House of Commons refer refer meet. House of Commons refer refer meet. House of Commons refer refer meet. House of Commons refer refer meet. House of Commons refer refer meet. Volume II. Parliamentary Debates 1886-88. However grave the charges and imputations made in that article may be, I do not think it is a case of privilege. It has been the practice of this House to restrain privilege under great limitations and conditions; and these restrictions and limitations have been, in my opinion, very wisely imposed by the House upon itself. The rule is that when imputations are made, in order to raise a case of privilege the imputation must refer to the action of honourable members in the discharge of their duties in the actual transaction of the business of this House; and though I quite understand the Honourable Baronet having brought this matter to my notice, I cannot rule that this is a case of privilege. Of course, if the Honourable members think themselves aggrieved, they have a remedy and they will not be precluded from pursuing their remedy elsewhere than in this House.”

“SriH. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of privilege. In to-day’s ‘Daily Mail’ there is a report of a speech by the Right Hon. Gentleman the

Privileges House of Commons Officials report 1953-54 June 21 to July 9. House of Commons

Sri H. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of privilege. In to-day’s ‘Daily Mail’ there is a report of a speech by the Right Hon. Gentleman the
Member from Easington (Mr. Shinwell). I will read the report, if I may:

"Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, Socialist, M. P. for Easington predicted an election at the end of the year when he spoke at Blaydon-on-Tyne Durham, Labour Party gala. He said it would be an opportunity to get rid of the crazy Tories the wretches, the rascals, the rabscallions."

As the reference was to a General Election and as a General Election, by implication, can only get rid of these people as a result of the election, the reference was clearly to Right Hon. and Hon. Members on this side of the House I would suggest that to refer to right Hon- and Hon. Members in those terms is a great breach of the Privilege of this House."

For that reason, I want you to be very careful, Sir.

"Mr. Speaker: I have had no notice of this, but I suppose the Hon. Baronet is asking me whether I consider this to be a prima facie case of breach of privilege. It is not for me to say whether it is or is not a breach of privilege, that is for the House. My view of it is that hard words used against persons and parties are dealt with, if necessary, by the law of defamation and it is only where the House as a whole is affected by the spoken word that, to my mind, question of privilege arises. In this case, it seems to me that these offensive epithets are selective in their application. Therefore, of the words complained of, I could not really find a prima facie case of breach of privilege. If the Hon. Baronet wishes to proceed further with the matter, he should put down a motion for the consideration of the House."
Privilege Motion
re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

12 July, 1960

1954 అంతర్గతం అందమానం, House as a whole affect
అంతర్గతం అందమానం, House as a whole affect
% 2/3 వైనా, 99% వైనా. Can you say that it affects the
House as a whole? Parliamentary Practice
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Its representatives in the Legislature were such people whom any First Class Magistrate could round up. They were men without any appreciable means of livelihood.
Mr. Speaker: Now I reserve my ruling.

“I have carefully considered whether or not I should rule that the hon. and learned Member has established a prima facie case of breach of privilege. My conclusion is that, whether or not the words are technically defamatory, the implication cast upon the hon. and learned member is not sufficiently grave to warrant giving to this matter precedence over the Business of the day. It is clear that the Chairman of the Juvenile Court was not fully informed of the true facts of the case, and the action in releasing the boy was taken by the Home Secretary. No criticism can possibly be attached to the hon. and learned member for his part in the matter.......

A member of Parliament is not exempt from criticism. I have to look at it from the point of view, ‘Is it going to interfere with the execution of his proper duties?’ I cannot think that the mere statement by a magistrate in Court, which was misinformed, would really deter the hon. and learned Member from performing his duties as a Member of Parliament.”
It would be creating an intolerable situation if there should be conflict of decisions between the Speaker of the Lok Sabha in the Delhi Parliament and the Speakers of the State Legislatures on identically the same matter and in respect of one and the same person and one and the same cause of action.

"It is not a question of the autonomy of the State Legislature or of the avoidance of conflict of decisions and the need for proper and smooth functioning in regard to parliamentary authority." Mr. Speaker: No. No. 2222.

Mr. Speaker: No. No. 2222.

"It would be creating an intolerable situation if there should be conflict of decisions between the Speaker of the Lok Sabha in the Delhi Parliament and the Speakers of the State Legislatures on identically the same matter and in respect of one and the same person and one and the same cause of action." Mr. Speaker: No. No. 2222.
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"It would be creating an intolerable situation if there should be conflict of decisions between the Speaker of the Lok Sabha in the Delhi Parliament and the Speakers of the State Legislatures on identically the same matter and in respect of one and the same person and one and the same cause of action." Mr. Speaker: No. No. 2222.
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Privilege Motion

re: Speech of Sri C. Rajagopalachari

12 July, 1960

The privilege motion was moved in Rajya Sabha on 19th August 1962 by the Health Minister. The motion sought to remove the privilege granted to the Health Minister. The purpose of the motion was to allow the Health Minister to make a speech without interruption. The Health Minister argued that the privilege was necessary to allow him to make a speech about the health of the country.

The motion was moved by the Health Minister. The motion was opposed by the opposition members. The opposition members argued that the privilege was unnecessary and that the Health Minister could make a speech without the need for a privilege.

The motion was debated for several hours. The Health Minister argued that the privilege was necessary to allow him to make a speech about the health of the country. The opposition members argued that the privilege was unnecessary and that the Health Minister could make a speech without the need for a privilege.

The motion was finally passed by a vote of 151 in favor and 14 against. The Health Minister was able to make his speech without interruption.

The purpose of the privilege motion was to allow the Health Minister to make a speech about the health of the country. The motion was opposed by the opposition members. The motion was debated for several hours. The motion was finally passed.
Mr. Speaker: Now I reserve my ruling.

There is no motion.

Mr. Speaker: There is no motion.

I have received a petition and I wanted to know the views of members particularly on legal questions. On the other hand SUO-MOTTON may either refer it or dismiss it. It is in your hands.
"Sri R. Lakshminarasimham Dora (Tekkali): Sir, is there a motion before the House or are you taking the House into confidence in order to give a ruling whether here is a prima facie case against Mr. Rajagopalachari so as to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee. It may be that some members have sent a motion to you, but it does not become a motion before the House. There are three procedures here.

Mr. Speaker: I am going on the presumption that they are making a motion.

Sri N. C. Seshadri: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: He has told me. I shall ask him to move a motion."

"Mr. Speaker: He has told me. I shall ask him to move a motion." ఇం యౌతి లోని రాహుల్ రాహుల్ నందిలు యిని యౌతి యిని" లోని యిని యిని యిని యిని యిని యిని యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిని యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద యిద్ద " whether the privilege is in order or not."

\[\text{whether the privilege is in order or not.}\]
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PRESENTATION OF THE SIXTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.


Mr. Speaker: The report is presented to the House.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

The Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill 1960.

The Minister for Finance (Sri K. Brahmananda Reddy): I move that the Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1960 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved.
Partiality & Co-operative Bank
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Technical mistakes & cover up

Show Cause Notice

supersede
The Andhra Pradesh Appropriation 12 July, 1960 (No: 3) Bill, 1960

The Government of India, being satisfied that the Andhra Pradesh Budget for the year ending the 31st March, 1960, has been presented to the Legislature of Andhra Pradesh by the Governor of Andhra Pradesh, recommends that the following Appropriation Bill be passed:

1. The Appropriation Bill for the year ending the 31st March, 1960, in the Andhra Pradesh Budget for the year ending the 31st March, 1960, shall be superseded, and the following sums shall be appropriated:

- For general administration, Rs. 10 lakhs
- For education, Rs. 20 lakhs
- For health, Rs. 15 lakhs

2. The debate on the Appropriation Bill shall be adjourned until the 6th July, 1960.
The Andhra Pradesh Appropriation
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Middle Schools are to be treated as Middle Schools in all respects.

Middle Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Middle Schools
మాఖుళల విద్యా సంస్థల పై మధ్య విద్యా స్థానపరిచే ప్రాంతాల పై సమూహంలో 15 స్థల పై సమూహంలో పాటాను చేస్తుంది. ఉన్నత కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ప్రాముఖ్యను కంటే ప్రపంచానికి ప్రతి పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. సమూహంలో సమానంతరగా పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ఈ కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది.

మధ్య విద్యా స్థానపరిచే ప్రాంతాల స్థానపరిచే ప్రాంతాల పై సమూహంలో రెండు స్థల పై సమూహంలో పాటాను చేస్తుంది. ఉన్నత కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ప్రాముఖ్యను కంటే ప్రపంచానికి ప్రతి పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. సమూహంలో సమానంతరగా పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ఈ కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది.

మధ్య విద్యా స్థానపరిచే ప్రాంతాల స్థానపరిచే ప్రాంతాల పై సమూహంలో రెండు స్థల పై సమూహంలో పాటాను చేస్తుంది. ఉన్నత కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ప్రాముఖ్యను కంటే ప్రపంచానికి ప్రతి పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. సమూహంలో సమానంతరగా పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ఈ కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది.

విద్యా సంస్థల పై సమూహంలో రెండు స్థల పై సమూహంలో పాటాను చేస్తుంది. ఉన్నత కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ప్రాముఖ్యను కంటే ప్రపంచానికి ప్రతి పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. సమూహంలో సమానంతరగా పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ఈ కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది.

విద్యా సంస్థల పై సమూహంలో రెండు స్థల పై సమూహంలో పాటాను చేస్తుంది. ఉన్నత కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ప్రాముఖ్యను కంటే ప్రపంచానికి ప్రతి పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. సమూహంలో సమానంతరగా పద్ధతి వేయబడింది. ఈ కారంలో పద్ధతి వేయబడింది.
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The word “రాష్ట్రం” is not relevant in this debate. The word “రాష్ట్రం” is not relevant in
this debate.
The Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (No: 3) Bill, 1960
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... repression... police... repressive methods... horrible...
The Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (No: 3) Bill, 1960

Act dated the 7th day of August, 1958, whereby the Criminal Procedure Code has been amended to include provisions for the transfer of petitions. Petitions to the I.G. of Police and to the Home Secretary, are to be submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code.
Mr. Speaker: Are you opposing the first reading?

Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu: I have to decide to oppose it.
12 July, 1960
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orders pass

*Deputy Leader of the Opposition*

Supplementary Demands
Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1960, be read a first time."

The motion was adopted.

Sri K. Brahmananda Reddy: Sir, I move:

"That the Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1960, be read a second time."

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved

(Pause)
Mr. Speaker: The question is:

That the Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1960 be read a second time.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Schedule.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That the Schedule do stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.”

Clause 1.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That Clause 1 do stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.”

Preamble.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That Preamble do stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Preamble was added to the Bill.
Sri K. Brahmananda Reddy: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move:

“That the Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1960, be read a third time and passed.”

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved

(Pause)

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That the Andhra Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1960, be read a third time and passed”.

The Motion was adopted.

THE HYDERABAD GRAM PANACHAYATS (ANDHRA PRADESH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960 (AS REPORTED BY THE REGIONAL COMMITTEE)

*The Minister for Planning (Sri P. Ranga Reddy): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move:

“That the Hyderabad Gram Panchayats (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1960 (as reported by the Regional Committee) be read a second time.”

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved.
12 July, 1960

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Hyderabad Gram Panchayats (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1960 (as reported by the Regional Committee) be read a second time"

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1.

Sri P. Ranga Reddy: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I, move:

"In sub-clause (2) of clause 1, for the words 'shall come into force at once', the words and figures and letters 'shall be deemed to have come into force on the 27th April, 1960', shall be substituted."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved

(Pause)

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"In sub-clause (2) of clause 1, for the words 'shall come into force at once', the words and figures and letters 'shall be deemed to have come into force on the 27th April, 1960 shall be substituted.'"

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 1, as amended, do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.
Clause 2.

Sri P. Ranga Reddy: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move:

"In clause 2, renumber the Explanation as Explanation I and after the Explanation as so renumbered insert the following:

'Explanation 2. A nominee of a village official or a watandar shall be deemed to hold an office of profit under the Government within the meaning of clause (e)."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved

(Pause).

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"In clause 2, renumber the Explanation as Explanation I and after the explanation as so renumbered insert the following:

'Explanation 2. A nominee of a village official or a watandar shall be deemed to hold an office of profit under the Government within the meaning of clause (e)."

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 2, as amended, do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 3.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 3 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.
New Clause 4.

Sri P. Ranga Reddy: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move:

"After clause 3, the following clause shall be added, namely:

'4. REPEAL OF ANDHRA PRADESH ORDINANCE I OF 1960:'

The Hyderabad Gram Panchayats (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Ordinance, 1960 (Andhra Pradesh Ordinance I of 1960) is hereby repealed.

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved

(Pause)

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"After clause 3, the following clause shall be added, namely:

'4. REPEAL OF ANDHRA PRADESH ORDINANCE I OF 1960:'

The Hyderabad Gram Panchayats (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Ordinance, 1960 (Andhra Pradesh Ordinance I of 1960) is hereby repealed.

The amendment was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Preamble

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Preamble do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Preamble was added to the Bill.
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move:

"That the Hyderabad Gram Panchayats (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1960 as reported by the Regional Committee) Bill be read a third time and passed"

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved

(pause)

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Hyderabad Gram Panchayats (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill 1960 (as reported by the Regional Committee) Bill be read a third time and passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE HYDERABAD MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (ANDHRA PRADESH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.

The Chief Minister (Sri D. Sanjivayya): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Hyderabad Municipal Corporations (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1960, be read a first time."

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved.
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The Hyderabad Municipal Corporations (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1960,

...
The story of the two cities of Secunderabad and Hyderabad is in some respects akin to the Tale of Two Cities of Charles Dickens. Secunderabad City had been a military cantonment from times immemorial and therefore imbibed the traditions of all cantonments, in matters of efficiency, administration, cleanliness, sanitation and health. As has been expressed by the hon. Chief Minister, the city of Secunderabad is perhaps one of the beautiful cities in the country. It has developed its own habits and thinking after the British; the medium of instruction in schools and other institutions has been English or Telugu. While Secunderabad was towing the line of British, Hyderabad city had been the capital of a feudal set-up and therefore developed certain characteristics of a feudal regime; particularly we find nepotism and a number of slums coming up in this city of Hyderabad. Therefore, the people of Secunderabad feel that they would stand to lose by this merger. This is a powerful sentiment which has swayed the people of Secunderabad. Besides, in all political movements Secunderabad city was in the forefront; it has been a pio-
neer in all the political movements that have taken place in the country. As you are aware, Sir, sentiment is a very powerful factor and it is difficult to do away with that. However, sentiment is not the only reason for the people to oppose the merger. Besides sentiment, there are certain other reasons; being small and compact, the administration has been very good and there is high percentage of tax. Although the percentage of tax is not high; the incidence has been very high on the people—it is as much as 16% per capita. Although the percentage of taxation is higher in Vijayawada, the cleanliness is not to be found as in the case of Secunderabad; it has developed an independent system of water supply, where the normal source of supply was not found feasible. The cheap price dispensaries are unique and novel. This experiment has been found very successful and all the provinces in the country have acclaimed this city for its bold venture. However, it has introduced a graded system of taxation which is in tune and which is in step with our socialistic pattern. Conservancy arrangements in this city of Secunderabad are fully mechanized and you do not find the unseemly sights of scavengers and thoties moving about with buckets, as we see in Hyderabad. All the roads in the city have been made dust-proof. Therefore, all these go to prove that the city of Secunderabad has been a beautiful city, has been a cleaner city and people are endeared to it both by sentiment as well as by other reasons. In these days of decentralisation when small villages are enjoying the status of panchayats, it looks a bit anomalous to do away with the physical existence of a city of 2.5 lakhs people. Perhaps this is the second biggest city in Andhra Pradesh.

While all these can be said in favour of merger, it cannot be gainsaid that a city, however clean, however sound in its administration, can finance its schemes, more so in the case of capital schemes. Renovation of water system alone costs about Rs. 25.0 lakhs; underground drainage
costs about Rs. 16.0 lakhs; slum clearance costs another Rs. 10.0 lakhs; housing is estimated to cost about Rs. 10.0 lakhs. In all, we require about a crore of rupees to implement all the schemes to provide greater and better facilities to the people. The Government has decided to merge the city for the reasons set forth in the Bill. They say that all the legitimate interests of the people of Secunderabad will be fully safeguarded. They feel that to finance the schemes envisaged by the Secunderabad municipal corporation they themselves will not be in a position to undertake. They would like to draw on the vast resources of the Central Government for implementing all the schemes of development; they envisage a greater and grander Hyderabad which can compare well with the other Provincial cities of Bombay, Madras, Calcutta and the like. But, if efficiency is to be maintained as has been done all these years, it is necessary that we have a zonal office or a unit office in the city of Secunderabad with an additional or a Joint Commissioner and enjoying full Powers of Commissioner having all the branches like Health, Sanitation, Education and other departments.

It is necessary that all these powers should be delegated. Otherwise, people will feel that they stand to lose, they will feel much resentment and, perhaps, they will even be averse to such a change. The hon. Chief Minister has just now assured the House that the Govt. would constitute a small committee consisting of members from both the cities which would go in detail into all the aspects of the merger, examine the legal aspects and recommend suitable amendments which would contribute to the efficiency of administration and see that the recommendations made by the Committee are implemented by the State Government. The terms of reference of such a committee, I would venture to suggest to the hon. Chief Minister, should be so wide as to satisfy that all those powers which they have been enjoying hitherto are fully safeguarded and all their legitimate interests are fully protected, and that the people of Secunderabad do in fact feel that they do not lose by this
merger, but only stand to gain. We must ultimately realise that mere physical integration is of no use; we should strive to bring about emotional or sentimental integration which alone can pave the way for establishing harmonious relations between the two cities. Future generations should decide whether today the 12th of July is a red-letter day or dooms-day for the people of Secunderabad. I am sure, in view of the assurances given by the hon. Chief Minister, the people will realise that this day would prove to be a red-letter day.

Thank you Sir.

*Sri Gopal Rao Ekbote (High Court): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question of integrating these two cities has been before not only the Government but also the public, for the last four years and all aspects of this integration has been thoroughly discussed not only by the Government and this Assembly or even the former Assembly of Hyderabad but also in newspapers and on various platforms. I am aware that there is a section in the Secunderabad city which favours a separate Corporation for the city of Secunderabad. I do not wish at the moment to go into the details as to why they want to keep the city separate, but if I am allowed to refer to an eminent authority on Local Bodies who traces the history of integrations of various regions into one consolidated big municipality or a corporation and cites various examples, particularly dealing with the expansion of London City or New York City, he clearly mentions amongst several other points one important point: Those who are usually in power always disfavour this kind of integration and usually the resentment or dissension emerge from this small circle which gets on expanded and some times comes in the way of actual expansion. Those who are interested in the methodical expansion or reconstruction of the city on modern lines should get over this difficulty by not only clarifying the issues at a higher intellectual level, but also contributing to bring
about the change at a psychological or as my hon. friend was saying at an emotional level.

Now, Sir, the cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad have always been one geographically, emotionally or even otherwise. I do not find any line of demarcation between these two cities. Therefore, in the interest of a scientific or methodical growth of the cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad as one city, one master plan built on a very scientific basis has been felt to be of absolute necessity since many years and if we want the whole area which can be legitimately called as one city to grow on a scientific basis under one master plan, the integration becomes absolutely necessary. Apart from that, Sir, the oldest twin doctrines of any local body have always been economy and efficiency. As far as economy has been concerned, it has been told several times to the people on the question of integration that not only the overhead costs will go down to a considerable extent but that the costs of collection of various taxes e. g. octroi duty can be reduced to a great extent and that all these savings can very legitimately be directed towards giving civic amenities to the people. On the question of efficiency also, if the whole city is placed under one administrator with efficient machinery to implement all the schemes of reconstruction such as drainage, expansion of electricity or other civic amenities, I am confident that the city will grow on proper lines. Population is increasing at a fast speed and after Hyderabad has become the capital of greater Andhra, it has become absolutely necessary to re-consider all the aspects after a careful rethinking regarding the requirements of this growing city. I, therefore, favour this Bill and I feel that there is absolutely no necessity to refer it to public opinion because it has been sufficiently expressed not only by the people of Hyderabad but even a large number of Secunderabad citizens apart from those who are immediately interested in the Corporation. The citizens as such have favoured this integration because they know the beneficial effect of it and there is no necessity either to refer it to a Select Committee as the matter is very simple. There is absolutely no complication and I, therefore, strongly support this integration.
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The wearer of the shoe knows where it pinches.
जनता के प्रतिनिधियों का अभिप्राय देना आवश्यक है। किंतु इस विचार का लक्ष्य यह है कि जनता के अभिप्राय को ठुकराया। अगर अपने इस विचार का विवाद है कि सिकंदराबाद की जनता इसके अनुकूल है वहां के निर्वाचित लोग जिनका समन्वय सिकंदराबाद भुनिमिन्डल कार्योंमें से है वह इस से सहमत है तो फिर आप इस विचार का प्रत्येक अभिप्राय निर्णय दिन पहले एक विराट सम्मान हुई थी जिसमें इसका विवाद किया गया और इसके प्रोटेस्ट किया गया। इससे स्पष्ट होता है कि वहां कि जनता इसके प्रत्यक्ष कृत है। वह नहीं चाहती कि सरकार हो। जनता के प्रति बिवाद के नाम से, जनता कि हुकूमत के नाम से इस सरकार का डकोस्टा करना यह कहां तक उचित है। आप क्यों जनता का अभिप्राय नहीं लेते। आप जनता की आवाज को क्यों कुचलते हैं। सच-मुख यह समझ में आने वाली बात नहीं है।

यह कहा जाता है कि अगर दोनों कार्योंमें सरकार का मंडल कर दिया जाये तो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में सुविधा होगी और साथ ही साथ एकीकरण इन सरकार (Efficiency in service) भी बढ़ेगी। इस तलाशके मुश्किल में कुछ कहने की जरूरत नहीं है। क्योंकि चीफ मिनिस्टर साहुब स्वयं अपने तकरीब में फरमान चुके हैं कि एकीकरण इस सरकार के हूए तक सिकंदराबाद कार्योंमें एक आदर्श कार्यों में सरकार गई है। यहुद न खेल उनका अभिप्राय है। बल्कि उनहोंने स्पष्ट बताया कि उन्होंने स्वयं लिया था और जिन्हें सिकंदराबाद की अवस्था मिला है उन्होंने यह बताया कि सिकंदराबाद की सरकार बहुत ही एफिशेंट है वहां की रौद्ष सरकार है। और मोहले परिषद है। इस्तादियु। यह बात न सिफर भी भी संजीवनी के कहने पर स्पष्ट होती है। बल्कि भी गुरूत्व में इस बात पर बच्ची तरह से प्रकाश डाल चुके हैं।

इसके बाद एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन कल्वीनियंस (administrative convenience) की बात आती है। यह फरमान है कि क्या ही अच्छा होता अगर ग्रेटर हैदराबाद की हमारी जो कहाना है जो फ्रिजलिय विचवलाइय किया गया है जिसके बारे में होगा का अभिप्राय प्राप्त किया गया है वह पूरा होता हांज़ैली, यह जो अभिप्राय प्राप्त करने के बारे में जो कहा जाता है उसका आप के पास कोई प्रमाण नहीं है। यह आज एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन कल्वीनियंस
की बात के संदर्भ होगी। आज तक यहाँ जो बड़े बड़े फाँसियों में हैं उनको पुरा करने में हैदराबाद मुनिस्पेक्टोरेशन और सिकंदराबाद मुनिस्पेक्टोरेशन दोनों में एक तरह का इंतजार किया गया है, लेकिन उनको यहाँ तक तो नहीं हुआ है। फिर यह बात सच है। इसलिए इन दोनों की कार्यार्थता आज तक तो नहीं हुई है। यह बात अभी क्यों है?

हाँ, यह बात तथ्यार्थ है। इसलिए इन दोनों की कार्यार्थता आज तक तो नहीं हुई है। उसका बस होता कि उसके दक्ष कर हमारे कार्यों की हिस्से में भी इसी प्रकार के दोनों द्वारा उनके कार्यार्थता आज तक तो नहीं हुई है। इसलिए इन दोनों की कार्यार्थता आज तक तो नहीं हुई है। इसलिए इन दोनों की कार्यार्थता आज तक तो नहीं हुई है।

प्रेकॉन्प्रिओनल एक्ट (Predominant Party) या रजिंग पार्टी (Ruling Party) के रूप में पंचायत करने में असमर्थ है। इस बात का उनको अनुभव हो चुका है। यहीं असल जैसा है। इस में न तो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का संबंध है न संस्थान का और न एफ्केनसी का। यह सभ संबंध है। किसी यह हुगरे कारण तब ही कार्यार्थता के दौरान में चुटकौंकी की कार्यार्थता की जाती है। वास्तवमें यह विनियमित कीया गया है। कार्य कह महसूस कर रही है कि जिनके भी विरोधी दल हैं वह अधिक संख्या में निर्विरोध होकर आ गये हैं। सिकंदराबाद में १५ कार्यकारिण के सदस्य हैं जो १३ विरोधी दल के सदस्य हैं। यद्यपि एक की मेजरशिप है। नहीं मालूम कब क्यों हो जाये क्योंकि मेयर दोनों के लिये किसी एक प्रमुख का आदेश खड़ा हो सकता है या किया जा सकता है और किसी दूसरे से बादाना कर निम्नाना हो जाये कि तुम कभी मेयर निर्बल होकर नहीं आ सकता। आपकी यह दर है। इसलिए आप दोनों कार्यों का भर्त कर देना चाहते हैं ताकि आप दो होल (on the whole) आपकी मेजरशिप रहे। और आप जो भी करता चाहें कर दें। सभी हम तरह से मुल्ला आप अपनी दुनिया के दिल्ली और रोकिमित्र के दिल्ली यह काम करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन यह ठीक नहीं है। आप इस तरह से एक भ्रमण पर अधिकार कर रहे हैं। और जनता की आवाज की कल्पना की कार्यार्थता कर रहे हैं। साथ ही साथ इसे एक सिस्टम पर परिवर्तन कर रहे हैं। और जनता की आवाज की कल्पना की कार्यार्थता कर रहे हैं। साथ ही साथ इनस्ट्रक्शन का आपका जो किसी गृहपत्र जो विद्वान जो एक युनिट वनना चाहते हैं और विद्वान को एक जो कर सकता चाहते हैं ताकि वह अपना कार्य कर बही ठीक हो सकें। सभी यह सब कैसे कर सकते हैं। आप समूहों से जिला परिषद बनाये हैं क्लेक्टोरेट है। हुसरा स्टाफ भी हैं। इन सब पर आप पैसा खर्च कर रहे हैं।
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अब इस तहत यह कहते हैं कि इस बिल का लाभ नहीं होगा। वर्तमान में व्यवस्था के तहत यह कहता है कि इस बिल के लाभ नहीं होगा। इस बिल के तहत यह कहता है कि इस बिल के लाभ नहीं होगा। इस बिल के तहत यह कहता है कि इस बिल के लाभ नहीं होगा। इस बिल के तहत यह कहता है कि इस बिल के लाभ नहीं होगा। इस बिल के तहत यह कहता है कि इस बिल के लाभ नहीं होगा। इस बिल के तहत यह कहता है कि इस बिल के लाभ नहीं होगा। इस बिल के तहत यह कहता है कि इस बिल के लाभ नहीं होगा। इस बिल के तहत यह कहता है कि इस बिल के लाभ नहीं होगा। इस बिल के तहत यह कहता है कि इस बिल के लाभ नहीं होगा।

अन्त में आयोग वहोरी देखने की तलाशें हैं कि संक्षेपावलयों के दिशा में अगर बड़ा हैं तो हम उनकी जनकल्पना एग्जिमेंट (Gentleman’s agreement) देने का अवसर रखते हैं। हम को इस जनकल्पना एग्जिमेंट का
तजुर्वा है। जिस बस्त तेल्गाना और आंध्र का एन्टीप्रेशन हुआ था उस समय भी अपने एक जेनरल एपिमेंट किया था उस एपिमेंट के साथ किस तरह का व्यवहार किया गया मुझे यह बताने की जरूरत नहीं है। कई बार मैं इस एसेंब्री में इस जेनरल एपिमेंट पर काफी प्रकाश दाँतबुद्धा है। जब यहां भी एक जेनरल एपिमेंट बनाने की कोशिश की जा रही है तो उसका भी बड़ा हाल होगा जो पहले का हुआ है। इसलिए मैं आपके पुराने शब्दों में अपील करता हूँ और लास्कर भी डू. संजीवनी से कहूँगा कि वह क्या करके यहाँ दर न रखे कि मजलिस इस्तेमादुल-मुस्लिमिन आगा जा रही है या आपकी मेजरिटी नहीं रहेगी, इसका डर न रखिये। बल्कि यह सीकर आए बढ़े कि आपने एक प्रिन्सपल को अपनाया है, उसको आपने हमारे केंद्र में कायमनित किया है, आप उस प्रिन्सपल को मानते है, जनता की आवाज को नहीं कुच्चे देने, और तीन चीजें। मेजरिटी का जो नियम रखा है उसको नहीं कुच्चे देने। इन बातों को समझने रखकर आप इस बिल को प्रस्तुत न कीजिये और अब इसको वापस ले कीजिये। मैं यह अपील करते हुए अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री बासुदेव नायक। अध्यक्ष महाशय जी। आप चूँकि बंदेमातर्स जी ने हिंदी में भाषण किया है इसलिए मैं उनको समझाने के लिये कि मैं उनका क्यों विरोध कर रहा हूँ हिंदी ही में भाषण करता हूँ।

महाशयजी ने पहले तो पॉलिसी और प्रिन्सपल पर विरोध किया और होते होते उन्होंने अपने विरोध को पॉलिटिकल एक्सिजेंसी (Political exigency) में का कर अंत किया। मैं महाशय को पुराना इतिहास याद दिलाऊँगा जब कि सिकंदराबाद कंटोपर्मेंट एरिया में था और वह एक भिंड़ी एरिया था। उस जमाने में जब कि हिन्दूस्तान में ब्रिटिशस की 7 लाख भिंड़ी रहा करती थी तो उस में से 70 हजार भिंड़ी बुजुर्ग, बर्मनगिरि और सिकंदराबाद में रही गयी थी। उस समय उनका माकस मदद यह था कि रेसीडेंसी का एक कमेंट एरिया रखते हुए उनकी अपनी भिंडी भिंडी को हैदराबाद से एक अलग स्वातांत्र्य पर रखने की व्यवस्था। हीनी चाहिए। इसी नीति, इसी आबजेक्टिव, और इसी उद्देश्य से सिकंदराबाद को अलग रखा गया। इसी प्रकार रेसीडेंसी और सुल्तानाबाद बाजार का एरिया भी अलग
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या। भाई को मालूम होंगा कि जब १४ मई १९६४ की सुलतान बाजार एरिया का हैदराबाद से इंटरफ्रेमेशन हुआ तो उस वक्त भी सुलतान बाजार के संबंध में यहीं आवाज उठाई गई थी कि इस एरिया को हैदराबाद के इस्सरे भाग से जुड़ा दिया जाय तो शायद मुलुक के अधिराज और सी-डेनसी एरिया के बहुत प्रबन्धक से आठ खास ग्यारही नई हैं जो हैदराबाद के इस्सरे भाग के रहने वाले नागरिकों के साथ जुड़ने पर उनका उल्लंघन होगा। मैं पूछता हूँ क्या आज वह डर बाकी है? क्या आप यह कह सकते हैं कि सिकंदराबाद एक कमरेजट्स एरिया होने की वजह से वह कमरेजट्स बोर्ड से इनहेरिटेंस (Inheritance) में आया है। इसलिए देमोक्रेटिक मेथड के तहत ताकःनेटवर्म, हैदराबाद और सिकंदराबाद दोनों नगरों को अलग अलग भागों में रखा जाना चाहिए। यह कैसे हो सकता है? अगर आप इसी सिद्धांत से देखें और आबादी पर भी गौर करें तो यह कह सकते हैं कि भयों न हैदराबाद कार्यालय के सरकार न्र २ सुलतान बाजार को इसी आवाज सिकंदराबाद एरिया की आबादी से व्यापत है और हैदराबाद कार्यालय की ५० फीसदी आबादी है हैदराबाद कार्यालय से अलग करके उसका भी एक अलग कार्यालय बना दिया जाये और उस पर भी क्यों न हैदराबाद आड़ इनरिटेंज का प्रभाव लागू किया जाये। हैदराबाद कार्यालय के ४ सरकार हैं। यह ४ सरकार होते हुए भी सरकार न्र २ इतना बड़ा है कि वह सिकंदराबाद के एरिया से अधिक है। यहाँ भी हैदराबाद इनरिटेंज का तत्त्व लाभ जा सकता है। यह भी है देमो-क्रेटिक मेथड में आता है। इस जो बिल लिखा गया है वह किसी तरह भी सिकंदराबाद वासियों के लिए हानिकारक नहीं है। मालूम नहीं आप किस तरह से यहाँ एक अजनबी बीजा लगा रहे हैं। आप और आप कबाबी गुड़े से जायेंगे तो सीमेंट रोड ही से सिकंदराबाद लगा हुआ है। उस तरह बेगमरेज के जाते हैं तो भी सिकंदराबाद सीमेंट रोड से ही लगा हुआ है। इस समय तो हैदराबाद और सिकंदराबाद एक कार्यालय (Contiguous area) होगा है। इसलिए एकान्ती और एफीजेन्सी
की खातिर यह एक बिल लागू जार्ज़ है। इस में कोई पोलिटिकल एक्स-जनसी लाकर खड़े की जाये तो यही कहना पड़ेगा कि आप में कुछ ब्रिटिश जमाने के लेगेसीज आए हैं और उन ही लेगेसीज को लेकर आप यहाँ पोलिटिकल एक्सजनसीज का आरोप इस बिल पर लगा रहे हैं। में अपना विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि द्वार हो में कार्यपोरेंट्रा के जुनाव हुए हैं उसमें कांग्रेस पार्टी को जो अधिक संख्या में यह नहीं मिला है उसके दर की कोई बात नहीं है। जो इस बेकार भी माइनार्टी में हैं उससे दर की क्या बात है। और फिर खास तौर पर उस सूरत में जब कि वह माइनार्टी, इन्डिया- जुलूस की हैं उनकी कोई पार्टी नहीं है। वह इतने स्वीकार करता है कि कभी भी अपने आपस में लड़कर बीक़नेट [Weakness] का सकते हैं ……

श्री बंदेसाराम रामच्छन्द्राराम: आपके कांग्रेस ने भी इस तरह से बहुत कुछ है।

श्री वामुदेश्वर नाग्रो: नहीं कांग्रेस में ऐसा नहीं है। कांग्रेस में एक विधान है, उसके रूप में, उनमें एक विधान है। उसकी मेजरिटी लीक भी कम क्यों न हो वह अपना कार्यक्रम बराबर पूरा कर सकती है। इसका विश्वास है। क्या आप नहीं जानते कि श्री बी. रामकृष्णराव के जमाने में गवर्नमेंट केवल दो सदस्यों की मेजरिटी से काम करती रही। उन्होंने ने केवल दो ही की मेजरिटी से क्यों न हो 5 साल तक अपना कार्यक्रम शान- दार तरीके पर पूरा किया। वह एक उदाहरण हैं इंदिराबाद हैं की आप के सामने है। इसलिये यहाँ पोलिटिकल एक्सजनसी की समस्या को ला खड़ा करना में नहीं समझता कि कोई ठीक बात होगी। में यह कहूँगा कि यह जो बिल लागू गया है वह आज ही नहीं लागू गया। कई जमाने से यह समझ जा रहा था कि कभी न कभी हैं इंदिराबाद और सिकंदराबाद एक ही एरिया हो जायेंगे। इस से एफीजीसी या एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन खराब होने का सबाल ही नहीं पैदा हुआ। क्योंकि आज इस दोनों एरियाजें के द्वारे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन एक ही हैं। पोलिस एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन एक हैं। ला एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन एक है। और जितने भी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन हैं दोनों एरियाजें के द्वारे एक ही हैं। क्या पोलिस कमिशन हैं इंदिराबाद को एक नजर से देखता है और सिकंदराबाद को
दूसरी नजर से देखता है। कमीशनर पोलीस यहाँ भी ला एण्ड आरडर [Law and Order] में लूट देता है और वहाँ भी करता है। तो फिर क्या जीता है कि जब हैदराबाद और सिकंद्राबाद दोनों के एडमिन- 
स्ट्रेटस्ट सरकार के बाई ओरों में एक ही है तो मुलायम 
कामों के लिये दोनों के लिये दो अलग अलग कार्यालय संबंध हैं।

इस में शक नहीं कि सिकंदराबाद में एक कमराड टाउनशिप थी कण्टोनें- 
ट परिवार में रहने वाले छात्रकर्मी लोगों ने वहाँ के व्योम के तालुक से 
एक अलग टाउनशिप बनाया है। उस जमाने में एक विचार के तहत 
एक कमेटें परिवार बना हुआ था। और वहाँ एफार्गांसी भी बढ़ गई थी।

उनके अनुसार से हैदराबाद और सिकंदराबाद की मिला कर एक भव्य 
सुन्दर कंपनी बना सकते है। अब जो दोनों पर अलग अलग लाओं 
रचना हो रहा है दोनों की मिला देने से काफी एकांकी कर सकते है।

और एफार्गांसी भी बड़ा हो गया है। इस तरह से एक सुन्दर 
और शानदार सिटी बनाने में हमें नहीं समझता कि कोई विरोध 
हो सकता है। और यह बात तो एक जमाने से आ रही है। यह 
बिल तो बहुत ही पहले का सोचा हुआ है। अबस्था कार्यालय एक्ट में 
तीन चीफमैन मेजरस्टी का एक लोक शाही का तत्त्व रखा गया था। इस के 
लिये चार साल का मौका दिया गया कि वहाँ के मुलायम कौन सा 
खुद अपनी तरफ से यह तैयार कर दे। यह मालिक ही था कि कमी न कमी यह 
बिल लाया है। और अब यह लाया गया है और इस बिल के तहत चीफ 
मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक जनरिमेंट एडिशन का अध्यादेश भी दिया है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि इस से सिकंदराबाद के नागरिक से संचालन का अध्यादेश भी 
हो जायेगा। अब सूरत यह है कि यहाँ किसी वर्ष तक के जब कोई एड्रेस पेश 
किया जाता है तो एक कार्यालय एक एड्रेस [address] पेश करता है और दूसरा कार- 
पोर्टर दूसरा एड्रेस पेश करता है। उन्हें यह कहा जाता है कि अनकरीब 
दोनों सिटीजन के रहने वाले एक ही कार्यालय बना रहें, उस बक्त एक ही 
मेयर, होगा, और एक ही एड्रेस पेश होगा। इस सब बातों को ध्यान में रखते 
हुए मैं समझता हूँ कि इस वक्त जो बिल हाऊस के सामने लाया गया है।

तुलना, खुश-दिल से स्वीकार करना चाहिए।
The Hyderabad Municipal Corporations (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1960

(*Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair*)

Merge the British Cantonment area with the city to create an efficient and separate entity. The merger is in较好 of the public opinion. The merger should not affect the incremental tax system. The new corporation shall be called the Hyderabad Municipal Corporation.

Corporation shall consist of 18, 19, 30 members, one each from 30 area. The area for the new corporation shall be 18, 19, 30. The capacity of the capital city is to expand. The new corporation shall be efficient.
Greater Hyderabad

Greater Hyderabad is a historical accident. It is the result of various mergers and amalgamations that occurred over time. The Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (AMBI) Bill, 1960, merged several smaller municipalities into a single entity. The process of merger often resulted in a compact district. It is a historical accident that Greater Hyderabad was formed.

Manager

Manager
The Hyderabad Municipal Corporations (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1960

unit smaller the municipal units, greater the efficiency. Water works, slum clearances, 40% matching grants. Water supply, slum clearances, 40% matching grants. Water supply, slum clearances, 40% matching grants. Greater Hyderabad aspect safeguards, assurances, safeguards. honest feel entity sentiment local difficulty.

aspect safeguards, assurances, safeguards. honest feel entity sentiment local difficulty.
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The Hyderabad Municipal Corporations (Andhra Pradesh Amendment) Bill, 1960
Mr. Speaker: Certainly, you can continue your speech tomorrow.
ADJOURNMENT MOTION

re: Strike by Central Government Employees

* The motion referred to is as follows: Members explained the situation in the Income tax Offices, Accountant General offices, civil employees, defence establishments etc., many All India Federations, the national organisations of income tax officials and civil employees, and the civil employees and defence establishments etc., have come to this House and adjourned their services from the 7th of July, 1960, and the strike by the Central Government employees is now 7th of July, 1960. The Government have to take immediate steps to settle the issues in a peaceful manner. The Pay Commission 1947 has been recommended to provide a scale of pay ranging from 100 points to 185 points, and 20 points of 5/- each. The Government have to take steps to settle the issues in a peaceful manner.
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Sri D. Sanjeevayya: Can we discuss here what the Central Government has done?

Sri D. Sanjeevayya: Who are we to advise them?

Sri D. Sanjeevayya: We must understand we are in the State Government.
The Leader of the Opposition is speaking about the difficulties of the Central Government's employees and asking us to realise and appreciate their difficulties. I submit that we have no concern about it.

We want the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. [Name] said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a matter that has been referred by the Leader of the Opposition. The Pay Commission has recommended a revision in the pay scales of the Central Government's employees. I would like to know when the recommendations will be implemented.

Mr. [Name] said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know when the recommendations of the Pay Commission will be implemented.
Adjournment Motion re: Strike by Central Government Employees
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Sri D. Sanjeevayya: That should be raised in the Parliament as to why they are going on strike.

I cannot allow hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I must say that I cannot allow any discussion with regard to the merits or the equities of the strike or the decisions of the Government of India. The only thing is, some
employees gave a strike notice and the Government of India said they would not accept. Then they wanted to go on strike. The Government of India issued an Ordinance. After the issue of the Ordinance you can say whether there is anything wrong on the part of the Government. Except that, there is nothing else.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Sundarayya, I have to ask you to kindly sit down first and listen to me.
Adjournment Motion re: Strike by Central Government Employees
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I am not going to allow one word about the reasons for ‘Samme’, equities of the ‘Samme’ or the cause of the workers, or the cause of the Government of India.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, it is a point of order.
Adjournment Motion re: Strike by Central Government Employees

It is not my business.

It is a sort of showing displeasure against the present Government.

It is a sort of showing displeasure against the present Government.

Sri D. Sanjivayya: No, no, no. The Hon. Speaker has given a definite ruling that we should not discuss the merits of the Strike. I object to it. He should withdraw it.
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Sri D. Sanjivyaya: He should not say it, Sir. He should withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: What shall I do, Mr. Sundaravya? You should not talk about it.
Adjournment Motion re: Strike by Central Government Employees
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ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం: ఆధునిక రాష్ట్రంలో ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం అందరియిద్దం సాధనం యొక్క తమిళనాడు రాష్ట్రం చేత 1960 సంవత్సరంలో ఎందరు పోటీ చేసింది. ఇది చారిత్రక పరిస్థితిలో ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం అంటే రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.

ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం: ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం మాత్రమే ప్రతి సంవత్సరం ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.

1960 సంవత్సరంలో ఎందరు పోటీ చేసింది?

ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం: ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం మాత్రమే ప్రతి సంవత్సరం ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.

事业部పవా: ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం మాత్రమే ప్రతి సంవత్సరం ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.

事业部పవా: ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం మాత్రమే ప్రతి సంవత్సరం ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.

事业部పవా: ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం మాత్రమే ప్రతి సంవత్సరం ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.

事业部పవా: ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం మాత్రమే ప్రతి సంవత్సరం ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.

事业部పవా: ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం మాత్రమే ప్రతి సంవత్సరం ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.

事业部పవా: ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం మాత్రమే ప్రతి సంవత్సరం ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.

事业部పవా: ప్రత్యేక నిసర్గం మాత్రమే ప్రతి సంవత్సరం ఉన్నత శక్తి వహించిన రాష్ట్రానికి ఉపయోగపడం లక్షణం లేదు.
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I think I had better close very soon. With the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am going to close the discussion.

Mr. Speaker: No, please sit down. If speech 3& close 3&.

Madam President: (In Telugu)
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అడ్డానికి. 25వ దినంలో రైందా రాయాలను, అ సమయం రేగులరు
అనుమతిగా ఉన్నాను. ఈ కార్యాలను రేగులరు జట్టా సమయంలో ధరించా ఉన్నాను. హెచ్చరికి రాయాలను మార్పు చేయాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. ఈ అర్థాలను పరీక్షించాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. వారి మద్యధారిత అవసరాన్ని అనుగుంచడానికి మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. ఈ అర్థాలను పరీక్షించాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. కాబట్టి మలసమల సమయం మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. ఈ అర్థాలను పరీక్షించాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. కాబట్టి మలసమల సమయం మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. ఈ అర్థాలను పరీక్షించాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. కాబట్టి మలసమల సమయం మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. ఈ అర్థాలను పరీక్షించాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. కాబట్టి మలసమల సమయం మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. ఈ అర్థాలను పరీక్షించాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. కాబట్టి మలసమల సమయం మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. ఈ అర్థాలను పరీక్షించాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. కాబట్టి మలసమల సమయం మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. ఈ అర్థాలను పరీక్షించాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. కాబట్టి మలసమల సమయం మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. ఈ అర్థాలను పరీక్షించాలంటి రీతిలో, మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది. కాబట్టి మలసమల సమయం మార్పు సాధనం పూర్తి వేయడానికి అనుకుంటుంది.
Mr. Speaker: How long, Mr. Sundarayya? What shall I do? Let me adjourn the House. I don't wish to adjourn. Then I shall close it down.

Mr. Speaker: I close the discussion, because......
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Several Members from the Treasury Benches: We do not want to hear, Sir.

Several Members from Treasury Benches: We don't want the discussion, Sir.

Sri K. Lakshman Bapuji: I want to raise a point of order, Sir.

Sri P. Sundarayya: I am not yielding, Sir.

Sri D. Sanjivayya: Point of order, Sir, point of order, Sir.

Sri P. Sundarayya: I am not yielding, Sir.

Sri A. Satyanarayana Raju. Point of order, Sir.

Sri P. Sundarayya: I am not yielding.

Sri K. Lakshman Bapuji: When the Hon. Chair has declared that he has closed the discussion, the hon. members should respect it and the hon. Leader of the Opposition should resume his seat. To disobey the hon. Speaker's ruling and to continue to talk is a disorder. Therefore I am raising a point of order. I want a ruling on that, Sir.
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Sri K. Lakhman Bapuji: I want a ruling, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: What do you want to say?

Sri K. Lakhman Bapuji: Then there is no democracy, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Please sit down. I have allowed him to speak.

Sri J. B. Muthyala Rao: Once the Hon. Speaker has given a ruling, how can the hon. Leader of the Opposition speak, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Please sit down. I have allowed him to speak.

Sri A. SatyanarayanaRaju: An hon. Member of the responsible Cabinet pleaded for a point of order and the hon. Leader of the opposition is not yielding and is going on shouting. It is not fair. When a point of order is raised, you please give a ruling, Sir. We all respect your ruling and we obey you. When a point of order is raised you please decide it and give a ruling. Then we will sit down. The hon. leader of the opposition is not obeying. It is not proper. At this rate it is impossible to conduct this House.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to explain how even the Central subjects can be discussed here.
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Therefore I close the subject as 60th in the list.

Rules of procedure are applicable. An adjournment motion cannot be moved on a Friday. The adjournment motion is not therefore admissible. The point of order raised is not relevant. Some Members from the Treasury Benches: Rules apply to Members only.
Mr. Speaker: Now the discussion is closed. I adjourn the House to 8-30 A.M. tomorrow.

(The House then adjourned)