

3137

LOK SABHA

Monday, 19th December, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Speaker: The Committee on absence of Members from the sittings of the House in its Twelfth Report has recommended that leave of absence may be granted to the following Members for the periods indicated in the Report:

- (1) Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri;
- (2) Shri Purendu Sekhar Naskar;
- (3) Shri Dev Kanta Borooh;
- (4) Shri N. Somana;
- (5) Dr. N. B. Khare;
- (6) Shrimati B. Khongmen;
- (7) Shri P. Natesan;
- (8) Dr. Ch. V. Rama Rao;
- (9) Dr. Shaukatullah Shah Ansari;
- (10) Shri Sofi Mohd. Akbar, and
- (11) Shri Kamakhya Prasad Tripathi.

Do I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee?

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

3138

Mr. Speaker: So the Members will be informed accordingly.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): May I seek one clarification?

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. Member may wait for some time. I myself want to clear certain grounds and then of course, if need be, we might have further clarifications, but we should not take much time over that. Now, let the Secretary read the messages received from the Rajya Sabha.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following two messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:

- (1) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1955, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 12th December, 1955, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."
- (2) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1955, which was

[Secretary]

passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 12th December, 1955, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

MOTION RE REPORT OF STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion:

"That the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission be taken into consideration".

This debate has gone on for four days and we have five days before us.

An Hon. Member: Four and a half days.

Mr. Speaker: No; I think on the last day there will be no Private Members' business. That was the suggestion made by the Business Advisory Committee, and therefore, I said five days including today. In spite of my very keen and best desire to give every Member a chance to speak, looking to the length of speeches of hon. Members and perhaps a nervousness on my part that it may not be possible to enforce a strict limit on speeches—unless Members themselves co-operate—it may not be possible to give a chance to every one to whom the Chair would like to give a chance. I am trying to conduct the debate on the lines which I had indicated previously, and it is my desire to see that every State, as at present organised, gets a chance of representing its views. Wherever a State is affected most, it should be given more time and Members representing some States which are not affected practically may be expected to be charitable enough to forego any speeches here, but even they should get a chance to speak on

the general aspects. I am not denying that. But I think we must now place a time-limit, and I shall do so only if the House supports me in that matter.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There seem to be some dissentients on the left side here.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): Except for Delhi which is most affected.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah (Golaghat-Jorhat) rose—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will be called. I am going to give a chance to him. Assam is in my picture.

Shri Debeswar Sarmah: I was going to submit that the time-limit should be clamped down only after the first round is given to every State.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): Hon. Members who have been speaking for particular States had been given one and a half hours each. But there is an opinion against the linguistic division and none of them have been given a chance. If some of us are given an opportunity to speak for an hour, and if some of us now are to restrict the speeches to 15 minutes, we cannot place our case properly or some cases would not have been placed at all. I would, therefore, submit that there should not be a time-limit for such Members.

Mr. Speaker: I understand these difficulties and indeed anticipated such difficulties. There is nothing new in these points which the hon. Member has brought to my notice.

Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Dist.—East): You have distributed the occasion for speeches, in the past, according to the States. One State after another has been given the opportunity and it has been discussed. It so happens that some States were unfortunately placed later on in your list and now they will suffer from the clamping down of a time-limit, I do not