

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

1919

1920

LOK SABHA

Friday, 9th December, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

11.59 A.M.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE. DISCUSSION
ON S. R. C. REPORT

Mr. Speaker: If hon. Members are agreeable, I would like to make a suggestion to them for consideration and such action as they would like to take thereon.

Since the S.R.C. Report has been decided to be taken up for consideration on the 14th instant, I have been considering the best way of guiding the debate, so that, all shades of opinion will have a chance of expressing their views relating to matters and recommendations contained in the Report.

It has to be remembered that, as far as I can see, the idea of having a discussion at this stage is not to record any definite conclusions about the implementation of the report, but only to enable the Government to know the views of the hon. Members of this House, so that Government may take them into consideration while formulating their proposals for legislation.

This is obviously the first round of discussions as Members will get further opportunities of discussing and placing before the House specific points when Government introduce

legislation. The present debate is, therefore, intended more for the purpose of a general discussion, keeping in view the broad points and broad recommendations about formation of separate units composing the Indian Union. There are some points such as merger of some parts of the existing States with other States, some questions about boundaries, etc. There is also the important question of safeguards for linguistic groups and financial and other administrative measures necessitated by the consequences arising out of readjustment of boundaries as detailed in Part IV of the Report. All these will be matters of detail for a more close examination and discussion in due course when specific proposals of Government come before the House. There is, however, scope for general indication on these points. There are also, similarly, many allied points of detail which, though relevant at the present stage, may only be mentioned if necessary but not form part of a discussion of a general character. This is my personal view.

Looking to the items of news appearing in the Press from day to day about public discussion of several parts of the Report, the resolutions by several bodies that are being passed and copies of which have been sent to me, and the discussion in the State Legislatures, reported in the Press, I am inclined to think that it will be better, if hon. Members having a common view on re-organisation and its various facets, informally discuss among themselves the particular points which they would like to place before the House and indicate to the Chair, for its guidance, the names of Members who will place them before

[Mr. Speaker]

the House on behalf of Members who share those views in common. I may again make it clear that though the Chair is not bound to call each such Member, it will do its best to give them a chance, so as to have the debate fully representative of the different views.

I shall also be thankful if, while supplying such names to the Chair, the specific points in respect of which those Members would like to speak, are also broadly indicated. If this is done, the Chair will be able to know beforehand the number and variety of points and will also be able to call upon such representative speakers to participate in the debate. In this way, every broad point will be not only before the House for consideration, but it will also enable the Government better to consider the view of the House and formulate their proposals.

My sole object in making the suggestion is to make the best use of the 54 hours allotted for the discussion of the Report. This will not only avoid repetition of the same views, but also spare time for giving opportunity to every set of views being expressed in the House.

I propose to allot half-an-hour to the individual speaker who leads the statement of a particular set of views. The time for the other speakers will depend upon the number of Members who share that set of views and various other factors, consistent with the allotment of time to other views in respect of which there may be sharp and varied differences.

I feel that, unless the debate is organised in some such manner as I have indicated, the discussions are likely to be rambling and will contain many repetitions, thereby possibly excluding expression of certain views, just because of want of time, in spite of the Chair's earnest desire to give proper time to each set of views.

I am making this announcement some time before the debate is to begin, with a view to enable hon.

Members to have talks amongst themselves and if they agree to my suggestion, they may send the names and the points to the Secretary by the 12th instant, that is, two days before the discussion starts on the 14th instant. That will leave me some time to look into the suggestions received and give them due consideration. As the discussion will continue quite a few days, the names and subjects as indicated before may be given even after the 12th; but, for obvious reasons, the earlier they are given, the better.

I have thought it proper to make this suggestion as the matter is one of vital importance to all parts of the Union and it is but proper and fair that every group of Members should have an opportunity to have their views brought before the House through spokesman or spokesmen.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): There are vital and controversial questions as regards very few States. More time should be allowed to the Members from those States so that the views may be fully expressed.

Mr. Speaker: I am not at present dealing with what allotment of time should be made. I am merely indicating very general lines. Some questions may be really controversial. Some other may be made controversial. What I want is that every point of view should have an opportunity and sufficient time consistent with the overall time granted to express their views. That is the idea. If Members consider this and then give me names, I shall be very happy to adjust all points of view. That is my desire.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): I would like to ask for a clarification. You have suggested, and very rightly too, this procedure for the expeditious and efficient disposal of this business, important as it is. You said that an hon. Member who wishes to raise a particular point should give that particular point in writing.

Mr. Speaker: Mention.

Shri Kamath: Yes. Does that mean that if, for instance, an hon. Member wants to speak about boundary disputes, he should mention which particular disputes he wants to speak about, or he may say in general, boundary disputes?

Mr. Speaker: The point is this. I do not know what disputes the hon. Members will be raising or placing. There may be boundary disputes in respect of many States. By way of illustration, I may say, take the State of Bombay, take the State of Bihar, take the State of Punjab and PEPSU. It would be better, therefore, if reference is given to the particular boundaries, so that I may know how to group the various speakers and how to arrange the speakers in respect of these various disputes, so far as possible. I have not yet decided, but my idea is,—of course everything depends upon the wishes of hon. Members and how things go—to have a first round of speakers in which all possible different views will be laid before the House. Then, of course, we may have second, third and fourth rounds as time permits. As I said, the idea is that every view should be placed before the House. So far as possible, no view should be crowded out. I believe hon. Members will appreciate this anxiety of the Chair to have expression of every view before the House. Nothing is settled. I do not know how things will develop and how the Members will react. Unless there is some such organisation of the debate, it will be difficult for the Chair to call upon Members and achieve best results from the proposed discussion.

Shri A. M. Thomas: (Ernakulam): May I request you to have this suggestion circulated to the Members through the Parliamentary Bulletin?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. We will circulate this.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East): May I have another

clarification in this respect? You have indicated that we should give the subjects on which we desire to speak. It may happen that after listening to the debate we may refer to some other subjects which may occur to us in that matter. So, would our indication of the subject be a sort of rigid thing to bind us, or would it...

Mr. Speaker: The idea of having the points is to enable the Chair to make a selection of those points, but when a speaker is called upon, the other points which other Members might have taken are certainly open. I will not shut them out on that ground.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): These are very useful suggestions for the guidance of the Members that you have given us and we are thankful to you. My fears are that if it is a general discussion, there might be some confusion and muddle and we might be lost in that. I cannot put forward the suggestion that each State can be taken separately because some conclusions might be interdependent. But in my opinion, certain regions can be taken, certain sets of States can be taken and discussed separately usefully. Otherwise, if the whole thing is thrown open to the House and one Member speaks from the South, another from the North, one from the East, perhaps the one who has spoken previously may not be followed so exactly by the Member who wants to answer those questions or the suggestions that have been made.

There are questions, as you have said, about boundaries as well, the safeguards that are provided there, linguistic minorities and other things. So far as boundaries are concerned, certainly they would require to be discussed so far as the general discussion is concerned, but they will also come for minuter discussion when the specific proposals are brought before

us in the form of legislation. But, so far as general principles are concerned, as my hon. friend put it, the proposals about certain regions are very controversial. Therefore, I would request you to bear that in mind also.

An. Hon. Member: No, no.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have got a decision this way, but I again put it to you to consider whether it would be advisable to adjust in such a way that certain regions might be taken separately, so that the debate might be real and useful suggestions might be made in that debate.

Mr. Speaker: I will certainly consider that point, and if Members give me indications of the points and the names, it will help me better. I am also prepared to meet Members, if they so like, informally and then come to such an arrangement of the debate as we possibly can. It is the common desire that on vital questions of this type where we are re-drawing the map of India, every view should come before the House and the Government.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): In some States there is no trouble, in other States there is. Will there at least be a minimum number of speakers for each State?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid if I were to allot time in proportion to the troubles, I shall perhaps indirectly be a party to add to those troubles. I should put it the other way, that the hon. Members who have nothing special or particular to say may keep aloof and give more time for States where there are controversies, but it will depend upon the names and co-operation of Members that comes to me.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

CYCLONE IN MADRAS

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): Under rule 216, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The recent severe cyclone in coastal districts of Madras, resulting in damage to life, property and Railways and the relief measures taken by the State and Union Governments."

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): As desired, I am making this statement about the devastation caused by cyclone in Madras and the measures taken to give relief.

The cyclone was of great ferocity and swept across from East to West causing considerable loss of life and property in the districts of Tanjore, Tiruchirapalli, Madurai and Ramnathapuram between 30th November and 2nd December. I place before the House the latest facts that could be gathered from Madras.

Tanjore District: Loss of human life in the district has been considerable and the present estimates put it at 181. The small town of Vedarayam was completely isolated by flood water and 143 persons are reported dead.

Exact figures about loss of cattle are not yet available but the estimate is of 3,000 head in Pattukottai and Tiruthuraiipoondi. About 1,000 buildings including huts are also reported to have been damaged in Pattukottai Taluk alone. Standing crop of paddy was submerged under sea and rain water and a number of plantain gardens, coconut trees and betel vines were uprooted. Railway communications were disrupted in the branch lines of the affected taluks. Irrigation channels were breached. It