

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

other day there was a report that the Grand Trunk Express had reached 15 hours late. Obviously this kind of things cannot be allowed to go on on the Railways. Therefore, I would request Your Lordships,—I am sorry—I would request you, Sir, to allow the adjournment motion and to have it discussed on merits—and it deserves a discussion.

Mr. Speaker : I can only say that adjournment motion is not the only method of bringing the matter to the notice of the House. This matter was brought to the notice of this House already and the hon. Members were not the first to bring it to the notice of the House here. Even on the 18th instant, a notice calling attention to this under rule 216 was made. Let us wait and hear what the hon. Minister has to say. Thereafter, it is always open to any hon. Member to say that in view of the serious consequences involved we might raise a discussion or debate on this matter. Later on, I shall find out what exactly the situation is and try to take such steps as are necessary. Nobody's intention is to avoid any discussion.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram) : This adjournment motion also will stand over till the 23rd. Is that so, Sir?

Mr. Speaker : I have already disallowed the adjournment motion for two reasons : that the matter is going to come up before the House under rule 216 and I have already admitted it; secondly, this matter will come up, it is not a matter which has been there only yesterday or today but it has been there from the 18th and earlier. Therefore, notice of adjournment motion is not the proper method of discussing this matter. I have not given my consent to this, but that does not mean that the House will not have an opportunity in the proper manner to discuss whatever necessary things have to be discussed.

So far as the other adjournment motion is concerned, it will stand over till the 23rd May, when the hon. Minister of Railways will be in a position to come here, gather material and make a statement.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad) : May I make a brief request to you with regard to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on Friday

evening at about 5 o'clock? He ought to have made it in the morning but unfortunately something must have happened which prevented it. You, Sir, were not present at that time and so I could not raise this point at that time. I wanted your presence for this purpose and I now raise it with your permission.

I do not know what has caused this sudden change in the programme. You were pleased to announce firmly to the House sometime ago that the House will sit till the 31st May, and on that basis some of us have tabled questions so as to be ripe for answer on the 31st. That is the first aspect of the matter. I do not know whether the statement was made in consultation with you—I suppose it was. The Chairman, Shri Barman, was not given a copy of it at that time. What was the purpose of making the statement then? It was very wrong on the Minister's part to have done so. I believe it has been done with your consent.

Mr. Speaker : But what is it that the hon. Member is driving at?

Shri Kamath : It uproots our questions coming up on the 31st. They may not now come up before the House at all. I would, therefore, request that the questions tabled for the 31st May may be answered on the 28th, the previous rota day. May be other hon. Members agree. I personally think that these changes have been made so as to suit the convenience of the hon. Members opposite on the treasury benches for their Bombay meeting. That should not have been done.

Mr. Speaker : Hon. Members will countenance some amount of difficulty. I am not in a position to go into all those details. All that I can say is that the suggestion which the hon. Member is making will be considered.

Shri Kamath : That is one part of the story. The other part is this. In paragraph 3 of the statement, it is stated that the discussion on the Preventive Detention Act has not been postponed, but the exact words are "time permitting" it will be discussed. The discussion of this Act has been postponed from session to session and we thought at least in this session we would have a firm announcement, and discussion of this Act. But it is stated there "time permitting". I think this should not now be countenanced by you, because this has been postponed for the last three sessions. If necessary, we will have to sit a day

longer to discuss this Act, but we should not allow the postponement of this discussion any further.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Till such time as the Act will be discussed, will the hon. Home Minister be pleased not to arrest people under the Act?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit C. B. Pant): I will not, you may be sure about it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): May we have an assurance that we are going to discuss the Preventive Detention Act this session?

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): All that I said the other day was that the House will not sit beyond the 31st. I never said that the House would sit only till the 30th. (*Interruptions*)

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): You have been pleased to issue instructions allotting some questions to some Ministries for the 31st also. It is not as if the House will not sit beyond the 31st or the 30th. 31st was fixed as a business day. Suddenly, it is cancelled. It is a question of undependability on the programme of the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The House is already committed to sit on the 31st. We do not know the reason why it has been suddenly cancelled. I request you to see that the House sits on the 31st.

Shri Kamath: My earnest request to you is that you should see that the House sits on the 31st also.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Some days ago, there were complaints from this side that the temperature was rising and so on. If you adjourn a day earlier, it is so much the better. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is a simple matter. It is true that the 31st was declared an Official day. The hon. Members were invited to table questions for that day under the impression that there will be work on the 31st. Now, 31st is not a sitting day, that is to say, a day on which we have work here. I have no objection to transferring questions to the 28th—such of them as are in time for the 28th, as suggested by Shri Kamath. Regarding the sitting of the House on any particular day, whatever the Government says, this is the meaning, namely, that there is official work on

that day. The Government has to place work before the House. Of course, the Speaker adjusts the time and announces the programme for the convenience of the Members and the Government. We anticipate that the work will go on but for some reason, the work falls through. We cannot sit on a particular day merely for answering questions, when there is no official work. I do not know under what particular circumstances the work is not continued on that day. But it is for the Government to say that there is work. Otherwise, it is for me to say that there is no work and adjourn the House *sine die*. In these circumstances, I will look into this. The questions on the 31st will not be interfered with; they will be answered on the 28th.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): It was the unanimous recommendation of the Business Advisory Committee that the report on the working of the Preventive Detention Act should be placed before the House and scrutinised. I hope there is no going back on that decision. We must have an opportunity to discuss it. We have postponed it a number of times and there should be some finality to it whatever happens to the 31st. There should again be no attempt made by the Government to postpone the discussion on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: I shall call immediately an emergency meeting of the Business Advisory Committee where the hon. Minister will also be represented. Let us consider this matter there and see what can be done.

Shri Kamath: I want a little clarification with regard to questions. You were pleased to say that those questions which were in time for the 28th would come up on the 28th. Proceeding on the basis of the firm announcement that the 31st would be the last day, some of us sent in questions on the 18th. Taking the ordinary calculation, they would not be ripe for answer on the 28th but they will be ripe for answer on 31st.

Mr. Speaker: I will consider that also.

Dr. Rama Rao: Just now you said that you did not know the reasons for the cancellation of sitting on the 31st by the Government. The House also has not been informed of the reasons. It is rather scant courtesy to this House that it is treated this way when so much work is pending and we are told that there is no work for the House.

Mr. Speaker : It is the concern of the Business Advisory Committee.

Shri Kamath : Before the Government changes the programme and timings, do they not communicate to you the grounds? That is a fundamental point. Don't they consult you?

Mr. Speaker : It is not so. The Government feels that it does not have sufficient work. There may be other reasons. In one or two cases, it may inform the Chairman if it is so urgent. Now, I will consider the whole matter.

Shri Kamath : Does it mean they have more work in Bombay than here?

Mr. Speaker : When he raised the point relating to questions, I said that the hon. Member need not prefix such statements. Now, he has followed them by suffixing these statements. Therefore, I may say that these statements may be avoided as prefixes and suffixes.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT OF DELHI ROAD TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, FOR 1953-54 AND 1954-55

The Deputy Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimani) : On behalf of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport, Shri Alagesan, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of Delhi Road Transport Authority for the years 1953-54 and 1954-55, under sub-section (2) of section 40 of the Delhi Road Transport Authority Act, 1950. [Placed in Library. See No. S—187/56]

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

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

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 101 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 15th May, 1956, agreed to the following amendments made by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 8th May, 1956, in the Hindu Succession Bill, 1955 :

Enacting Formula

1. That at page 1, line 1,—
for "sixth year" substitute "Seventh Year."

Clause 1

2. That at page 1, line 5,—
for "1955" substitute "1956".

Clause 3

3. That at page 2, line 13,—
omit "(gotraja)".
4. That at page 2, line 21,—
omit "(bandhu)".
5. That at page 3, line 14,—
after "Cochin Nayar Act" insert—
"with respect to the matters for which provision is made in this Act".
6. That at page 3, line 18,—
after "governed" insert—
"with respect to the matters for which provision is made in this Act".

7. That at page 3, line 24,—
add at the end—

"with respect to the matters for which provision is made in this Act".

8. That at page 3,—
omit lines 31 and 32.
9. That at page 4,—
after line 19, add—

"(iii) the Valiamma Thampuram Kovilagam Estate and the Palace Fund administered by the Palace Administration Board by reason of the powers conferred by Proclamation (IX of 1124) dated 29th June, 1949, promulgated by the Maharaja of Cochin".

Clause 6

10. That at page 4,—
for lines 25 to 36, substitute—

"Provided that, if the deceased had left him surviving a female relative specified in class I of the Schedule or a male relative specified in that class who claims through such female relative the interest of the deceased in the Mitakshara coparcenary property shall devolve by testamentary or