

INDIAN RAILWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri Shah nawaz Khan): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Railways Act, 1890, be taken into consideration."

The House will recollect that in deference to the persistent public demand the Railway Freight Structure Enquiry Committee was set up in June, 1955 under the Chairmanship of Dr. A. Ramaswamy Mudaliar to review the freight rate structure of our railways. The need for this examination had arisen owing to the far-reaching changes that had taken place in the economic activity in the country since the last revision of the rate structure in October, 1948.

Another reason for the fresh examination was the considerable development of rail facilities that was planned and the consequent appreciable increase in the working expenses of the railways including the dividend payable to the general revenues that was anticipated.

The terms of reference of the committee were: firstly, to review the present railway freight rate structure in all its aspects and to suggest what modifications should be made therein, bearing in mind the needs of our developmental economy and the necessity for maintaining the financial stability of the railways; secondly, to examine whether the statutory provisions dealing with the responsibility of the railways as carriers needed any, and if so what, modifications; thirdly, what modifications, if any, are needed in the existing constitution, jurisdiction and rules of the Railway Rates Tribunal so that the Tribunal might be a more effective and expeditious instrument for adjudication of railway freight matters at reasonable cost to the litigant.

The inclusion of the last-mentioned item in the terms of reference was on account of complaints that had been received that the Railway Rates

Tribunal as now functioning is too legalistic and formal and that it subjects the complainant to undue expenditure of both time and money.

Copies of the report of the Committee have been placed in the Library of the House since the 14th November, 1957.

In May last while presenting the Budget the hon. Minister of Railways stated that the recommendations of the Enquiry Committee, whose report in the final form had been received only a short while prior to that, were under the consideration of the Government.

Examination of the recommendations of the Committee in respect of the three items of their terms of reference has been processed and substantial progress has been made.

The recommendations of the Committee in regard to the revision of the rate structure which have far-reaching consequences and have to be examined in great detail is likely to take a little more time before the Government are able to finalise their decisions on those recommendations,

Examination of the recommendations of the Committee regarding the responsibilities of railways as carriers is also likely to take some more time. In fact, the Committee themselves have recommended that the changes in this respect be implemented one year after the revised freight structure comes into force.

Examination of the recommendations of the Committee regarding the jurisdiction and constitution of the Railway Rates Tribunal has, however, been completed, and excepting for a few minor changes, practically all the recommendations of the Committee in regard to this have been accepted, and legislation now being introduced is to implement the decisions.

Opportunity is being taken at the same time to remove certain lacunae and defects in the provisions of Chapter V of the Indian Railways Act that have come to notice during

[Shri Shah Nawaz Khan]

the course of the last eight years since this Chapter was modified in the year 1949.

It is necessary that legislation as proposed in the present Bill be passed in the current session itself as the implementation of certain of the recommendations of the Committee regarding changes in the classification of certain commodities is inter-linked with the jurisdiction of the Railway Rates Tribunal as statutorily provided.

The proposals are substantially non-controversial, and I once again commend their consideration and acceptance by the House.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Railways Act, 1890 be taken into consideration".

Shri Naldurgker (Osmanabad):
Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 30th January, 1958".

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 30th January, 1958".

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): Sir, the question of re-constituting the Railway Freights Tribunal is a very important one because it is not only that the interests of the Government are effected thereby but also the interests of the consuming public. Sir, this amending Bill seeks to make three major changes—first, in the constitution of the Tribunal, secondly, in the extent of its jurisdiction, and thirdly, in the nature of the Tribunal's power.

As this House will recollect, it was about 1948-49 that the Ministry of Railways put forward certain proposals. The Standing Finance Com-

mittee modified them. And, at present the Railway Freights Tribunal consists of three persons who are Judges, assisted by assessors drawn from two panels, one set up by the Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the other by the Railway Board. The underlying principle was that if the assessors with experience of the economic conditions, working of the commercial side of railways, could bring to bear their experience on the judgment of the Tribunal, possibly the Tribunal's decision would be satisfactory to either side.

Sir, the Freight Structure Committee has made a report and on page 97 of that Report they made certain suggestions. The main argument advanced by the Committee is that there is a legal bias so far as the Tribunal is concerned, that there has been a complete failure of the assessor system and, therefore, the whole thing requires to be overhauled. The main defects pointed out by the Freight Structure Committee are that the Tribunal has become virtually a law court with inevitable legal bias.

Secondly, it has been pointed out that the dispute between individuals is not merely a dispute between two persons, but that the decisions would have farflung repercussions, because the decisions would bind not only the two parties to the dispute but the entire consuming public also. It was also felt that the association of persons with knowledge of business and economic conditions in the country was necessary, and that assessors were useless. According to the Committee's opinion, there is dissatisfaction at the decision of the Tribunal since there were procedural defects confronting the complainant. The procedure was elaborate, investigations are formal and the cost of litigation high. The Committee, therefore, suggested revision of the constitution of the Tribunal. According to that the Tribunal was to be composed of one President, who should be an experienced High Court Judge, and two

other members, chosen for their knowledge of commercial, industrial and economic conditions of the country. The Committee makes it clear that it does not cast any reflection on the existing Tribunal because there are certain defects which are inherent in the constitution which require to be removed. The Committee has also recommended that the assessor system should go.

Now, coming to the question of jurisdiction, and this is an important point, the Committee records that public opinion has been in favour of extending the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. Actually, the Committee, strangely enough, comes to the conclusion that the Tribunal's jurisdiction should be restricted. On page 100 of their report, they say that it is unthinkable that Government's control over railway revenue should be watered down by interference from an independent body. It also says that in the context of the rapidly increasing tempo of industrialisation and progress of the Second Plan, and in every field it will be an impediment to the Government if their decisions regarding freight rates are subjected to the decisions of the Tribunal.

Sir, here is a point which this hon. House must consider in detail. For whose benefit is this Railway Freight Tribunal? Why is it that the Railway Freight Tribunal has come to be constituted at all? Whose interests are going to be paramount?—Railway revenue interest or the interest of the consuming public, or is it possible to strike some balance between the two. Sir, my submission is this that when a Tribunal is appointed, it is essential to safeguard the interest of the consumer, of the public, because so far as Government is concerned, they wield power and the Railways being in the monopolistic position today they can dictate their terms both to the trade and to the consuming public. In this case there is not much difference between trade and consuming public because whatever unjust burden is thrown upon trade that ulti-

mately shifts to the consuming public in the shape of higher price. Therefore, my submission is this that in this particular case in creating and restricting the jurisdiction of the Tribunal we must bear in mind the purpose for which the Tribunal is constituted, viz. to safeguard the interest of the consumer. That is important.

Now, what has the Committee recommended? It says: "It is unthinkable that Government's control over Railway revenue should be watered down by the interference of an independent body". Look at the language. It calls it "interference by an independent Tribunal". It is a decision of a Tribunal, a body which is supposed to hold scales even between the Railway authorities and the consuming public, and yet the Committee calls it "interference". In other words, the recommendations of the Committee are vitiated by the fact that it places extraordinary emphasis on Government revenues; it does not care for the public. It also says that in the context of increasing tempo of industrialisation and in every field it will be an impediment to the Government if the decisions regarding freight rates are subjected to decisions of a Tribunal. If the Government considers the decisions of a Tribunal an "interference" why not scrap the Tribunal altogether. Why have a Tribunal at all? What is the fun in having them? The Committee seems to be more interested in safeguarding Railway revenues irrespective of the fact that the freight structure may be completely unreasonable, rather than protecting the interest of the consumer. My submission is that apart from the constitution of the Tribunal, to which I shall presently come, the jurisdiction of the Tribunal must not be whittled down; it must not be taken away.

They have first suggested that the constitution should be changed. I agree with the Committee's recommendations in so far as assessors are concerned. It has been our experience wherever assessors are taken, they did not help much.

Shri Easwara Iyer (Trivandrum): They hamper.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Not only they hamper, they do not even understand their business. In case of *post mortem* examinations the assessors are a farce. I am even inclined to accept the recommendation that two persons with commercial experience and the experience of working of railways should be on the Tribunal.

It is good that the Chairman is a person of the level of a High Court Judge. But, having constituted a Tribunal, which, according to its own recommendation, is going to be such as would safeguard the interests of the railways, where is the necessity of whittling down the jurisdiction?

16 hrs.

The Committee recommends on page 101, paragraph 299, that it should have the following jurisdiction: it may decide and give judgment in cases coming under section 28 of the Railway Act, that is to say, of undue preference, that is where undue preference is given to one consignor. Secondly, where an unreasonable charge is made between two specific stations. Thirdly, the levy of an unreasonable charge on freights. These are the only three categories of disputes on which the decision of the Tribunal will be mandatory. What has been taken away from the Tribunal? It is, under section 41(e), unreasonably switching a commodity to a higher class. Why is that being taken away?

The Committee, in fact, wants to classify the powers of the Tribunal under two categories, mandatory and recommendatory. These three only are mandatory. I suppose the number of disputes falling under the three categories must be limited and those falling under the fourth category may be high. But, whatever reason, the point remains that the railway can be unreasonable by switching over one commodity from one class to a higher class, subjecting it to a higher

freight. Then, what happens to that? The aggrieved person or the aggrieved party, if Government agrees, may take up the matter before the Railway Rates Tribunal. The Tribunal will say, 'we can only recommend'.

I want to ask the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill, if he accepts the basic principle that this Tribunal is kept to safeguard the interests of consumers, why is it that its jurisdiction has been whittled down. What case has he made out for whittling down the jurisdiction except the recommendations of this body? Surely, the Government is not bound to accept each and every recommendation. He has got to make out a case that for these reasons we are going to whittle down the jurisdiction. The hon. Minister has not so far done that. He says, 'we have accepted most of the recommendations of the Committee'. That is no very great virtue if the recommendations are against public interest.

I cannot also understand the mentality of the Committee when it says that in matters in the advisory category no lawyer should appear before the Tribunal. Why? Vital interests may be at stake even in cases where the Tribunal has to pronounce a recommendatory judgment.

I know what a mess has been made in our Bombay State because lawyers have been excluded from appearing before *mamlatdars* in case of land tenure disputes, in cases under the Bombay Agricultural Land Legislation. A complete mess has been made to such an extent that even the High Court has been forced to recommend in its judgment that lawyers should be permitted. I cannot understand why the Committee in its extreme desire to expedite proceedings wants the lawyers to be barred. Why not bar them even from mandatory categories also?

Shri Easwara Iyer: A bias against lawyers.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I think there is some allergy; some of our Ministers cannot stand lawyers and were it not for the Constitution, they would have long ago liquidated us.

I submit that this does not bring in expeditious justice. I am sure that it must be the experience of nearly 150 lawyers over here, that the lawyers assist the Tribunals in putting matters through very expeditiously. In all proceedings which are of a judicial character an amount of delay is certainly involved. You cannot have justice and decisions from a judicial body as you would take out articles from a penny-in-the-slot machine. Expedition of that kind cannot be had in cases of judicial pronouncements. Things have got to be thought out carefully.

In this House, you Sir, as Chairman can ring the bell and ask us to sit down. In the law court, no magistrate or judge has the power to ask us to sit down. I can take long hours in examining and cross-examining witnesses. You cannot get over that. If there are any procedural matters which can be rectified and simplified, by all means do that. But, some sort of delay is inevitable. And, I think, by making such recommendations the Committee shows that what it is interested in is not the consumers' interest but to expedite the matter and see that the railways are not hampered by prolonged decisions of the Tribunal.

My grievance against the Bill is this, that it whittles down the jurisdiction and the powers of the Tribunal in a way which will react adversely on the interests of the consumer. It is no use my hon friend saying, 'Why is Shri Bharucha speaking in favour of the private trade?' Because, I know the ultimate burden is on the consumer. I, therefore, submit that there is no justification for amending section 41 of the Act.

The Tribunal must have power to classify goods. I am in favour of giving the Tribunal the largest powers possible. Administrative difficulties

will always be brought forward. If Administrative difficulties are an excuse for short-circuiting the powers of a Tribunal, I am afraid that the principle might be imported later on in other measures where even the powers of the existing law courts might be short-circuited. I am not in favour of this.

If the Government genuinely believes that the Tribunal is necessary, that it must protect the interests of the consumers, then the Tribunal must have necessary powers to see that the responsibility put on it by the Act is properly discharged.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are glad that this revision of the constitution of the Tribunal has come before us. We find that the assessor system has been abolished.

Shri Easwara Iyer: It seems that there is no quorum. I think it is the Polo match that has come in the way.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): This is not the first time. Hon. Members are probably honouring our guests and seeing the Polo match. Let us also adjourn.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I second that.

Shri V. P. Nayar: It is a unique function that we are having in the Capital. There is no use continuously ringing the bell. Half an hour ago we rang the bell and there was no quorum.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): It seems there is no chance of a quorum.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Let us not lag behind; let us also go. Let us adjourn for want of quorum; it will have a better effect also. The bell rings but not even one hon. Member turns up.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): I think there is a persistent lack of quorum. It is probably because people are anxious to go to the Polo match that is taking place. Let us adjourn.

Shri Dasappa: It is not right that a Bill of such importance should go on without quorum. There is a general consensus that we should adjourn.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Both the Government and the Opposition agree on this. Now, the number is only 30 or 32.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]
16.10 hrs.

Shri Dasappa: There was a motion made by my hon. friend ably supported by a number of others that in view of the thin House, this important measure may kindly be taken up tomorrow. There is another important engagement which the hon. Members would like to participate in.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Do you wish that the House be adjourned or that the business of the House be so adjusted for the sake of an important engagement?

Shri Dasappa: I quite see the point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is quorum now. We can continue.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I was referring to the constitution of the tribunal that was before and that is proposed to be composed at present. The assessor system has been advised to be abolished. Really we feel that these 100 persons who were enlisted as assessors were not of such good avail to the speedy execution of the proceedings of the tribunal.

You, Sir, will be astonished to hear that even those members who were selected as assessors and their names published in the Gazette were not informed that they were on the panel of assessors. Such was the distress and the lot of the assessors who were appointed. However, that provision has been deleted, and instead of three high court judges, one high court judge will be the Chairman and two other experienced persons will be the other two members of the Tribunal. They will be appointed by the Government from amongst those who have experience in the commercial, indus-

trial or economic conditions of the country.

When there was the assessor system, some of the members on the panel was from agriculturists. Here, the experienced persons who will be appointed by the Central Government need not be experienced in agriculture, as I find in the body of the Bill. So, I would request the hon. Minister to pay his attention to this point so that where "commercial, industrial or economic conditions of the country" occur, "agricultural conditions" may be added.

As regards the revision of orders by this tribunal, the Bill says as follows:

"Where a railway administration, bound by an order of the Tribunal, considers that since the order was made there has been a material change in the circumstances on which it was based, the railway administration may, after the expiry of one year from the date of the order, make an application to the Tribunal for revision of the order and the Tribunal may, after making due inquiry into the matter in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter, vary or revoke the order."

So far, so good. But should the opposite party not be given that chance to revoke the decision if circumstances change? Why only the railway is given the advantage of the revision of the order of the Tribunal? I would request the Minister to give thought to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are many voices audible here. I can realise there may be important discussions going on, but normally I might have asked the hon. Members to carry on those discussions in the lobbies but I am afraid I cannot exercise that right now! I would only request the hon. Members to exercise more restraint and be least noisy in their talk.

Shri S. C. Samanta: I would request the hon. Minister to inform the House how the constitution of the Tribunal

in this way will expedite the disposal of the cases that will be pending with them. The old tribunal consisting of three high court judges could sit separately with assessors and decide cases, whereas in the new formation of the tribunal, there is one high court judge only and the two members will associate with him to take decisions in any matter. So, the number of cases, I think, cannot be dealt with so expeditiously as has been hoped by the Government. In this respect, the House should be enlightened by the hon. Minister.

As regards the classification of goods, though it will not be so much appropriate on this occasion, I would draw the attention of the Minister to one case. Question papers were being despatched by train. The words "Question Papers" were written on the parcel. But they would not give it preference. You will be astonished to know that the question papers reached the destination after the examination date.

Shri D. C. Sharma: What question papers?

Shri S. C. Samanta: The question papers were meant for the school examination. While classifying the goods, even when special things have been written, the article was not delivered. You will be amused also that these question papers were found out only after one month. They went from Howrah to Contai railway station and one month elapsed before they could reach Contai, a distance of about 125 miles.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Did the boys also show any concern?

Shri S. C. Samanta: It was otherwise, when they did not find the question papers in the station.

When they have to classify things, I hope they won't be brought before the Tribunal for screening them. The railway authorities should make it such that there will be no grievance on the part of anybody to take it before the Tribunal.

I hope that when the new tribunal is formed, it will be able to redress the grievances of the public and also of the administration. I shall be more glad if the process by which the expedition is achieved can be explained to us by the hon. Minister.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक का स्वागत करते हुए मैं दो तीन बातों की तरफ सरकार का विशेष ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। इस विधेयक के द्वारा मूल एक्ट की धारा २७ए में संशोधन किया जा रहा है, जिस के अनुसार सेंट्रल और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के माल के लिये कुछ सहूलियतें देने का विचार है, जोकि पहले भी थीं, लेकिन अब उन को ज्यादा साफ शब्दों में रखा जा रहा है।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर बाकई गवर्नमेंट को-आपरेटिव सोसायटीज की तरक्की चाहती है और चाहती है कि को-आपरेटिव तरीके पर हमारे देश का व्यवसाय हो, तो यह जरूरी है कि उन को भी इस विधेयक में स्थान मिले और उन के माल के आने जाने में भी वही सुविधायें प्रदान की जायें, जोकि गवर्नमेंट अपने माल के लिये रख रही है। मैं ने यह देखा है कि गवर्नमेंट का यह विचार है कि खाने के मामले में—गल्ले के मामले में, छोटे-छोटे उद्योग-धंधों के मामले में योजना को तरक्की दी जाय, लेकिन यह एक तथ्य है कि योजना की तरक्की में रेलवे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन बहुत हद तक सहायक या बाधक हो सकती है। इस विधेयक में यह प्राविजन रखा गया है कि गवर्नमेंट के माल के सम्बन्ध में रेलवे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को डायरेक्ट किया जा सकता है कि वह उस माल को प्रैकरेंस दे। अगर को-आपरेटिव सोसायटीज के माल के लिये भी यह सुविधा दे दी जाय, तो उन को बहुत प्रोत्साहन मिल सकता है और उन के कार्य में बहुत तरक्की हो सकती है। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं है।

[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस की आवश्यकता क्यों है। व्यक्तिगत व्यापारी तो किसी न किसी प्रकार से अपना काम ठीक कर लेता है। उस को गाड़ी भी मिल जाती है और माल भी धा जाता है, लेकिन कभी कभी सरकारी माल के भ्राने में दिक्कत हुमा करती है। एक बार गोरखपुर में एक बिजली का कारखाना बन रहा था। उस के सिलसिले में कुछ कोयले की जरूरत थी और कुछ सीमेंट और चूना बनारस चाहिये था। वह सब लखनऊ में पड़ा था और लखनऊ से गोरखपुर के लिये डिब्बे नहीं मिल रहे थे। वहाँ के एक इंजीनियर ने मुझे कहा कि मैं कहां से, किस मद् से घूस ला कर दूँ कि वह माल यहां धा सके। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि कभी कभी गवर्नमेंट के माल के भ्राने जाने में भी मजबूरी होती है। इसी तरह से को-ऑपरेटिव सोसायटीज के माल के भ्राने जाने में भी दिक्कत पड़ती है। उन के खातों में भी लेनदेन का खाता नहीं होता है कि वे कुछ ले दे कर अपना काम चला लें।

Shri V. P. Nayar: There is no quorum.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: The position is precarious.

Shri V. P. Nayar: We want you to be heard by at least the minimum number of members.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The quorum bell is being rung. Now there is quorum. Mr. Sinhasan Singh may now continue his speech.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Again, after a minute, there will be no quorum.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Rane may now present his report.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FOURTEENTH REPORT

Shri Rane (Buldana): I beg to present the Fourteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

INDIAN RAILWAYS (AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Sinhasan Singh may now continue his speech.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : मैं कह रहा था कि को-ऑपरेटिविज के उत्थान के लिये यह जरूरी है कि स्टेट और केन्द्रीय गवर्नमेंट इस को विधेयक के द्वारा जो सुविधा दी जा रही है, वह को-ऑपरेटिव सोसायटियों को भी दी जाय। गवर्नमेंट का यह उद्देश्य है कि हमारे देश में को-ऑपरेटिव कारोबार बढ़े। इस तरह वह उद्देश्य पूरा हो सकता है।

इस के बाद मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ट्राइब्यूनल की बनावट में जो तब्दीली की जा रही है, वह एक बड़ा मामूल परिवर्तन है। अब तक उस में केवल वही शास हो सकता था, जोकि हाई कोर्ट का जज रहा हो। लेकिन अब उस के भलावा दो ऐसे अन्य व्यक्ति भी रहेंगे, जिन को तिजारत का तजुर्बा हो, जोकि तिजारत से संबंधित रहे हों। उन लोगों को ट्राइब्यूनल में बैठने का, रेट को निर्धारित करने का और झगडों इत्यादि का फ़ैसला करने का उतना ही अधिकार है, जितना कि एक जज को पहले था। मेरे छोटे विचार में, और अगर तिजारत से सम्बन्धित व्यक्तियों को यह उच्च स्थान दिया जा रहा है तो, जैसाकि सामन्त जी ने कहा है, गृहस्थों को भी उस में क्यों न स्थान दिया जाय ? अगर विचार यह है कि इस ट्राइब्यूनल में सब इन्डेस्ट्रिज को रिप्रेजेंटेशन मिले, तो कृषक समाज को भी उस में प्रतिनिधित्व मिलना चाहिये। इस धारा में परिवर्तन की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं थी।

श्री पी० चं० शर्मा (गुरदासपुर) :
छोटे बिचार का क्या मतलब है ?

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : जैसे आप छोटे हैं
कद में ।

श्री राम सुभग सिंह (सहसराम) :
आप को भी बिया जाय । आप को उस
का चेयरमैन बना दिया जाय ।

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : मुझे ऐसा आभास
होता है कि इस परिवर्तन के हो जाने के बाद
काम ठीक तरीके से नहीं चलेगा, क्योंकि
इन्ट्रस्ट्स में क्लेश बढ़ेगा । ट्राइब्यूनल में जो
कामस्थायल इन्ट्रस्ट है और जो गवर्नमेंट
का इन्ट्रस्ट है, रेट के मामले में दोनों का
झगड़ा चलेगा और शायद ऐसे मौके न मिलें,
जबकि उन में युनैनिमिटी हो ।

Shri Dasappa: Would it be right on
my part now to interrupt....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Any objection
to the speech?

Shri Dasappa: The question of
quorum is there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What does the
hon. Member want?

Shri Dasappa: We want to see the
Polo match. Of course, it is left to
the discretion of the hon. Deputy-
Speaker.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can continue
for any length of time. What is the
desire of the hon. Member? He should
state that.

Shri Dasappa: May I humbly submit
that the House may kindly be adjourn-
ed?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the House
so desires, it can be done. It is more
dignified. I have no objection. Is it
the desire of the House?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then the
House stands adjourned.

16.28 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the
6th December, 1957.