

COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

TENTH REPORT

(FIRST LOK SABHA)

(Presented on the 13th September, 1956)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

September, 1956

Price: 37 naye Paise

CORRIGENDA

to

The Tenth Report of the Committee on Petitions

1. Page 1—

(i) line 16, for 'Sharma' read 'Sharan'.

(ii) line 18, for 'Fectories' read 'Factories'.

2. Page 2, line 3, for 'Fulsinjhi' read 'Fulsinhji'.

3. Page 4—

(i) last line, for 'though appreciate' read 'while appreciat-
ing'.

(ii) line 6 from below, for 'Gangadhar' read 'Gangadhara'.

4. Page 5, line 3, for 'he' read 'The'.

5. Page 12, line 6, for 'State' read 'State'.

6. Page 16, line 8 from below, for 'Vamsadhra' read 'Vamsadhara'.

7. Page 21—

(i) line 15, for 'in chbreadthwise' read 'inch breadthwise'.

(ii) line 8 from below for 'incher' read 'inches'.

(ii)

8. Page 22—

- (i) line 9, for 'Restrain' read 'Restraint'.
- (ii) line 18, for 'conciencie' read 'conscience'.
- (iii) line 19, for 'propogate' read 'propagate'.
- (iv) line 4 from below, for '13()' read '13(2)'.

9. Page 23—

- (i) line 21, for 'Ahinsa' read 'Ahimsa'.
- (ii) line 4 from below, for 'burdon' read 'burden'.

10. Page 24, line 2 from below, for 'wih' read 'with'.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Members of the Committee on Petitions	(v)
2. Report	I
3. Appendices—	
Appendix I	9
Appendix II	10
Appendix III	11
Appendix IV	13
Appendix V	14
Appendix VI	15
Appendix VII	17
Appendix VIII	18
Appendix IX	19
Appendix X	21
Appendix XI	22

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

1. Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah—*Chairman*.
2. Shri Shiva Datt Upadhyaya.
3. Shri K. T. Achuthan.
4. Shri Sohan Lal Dhusiya.
5. Shri S. C. Deb.
6. Shri Liladhar Joshi.
7. Shri U. R. Bogawat.
8. Shri Jethalal Harikrishna Joshi.
9. Shri Ramraj Jajware.
10. Shri Resham Lal Jangde.
11. Shri P. N. Rajabhoj.
12. Shri P. Subba Rao.
13. Shri Anandchand.
14. Dr. Ch. V. Rama Rao.
15. Shri Ramji Verma.

SECRETARIAT

- Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Joint Secretary*.
Shri Avtar Singh Rikhy—*Deputy Secretary*.
Shri A. L. Rai—*Under Secretary*.

REPORT

REPORT

On behalf of the Committee on Petitions, I having been authorised by the Committee, present this their Tenth Report.

2. The Committee at their sittings held on the 29th and 30th May, 28th July, 13th August, and 8th September, 1956 considered the following petitions:—

- (i) Two petitions from Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Chittoor District, Andhra State, relating to the amendment of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Act and the Rules framed thereunder. (Petitions Nos. 61 and 62—Appendices I and II).
- (ii) Petition from 6,668 inhabitants of the villages in the Madakasira Taluk, Andhra State in respect of the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956. (Petition No. 63—Appendix III).
- (iii) Petition from Shri Brij Bhushan Sharan, Honorary, Secretary, Delhi Hindustani Mercantile Association, Chandni Chowk, Delhi in respect of the Factories (Amendment) Bill, 1956, introduced by Shri T. B. Vittal Rao, M.P., on the 4th May, 1956, (Petition No. 64—Appendix IV).
- (iv) Petition from 74 inhabitants of Agartala, Tripura State in respect of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1956, Petition No. 65—Appendix V).
- (v) Petition from 1,175 Andhra residents of Parlakimedi Taluk in Orissa, in respect of the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956. (Petition No. 66—Appendix VI).
- (vi) Petition from 2,118 inhabitants of the State of Delhi, in respect of the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956, (Petition No. 67—Appendix VII).
- (vii) Petition from 3 inhabitants of Nagpur, Akola and Wardha (Madhya Pradesh) respectively, relating to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1956. (Petition No. 69—Appendix VIII).
- (viii) Petition from Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Chittoor District, Andhra State, relating to the amendment of the Motor Vehicles Act and the Rules framed thereunder. (Petition No. 70—Appendix IX).
- (ix) Petition from Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Chittoor District, Andhra State, regarding standardization and machine-ruling of non-judicial and Court fee stamp papers. (Petition No. 68—Appendix X).

- (x) Petition from 118 citizens of Delhi in respect of the Child Sanyas Diksha Restraint Bill, 1956 introduced by Shri Fulsinhji B. Dabhi, M.P. on the 6th April, 1956. (Petition No. 72—Appendix XI).

3. The Committee considered on the 29th and 30th May, 1956, Petitions Nos. 61 and 62 (Appendices I & II) presented by Shri T. N. Viswanatha Reddy, M.P. on the 23rd and 26th May, 1956 respectively.

In Petition No. 61, the petitioner has suggested that the I.P.O. Rules might be suitably amended to enable petitioners to send petitions, addressed to the Lok Sabha or to the Members, for presentation, by post at book-packet rates. The Committee feel that the public has a right to approach the Lok Sabha direct or through the Members for redress of their grievances and every facility in that direction ought to be provided. The Committee, therefore recommend that the I.P.O. Rules might be amended so that petitions addressed to the Lok Sabha, or, those sent to the Members for presentation to the Lok Sabha, might be sent by post at book-packet rates.

In Petition No. 62, the petitioner has suggested that the words 'Local Delivery Area' may be defined to include city limits in urban areas and to include area covered by a sub-post office in rural areas so that the benefits of 'Local Delivery Post Cards' might be enjoyed by a larger section of the public.

The matter was referred to the Ministry of Communications for comments. The Committee note that the expression 'Local Delivery Area' in urban areas is more or less the same as suggested by the petitioner. As regards rural areas, the proposed amendment would cover a large number of branch post offices under a sub-post office in rural areas, while the concession at present was admissible to those post-cards only which did not leave the area where they were posted. As the advantages likely to result from the adoption of the proposed amendment would not be commensurate with the financial loss involved, and there would be practical difficulties, involved in the way of its adoption, the Committee do not consider that any amendment in this connection is necessary to the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Act and the Rules framed thereunder.

4. The Committee considered on the 28th July, 1956, Petition No. 63 (Appendix III) presented by Shri Sivamurti Swamy, M.P. on the 17th July, 1956. The petition related to the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956.

The petitioners who are inhabitants of 68 villages in the Madakasira Taluk, Andhra, had prayed for the merger of their villages in Mysore, on grounds of geographical contiguity, administrative convenience, and predominance of Kannada speaking population in that area. As the States Reorganisation Bill was under the consideration of the House, the Committee directed that the petition might be circulated *in extenso* under Rule 185. The petition was accordingly circulated on the 28th July, 1956.

5. The Committee also considered on the 28th July, 1956 Petition No. 64 (Appendix IV) relating to the Factories (Amendment) Bill, 1956 by Shri T. B. Vittal Rao, M.P., introduced in the House on the 4th May, 1956. The petition was reported by the Secretary on the 18th July, 1956.

The petitioner had urged that the proposed amendment of Sections 51, 54 and 59 (1) of the Factories Act, 1948 seeking to reduce the working hours in factories, from 48 to 44 hours per week, was not justified as it would result in reduced production and increased costs. The Committee directed that the petition be circulated *in extenso* under Rule 185. The petition was accordingly circulated on the 28th July, 1956.

6. The Committee also considered on the 28th July, 1956 Petition No. 65 (Appendix V) presented by Shri Dasaratha Deb, M.P. on the 26th July, 1956. The petitioners had represented against the amendment proposed in Schedule IV of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1956, whereby the word 'Tripura' would be substituted by the words 'Tripura or Tripuri, Tippera (except in Agartala)', thus excluding a section of the Tripura community living in Agartala from the list of Scheduled Tribes of the State.

As the Bill was pending before the House, the Committee directed that the petition be circulated *in extenso* under Rule 185 and a copy thereof sent to the Ministry of Home Affairs. The petition was accordingly circulated on the 28th July, 1956 and a copy was also forwarded to the Ministry of Home Affairs.

7. The Committee also considered on the 28th July, 1956 Petition No. 66 (Appendix VI) presented by Dr. Lanka Sundaram, M.P. on the 27th July, 1956. The petition related to the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956. The petitioners had desired that the Parlakimedi Taluk situated in Orissa be transferred to the Andhra State, as it was predominantly a Telugu Taluk and contiguous with the latter State.

As the Bill was under discussion in the House, the Committee directed that the petition be circulated *in extenso* under Rule 185. The petition was accordingly circulated on the 28th July, 1956.

8. The Committee also considered on the 28th July, 1956 Petition No. 67 (Appendix VII) presented by Shri H. V. Kamath, M.P. on the 27th July, 1956. The petitioners, who were inhabitants of the Delhi State had represented that the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956 and the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, 1956 providing for abolition of Delhi State, may not be proceeded with as they would be deprived of the present democratic set up.

As these Bills were pending before the House, the Committee directed that the petition be circulated *in extenso* under Rule 185. The petition was accordingly circulated on the 28th July, 1956.

9. The Committee considered on the 27th August, 1956 Petition No. 69 (Appendix VIII) reported by the Secretary on the 13th August, 1956. The three petitioners who are inhabitants of Nagpur, Akola and Wardha (Madhya Pradesh) stated that the amendment contemplated by the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1956 would exclude certain backward communities residing in the excluded areas from enjoying the existing concessions and privileges to which they were entitled in Madhya Pradesh State as a whole. The petitioners contended that this restriction was being imposed only in Madhya Pradesh State while in other States no such restriction was being imposed. The petitioners, therefore, requested that the concessions and privileges to Scheduled Tribes should be available throughout the State of Madhya Pradesh.

As the Bill was pending before the House, the Committee directed that the petition be circulated *in extenso* under Rule 185. The petition was accordingly circulated on the 27th August, 1956.

10. The Committee also considered on the 27th August, 1956 Petition No. 70 (Appendix IX) presented by Shri T. N. Viswanatha Reddy, M.P. on the 22nd August, 1956. The petitioner had urged that the Motor Vehicles Act and the Rules framed thereunder might be suitably amended to enable speedy carriage of mails by Motor Vehicles instead of the runners who were still being utilised in certain areas for carrying mails. The petitioner had further suggested that the bus owners might be made to take up the job of carrying mails. The Ministry of Communications to whom the matter was referred to for comments, have stated that one of the conditions for a stage carriage permit holder was to convey mails on such terms and conditions as the Regional Transport Authority might fix in consultation with the Postal Authorities.

Further, the Ministry had outlined their programme for conversion of runners lines into mail motor lines where it would result in expedition in delivery or despatch of mails.

The petitioner had also suggested co-opting of the Local Superintendents of Post Offices and Heads of Circles as members of Regional Transport Authority and State Transport Authority. The Ministry stated that close co-operation already exists between the Postal and Regional Transport Authorities and therefore, it is not considered necessary to co-opt the officers in the manner suggested.

The Committee felt that the comments of the Ministry generally met the suggestions made by the petitioner. The Committee have accordingly advised the petitioner.

11. The Committee considered on the 8th September, 1956, Petition No. 68 (Appendix X) presented by Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva, M.P. on the 5th September, 1956.

The petitioner had prayed that all non-judicial and court fee stamp papers might be standardized and machine-ruled in order to prevent frauds being perpetrated by borrowers on money-lenders. The Committee, while appreciating the suggestion made by the

petitioner noted that the matter was the concern of the State Government *vide* entry No. 63 of List II of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. The petitioner has, therefore, been advised to approach the Andhra State Government.

12. The Committee also considered on the 8th September, 1956 Petition No. 72 (Appendix XI) reported by the Secretary on the 6th September, 1956.

The petitioners had *inter alia* stated that the Child Sanyas Diksha Restraint Bill, 1956, introduced by Shri Fulsinhji B. Dabhi, M.P. on the 6th April, 1956, sought to violate certain Fundamental Rights guaranteed under the Constitution. The petitioners had therefore urged that the Bill be not proceeded with. As the Bill was pending before the House, the Committee directed that the petition be circulated *in extenso* under Rule 185. The petition was accordingly circulated on the 8th September, 1956.

NEW DELHI;

S. C. DEB.

The 13th September, 1956.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Petition No. 61

To

Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Member, District Planning and Development Committee, Bheemavaram, Chandragiri Post, Chittoor District,

sheweth

That the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Act and the Rules framed thereunder may be amended suitably to send "Petitions to the Lok Sabha for presentation through an M.P.", by Book Post.

An exhaustive list of articles which can be sent by "Book Post" is given in about 5 pages of small print in the Posts and Telegraphs Guide, but unfortunately "Petitions to the Lok Sabha" are not included in the list.

Manuscript press communications which are of general public importance can be sent by "Book Post". In the same way "Petitions to the Lok Sabha" are of general public interest, bringing several amendments to the Acts and the Rules to suit the needs of the public. Probably, this was omitted because the Constitution was framed only a few years back and "Petitions to the Lok Sabha" came into existence only about 4 years back and nobody brought it to the notice of the Government to permit sending of petitions to the Lok Sabha for presentation through an M.P. by Book Post,

and accordingly your petitioner prays.

1. That the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Act and the Rules framed thereunder may be amended suitably to send "Petitions to the Lok Sabha sent to the M.P., for presentation" by Book post; and

2. That a clause may be added under "Chapter XIII—Petitions and Committee on Petitions" of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, that "Petitions to Lok Sabha" may be sent by "Book Post",

and your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX II

Petition No. 62

To

Lok Sabha,

New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Member, District Planning and Development Committee, Bheemavaram, Chandragiri Post, Chittoor District, sheweth

That the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Act and the Rules framed thereunder be amended suitably to give a clear definition of the words "Local Delivery".

Statistics show that the benefit of the introduction of "Local Delivery Post Cards" are fully utilised in Cities, less in Municipalities and Nil in rural parts.

The definition of "Local Delivery" in rural parts is not very clear. Local Delivery may be defined as (1) "city limits in Urban Areas" and (2) "within the jurisdiction of a sub-Post Office in Rural Areas". If so, the people can write local delivery letters (i) within the city limits in the Urban areas and (ii) from the sub-Post Office to the Branch Post Office and *vice versa* and from one Branch Post Office to another within the jurisdiction of a sub-Post Office.

If such a clear definition is given it will help (1) The Postal Department to get more revenue by the sale of Local Delivery Post Cards in the rural parts and (2) it will encourage the rural population to have postal correspondence with their near relatives and (3) the letters in several Branch Post Offices newly opened will also increase,

and accordingly your petitioner prays that the definition of "Local Delivery" may be clearly defined as (a) "city limits in Urban Areas" and (b) "within the jurisdiction of the sub-Post Office in Rural Areas",

and your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX III

Petition No. 63

To

Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri N. Sreerama Reddi, Chairman, Mysore Pro-Merger Committee, Madakasira Taluk; Patil Puttappa, Chairman, Karnatak Vidyavardhak Sangh, Dharwar; and 6,666 other inhabitants of the villages in the Madakasira Taluk, Andhra State, sheweth.

MADAKASIRA TALUK

1. Geographical Features

- (a) This Taluk is an Andhra enclave in Mysore State.
- (b) Out of 180 miles of the border of this Taluk, 175 miles is contiguous with Mysore and only 5 miles with Andhra.

2. Administrative Convenience

DISTRICT H.Q.

CAPITAL

- | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|
| (a) Distance from seat of Government of Andhra:— | 80 Miles | 400 Miles |
| (b) Distance from seat of Government of Mysore:— | 48 Miles | 80 Miles |

3. Language

- (a) 13% speak mixed languages as mother tongue.
- (b) 22% speak Telugu language as mother tongue.
- (c) 65% speak Kannada, THE OFFICIAL Language of Mysore.

N.B.—All People in the Taluk can speak Kannada.

4. It is no advantage to Andhra to retain Madakasira
5. It is advantageous to Mysore to have Madakasira which is an enclave.

GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION, ADMINISTRATIVE CONVENIENCE AND THE PREDOMINANT LANGUAGE demand the inclusion of Madakasira Taluk in Mysore State especially now when an opportunity has presented itself.

Even the S.R.C. in their report (Para 398) were pleased to observe that "The position regarding Madakasira Taluk is somewhat complicated.....But a substantial area of this Taluk which has a KANNADA majority of about 64% still juts out in Mysore and is surrounded on three sides by the area which belongs to the prospective Karnataka State."

Since the States Reorganisation Bill is now pending before the Lok Sabha, your petitioners wish to express their belief that the merger of their villages within the Madakasira Taluk (now in Andhra State) with Mysore would be a positive advantage to them,

and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX IV

Petition No. 64

To

Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri Brij Bhushan Sharan, Hony. Secretary, Delhi Hindustani Mercantile Association, Chandni Chowk, Delhi, on behalf of the Committee of the Association, sheweth

The object of the Factories (Amendment) Bill, 1956, at present pending before the House, is to reduce the working hours from 48 to 44 per week and the spread over from 9 to 8 hours per day.

2. The argument advanced in support of the Bill, viz., that because most of the advanced countries are taking work for 44 or even less hours per week from their workers, the Government of India should also follow in their foot steps, does not seem to be very sound from the Indian economic point of view. There has not been any additional or excessive pressure of work on the workers engaged in the Factories since the enactment of the Act in 1948, and therefore, there is no justification for the reduction of working hours.

3. The amending Bill, if enacted into law, would affect all the Industries in view of the following:—

- (i) The change will have a serious set-back on all the industries throughout the country—production would be reduced, and the cost of production would automatically go higher, because of the reduction in working hours.
- (ii) The workers would not accept lower wages than what they are getting, and this would result in higher prices.

and accordingly your petitioner prays that no change be made in the existing Sections 51, 54 and 59(1) of the Factories Act, 1948, and your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX V

Petition No. 65

To

Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri Lalitmohan Deb Burman and 73 other inhabitants of Agartala,

sheweth.

(1) That in Schedule IV of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1956, an amendment of the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) (Part C States) Order, 1951, has been proposed whereby the word 'Tripura' in entry 15 in Part VII—TRIPURA, under the item 'Throughout the State' in the said Order, has been sought to be substituted by the expression—"15. Tripura or Tripuri, Tippera (except in Agartala)".

(2) That, by this amendment, a section of the Tripura community living in Agartala has been sought to be excluded from the list of Scheduled Tribes of Tripura State. Moreover, the term 'Tripuri' has a bigger denotation and connotation than the other terms standing beside it, for it signifies all aboriginal people of Tripura.

(3) That the proposed amendment is not only ambiguous and illogical, but artificial as well as without basis and hence your petitioners strongly protest against it,

and accordingly your petitioners pray that the words "except in Agartala" be deleted from the amendment proposed in the Bill mentioned above, to entry No. 15 in Part VII—TRIPURA of the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) (Part C States) Order, 1951,

and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX VI

Petition No. 66

To

Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

The humble petition of 1,175 Andhra residents of Parlakimedi Taluk in Orissa,

sheweth

It has been a great shock to the petitioners that the States Re-organisation Commission has summarily rejected the claim and the demand for the transfer of Parlakimedi Taluk to Andhra. It is regrettable that the Report of the Commission reveals no attempt at assessing appropriately, on the basis of facts and figures presented to them, the case for its inclusion in Andhra.

2. The people of Parlakimedi feel a sense of disappointment that, while they hoped for the provision for the appointment of a boundary commission in the case of areas in dispute, the final draft of the Bill which is now before the Lok Sabha as reported by the Joint Select Committee, does not contain such a provision. Though the case of Parlakimedi Taluk, which will be briefly described below, does not need any elaborate enquiry by a boundary commission, a provision for such a commission in the Bill as it finally emerges from the Parliament will allay the disturbed feelings of the people of Parlakimedi.

3. It is submitted that not much argument is needed to convince that Parlakimedi is (1) a predominantly Telgu Taluk, (2) is contiguous with Andhra State, (3) is cut off from Orissa by a wide tract of Andhra area and (4) is economically, culturally and commercially linked with Andhra. Then, what the previous enquiry committees stated and opined and how finally it was transferred in part, after bifurcating it, by a fiat of the then Secretary of State for India, to help the Zamindar of the place,—all form part of familiar history and do not need detailed submission.

4. The following facts and figures may however be usefully quoted: Sir Samuel Hoare, the then Secretary of State for India (1934), finally gifting away part of Parlakimedi Estate (the present Parlakimedi Taluk) said:

“The majority of the population is admittedly Telugu. On the other hand the Zamindar, the Raja of Parlakimedi, who is a leading Oriya pressed strongly that his Estate should be included in the province (Orissa).”

A glance at the population figures (1931 census):—

Total population	1,03,529	
Telugus	63,015	60.9 per cent
Oriyas	33,607	32.5 per cent
Savaras (Hill Tribes).	6,907	6.6 per cent

5. What the Andhras of Parlakimedi are surprised at is that the S.R.C. Report has endorsed the decisions of the British Government and sees no need for the disturbance of the present arrangement, even after being apprised of the injustice perpetrated by the British rulers and the general attitude of hostility, leading to terrorism that is now witnessed in this part of Orissa, though it is not being mentioned as an argument for transfer.

6. This petition is submitted to bring this matter to the notice of Parliament for its kind and earnest consideration, so that justice may be done to a people who have been suffering.

7. It may appropriately be brought to the notice of Parliament that it is not out of any sense of bitterness or separatist propensities or actuated by any spirit of narrow linguism or regionalism that this transfer is being pressed. The majority of people are Andhras in this area. The language affinities are therefore strong. But that is not all or the major part of the case. The area has every kind of connection and contiguity with Andhra; administratively it can thrive under the Andhra State; economically its prosperity is linked with Andhra; its irrigational projects, prospects and problems are inter-twined with Andhra as for instance in the case of Vamsadhara.

8. Considering all aspects, the people of Parlakimedi hope that Parliament would give its best consideration to this petition,

and accordingly your petitioners pray that Parliament, which is seized of the subject of the States Reorganisation Bill, may kindly consider the case of Parlakimedi and include in the Bill necessary provision for its merger with the Andhra State,

and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX VII

Petition No. 67

To

Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

The humble petition of 2,118 inhabitants of the State of Delhi, sheweth

1. Delhi, being one of the important cities in India in the political life, should not be reduced to the status of a Union territory without a Legislature and a Council of Ministers.

2. Denial of democratic set-up to the people of Delhi will deprive them of the privileges which are enjoyed by every citizen of India in the States.

3. Steps suggested in the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956 will amount to discrimination between one citizen and another and will thus be *ultra vires* of the fundamental rights,

and accordingly your petitioners pray that the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956 and the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, 1956 as reported by the Joint Select Committee of Parliament, providing for the abolition of the State of Delhi, may not be proceeded with in Parliament,

and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX VIII

Petition No. 69

To

Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

The humble petition of 3 inhabitants of Nagpur, Akola and Wardha (Madhya Pradesh) respectively, sheweth

The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1956 will come up for discussion before both Houses of Parliament during the ensuing session. The following facts with regard to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1956 be sympathetically considered and amended accordingly.

According to the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order, 1950, the castes included in Part IV, Madhya Pradesh are eligible to all sorts of concession and privileges in restricted area. This being so, a student belonging to a certain caste included in the Schedule but not residing in the areas mentioned cannot derive any benefit, which is due to him, because of his caste and backwardness. For instance, an individual belonging to Gond Community and not residing in the areas mentioned in the Order is deprived of the concessions. And hence his children, even though backward, shall not get free education, preference in Government Service etc. In other States this is not so and an individual belonging to a caste included in the Schedule in that State can get all concessions throughout the State.

If we really want to uplift our people, it is most essential that an individual belonging to castes mentioned in the Order as well as in the amending Bill of 1956 and residing anywhere in the State, irrespective of any area, should be allowed to enjoy the facilities and privileges,

and accordingly your petitioners pray that the words "TROUGHTOUT THE STATE" for item (a) of para 5 in Part IV, Madhya Pradesh on page 30 of the amending Bill, 1956 be substituted, thereby allowing all castes and communities scheduled as Scheduled Tribes to have the benefit of the concessions throughout the State,

and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX IX

Petition No. 70

To

Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Member, District Planning and Development Committee, Bheemavaram, Chandragiri Post, Chittoor District,

sheweth

That the Motor Vehicles Act and the Rules framed thereunder may be amended suitably to carry Mails by buses.

Nearly half the mails of the country are still carried by runners. It is an anachronism of modern days that such archaic methods should still persist, but the Postal Department will not be able to speed up delivery until more use is made of motor traffic. Better service should be the aim of the Department and better arrangements should be made for the more speedy transport of mails.

Runners are used in many places, because they are cheap; but that is not enough. Speed in these days is more essential. If buses are to carry mails, there will be early delivery and late clearance in the rural parts.

If the bus owners take up the job of carrying mails, they can enjoy the benefit of (1) suitable timings (2) additional bus called "support mail" and (3) regular income from the passenger traffic as the passengers have got confidence of the bus reaching the destination in time. This will be of mutual benefit to both the bus owners and the Postal Department.

Though the Postal Department belong to the Central Government and the Motor Vehicles belong to the State Governments, it is hoped that they will join together and work for the common good of the people.

The Director, Posts and Telegraphs, Kurnool (a Central Government Employee) is co-opted as a Member of the National Savings Advisory Committee. In the same way, if the Superintendents of Post Offices and the Directors of Posts and Telegraphs (or Postmasters General) are co-opted as Members of the Regional Transport Authorities (at the district level) and Central Road Traffic Boards (at State levels), they will be able to plan and organise buses timings for early delivery and late clearance at the remote corners of the Country,

and accordingly your petitioner prays:

(1) That the Motor Vehicles Act and the Rules framed thereunder may be amended suitably to carry Mail by buses compulsorily,

(2) That the Superintendents of Post Offices may be co-opted as Members of the Regional Transport Authorities,

(3) That the Directors of Posts and Telegraphs (or Post Masters General) may be co-opted as Members of the Central Road Traffic Boards,

and your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX X

Petition No. 68

To

Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Member, District Planning and Development Committee, Bheemavaram, Chandragiri Post, Chittoor District,

sheweth

That all the non-judicial and court fee stamp papers may be brought to a standard size and machine-ruled for the reasons quoted below:—

That a certain party registered a mortgage deed in a single stamped paper and after taking it back from the Sub-Registrar, neatly cut out one inch breadthwise at the bottom (taking advantage of uneven size of the stamp papers—each denomination stamp differing with the other in length) and handed it over to the money-lender and took the money. The mortgagor did not repay the amount and when the money-lender filed a suit in the court, the mortgagor pleaded that he paid a part of the principal and interest and wrote at the bottom end of the mortgage deed which was neatly cut and removed by the money-lender. Even the Sub-Registrar was not able to give satisfactory evidence in the Court regarding the size or length of the stamped paper filed for registration etc.

In the case of certain lease deeds and sale deeds, certain intelligent people are adding certain items of properties in the schedule after taking the signature from the party.

In order to overcome all these difficulties it is better to arrange to (1) machine-rule all the non-judicial and court fee stamp papers; (2) numbering the lines as 1, 2, 3, and so on; (3) with full stops (like); (4) the last line may be machine-ruled (like———); and (5) at the rate of 2½ lines per inch (or 5 lines for 2 inches) facilitating for easy typing—with double spacing:

and accordingly your petitioner prays:

(1) That all the non-judicial and court fee stamps papers may be brought to a standard size,

(2) That all the non-judicial and court fee stamp papers may be machine-ruled and the lines numbered as suggested above,

and your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

APPENDIX XI

Petition No. 72

To

Lok Sabha,

New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri Mohan Lal Kathotiya and 117 other citizens of Delhi,

sheweth

The Child Sanyas Diksha Restraint Bill, 1956, if placed on the Statute Book, will be a flagrant violation of the Constitution of India. In the name of social reform, it seeks to strike at the roots of religious freedom and undermine the age-old spiritual traditions which alone can be a solid foundation on which the edifice of a new India of our dreams can be built.

2. The Constitutional provisions, which are categorical and unambiguous, are mentioned below:—

- (i) The Constitution specifically guarantees to all persons, of all ages, freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practice and propagate religion. [Part III, Article 25 (1)].
- (ii) The Constitution lays down that subject to public order, morality and health, every religious denomination, or any section thereof, shall have the right to establish and maintain institutions for religious and charitable purposes and to manage its own affairs in matters of religion. [Part III, Article 26 (a), (b)].
- (iii) The Constitution clearly safeguards the personal liberty of a citizen (Part III, Article 21) and confers the right to any section having a distinct culture of its own to conserve it [Part III, Article 29 (1)].
- (iv) The Constitution states categorically that the State shall not make any law which takes away or abridges the rights conferred by Part III and any law made in contravention of this clause shall to the extent of this contravention be void. [Part III, Article 13 (2)].

3. The proposed Bill goes against both the spirit and letter of these provisions and should automatically be rejected as *ultra vires* of the Constitution.

4. It is said that a child below the age of 18 is not capable of understanding the implications and consequences of initiation in an order of monks and nuns. It is pertinent to ask whether such arguments are raised when the question of selecting a career for a child is concerned. It is considered quite natural for boys and girls to choose a course for themselves whether it be law or medicine or engineering or something else. But when it comes to a question of renouncing worldly pursuits and adopting a life of self-denial and spirituality, there is a hue and cry.

5. Moreover, both when deciding on a vocation or becoming a Sanyasi, it is the parents and the elders of a child who help him with advice and guidance to take the correct step. The parents alone know best the inclinations of a child. The parents have the interest of their children at heart. There is no reason as to why parents cannot be trusted to give correct guidance to their children if they wish to become Sanyasis and there is no need for the State to intervene.

6. The institution of Sanyas is a hoary one and has been the basis of India's spiritual greatness through the ages. Its ideals are lofty, the ideals of selflessness and service of mankind through the principles of *Brahmacharya*, *Tyaga*, *Satya* and *Ahimsa*. At a time when commercial-mindedness and selfishness are growing, it is all the more necessary to strengthen spiritual ideals and not weaken them as the present ill-considered Bill will undoubtedly do.

7. But without a continuity of Sanyasis, there can be no institution of Sanyasa, and it is not understood how this continuity can be maintained if young people are prevented from becoming monks or nuns.

8. It is a fact recognized by psychologists that it is during the formative years that a child's bent of mind can be properly developed. Only young initiates can best imbibe the true spirit and discipline of a Sanyasi. It needs long years of stay with Gurus, breathing always an atmosphere of purity and holiness for the ideas of Truth, Non-violence, and *Tyaga* to take firm roots in the minds of boys and girls. To wait till they are over 18 is to minimise the chances of their becoming good disciples worthy of the sublime traditions of Sanyasis.

9. Sanyasi Diksha enables a child through spiritual development and moral training to become a source of inspiration to society. There may be rare exceptions in this as in all cases but these exceptions should not become an excuse for undertaking legislation which would prove harmful to society.

10. Further, initiation of children below 18 is not a common occurrence. It is only where a child possesses rare gifts that he is ordained as a Sanyasi and such cases are very few. It is not at all necessary to burden the Statute Book with additional legislation to deal with such cases.

11. The member-in-charge of the Bill has not adduced any facts and figures to show that initiation of children below 18 is taking

place on a wide scale, or that unfair practices are resorted to to make children Sanyasis. The fact is that no such evidence exists and as such the need for such a Bill also does not arise.

12. On no grounds—constitutional, psychological, moral or spiritual,—is this Bill justified. Social reforms should not be at the expense of moral values. Today, more than ever before, it has become imperative to uphold spiritual aims. The institution of Sanyas is a rich fount which keeps alive these aims. Let us not be guilty of making this fount dry.

13. If there are any wrongs that might be done against a child, such an coercion, intimidation or forceful initiation, the present laws are quite adequate to deal with them and no new legislation of a sweeping nature is called for,

and accordingly your petitioners pray that the Bill referred to above should not be proceeded with and enacted,

and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.