

# COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

## **SEVENTH REPORT** (Second Lok Sabha)

*(Presented on the 9th September, 1959)*



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**  
**NEW DELHI**

*September, 1959*

*Price : 25 naye paise*

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Personnel of the Committee on Petitions . . . . .	(iii)
2. Report . . . . .	i
3. Appendices I to IV . . . . .	5

## PERSONNEL OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

1. Shri Upendranath Barman—*Chairman.*
2. Pandit Jwala Prasad Jyotishi
3. Shrimati Uma Nehru
4. Pandit Dwarka Nath Tiwary
5. Shri M. K. M. Abdul Salam
6. Shri Jiyalal Mandal
7. Shri Pendekanti Venkatasubbaiah
8. Chaudhary Pratap Singh Daulta
9. Shri Ram Chandra Majhi
10. Shri Arjun Singh Bhādauria
11. Shri Pramathanath Banerjee
12. Shri A. V. Ghare
13. Shri Chhaganlal M. Kedaria
14. Shrimati Krishna Mehta
15. Shri M. K. Shivananjappa.

### SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Joint Secretary.*  
Shri A. L. Rai—*Under Secretary.*

## R E P O R T

1, The Chairman of the Committee on Petitions, having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present this their Seventh Report.

2. The Committee held five sittings during the Eighth Session, i.e. on the 12th, 14th, 20th and 31st August and the 3rd September, 1959. The Committee considered the following petitions:—

- (i) Petition from Shri V. B. Setty and 573 other residents of Tiruttani Taluk, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh, relating to the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill, 1959. (Petition No. 31—Appendix I).
- (ii) Petition from Shri B. Subrahmanyam, President, Tiruttani Panchayat, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh, relating to the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill, 1959. (Petition No. 32—Appendix II).
- (iii) Petition from Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Chittoor District, Andhra State, regarding accidents at railway level-crossings (Petition No. 33—Appendix III).
- (iv) Petition from Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh, relating to amendment of the Indian Arms Rules, 1951. (Petition No. 36—Appendix IV).

3. The Committee considered on the 14th August, 1959, Petition No. 31 (Appendix I), which had been presented to Lok Sabha by Shri Ram Chandra Majhi, M.P., on the 13th August, 1959.

The petitioners had registered a protest against the transfer of a majority of villages in Tiruttani Taluk to Madras State, as proposed in clause 3(b) of the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill, 1959, which had been introduced in Lok Sabha on the 12th August, 1959. They had also put forth a number of arguments in support of the following prayer:—

- (i) for continuance of *status quo*; or
- (ii) if it was necessary to re-adjust the territories, the Government of Andhra Pradesh might be directed to submit an accurate map of the area to Shri Pataskar for giving a fresh finding; or
- (iii) a census might be ordered for the purpose; or
- (iv) the issue might be postponed till 1961 when a census would be held and the matter decided on the principle of 70 per cent majority as recommended by the States Re-organisation Commission.

As the Bill was pending before Lok Sabha, the Committee directed that the petition might be circulated *in extenso* to all the Members of the House under rule 307.

The petition was accordingly circulated on the 14th August, 1959.

4. The Committee considered on the 20th August, 1959, Petition No. 32 (Appendix II), which had been presented to Lok Sabha by Shri N. R. M. Swamy, M.P., on the 19th August, 1959.

The petitioner had refuted the statements made in Petition No. 31 from the President, Taluk Congress Committee, Tiruttani and 573 other signatories of Tiruttani. The petitioner had stated that the award of Shri Pataskar proposing the transfer of majority of villages in the Taluk to the Madras State, had been accepted by (a) the representatives of all the parties concerned, (b) the Governments of Madras and Andhra Pradesh, and (c) the Central Government and now as embodied in clause 3(b) of the Bill, ought to be implemented.

In support of his plea, he had stated that—

- (a) Tiruttani Town was populated by nearly 11,000 people of which only 3,000 were Telugu-speaking; and
- (b) only candidates set up by the Tamil Nad North Boundary Protection Committee had been successful at 3 panchayat elections as member, president and vice-president.

Hence, the petitioner maintained that the statements made in Petition No. 31 that the majority of the villages were populated with only Telugu-speaking people and their merger with Madras was recommended on the basis of wrong figures and disputed map, were not correct.

As the Bill was pending before the House, the Committee directed that the petition might be circulated *in extenso* to all the members of Lok Sabha under rule 307.

The petition was accordingly circulated on the 20th August, 1959.

5. The Committee considered on the 31st August, 1959, Petition No. 33 (Appendix III), which had been presented to Lok Sabha by Shri T. N. Viswanatha Reddy, M.P., on the 25th August, 1959.

The petitioner had referred to a news item in the 'Mail', Madras, dated the 17th February, 1959, regarding an accident in which a loaded lorry had dashed against the Up Renigunta-Katpadi passenger train on the 16th February, 1959, on the Puthalapattu-Chittoor Block Section. This had resulted in the death of one passenger, serious injury to another and minor injuries to three others and slight damage to a train carriage.

The petitioner, while alleging that such accidents occurred due to negligence and laziness of gate-keepers at level-crossings, had suggested that the gates at the level-crossings might be fixed so that:—

- (i) the roadside was always kept open;
- (ii) the rail side was usually blocked;
- (iii) whenever trains passed, the roadside might be blocked; and the train side kept open for so long as the train actually passed over the crossings.

The Committee also perused the comments of the Ministry of Railways on the above suggestion.

The Ministry had admitted that the accident had been caused due to the gate-keeper's failure to observe the rules which provided that the gates were normally to be kept closed to road traffic except when interlocked with signals and were to be opened to road traffic only when necessary to do so.

They did not accept the petitioner's suggestions on grounds of safety, but proposed to interlock the gates at the above-specified level-crossing with signals.

The Committee, while noting the above, feel that similar adequate steps ought to be taken by the Ministry of Railways on all level-crossings so as to prevent recurrence of such accidents in future.

6. The Committee at their sitting held on the 31st August, 1959, considered Petition No. 36 (Appendix IV), which had been presented to Lok Sabha by Shri T. N. Viswanatha Reddy, M.P., on the 27th August, 1959.

The petitioner had referred to the recommendations of the Committee on Petitions, First Lok Sabha, in their Sixth Report, on the suggestion made in his Petition No. 45 for fixation of an arms licencee's photograph on a licence for easy identification.

The petitioner, after reproducing the above recommendations and the comments of the Ministry of Home Affairs on the same, contained in the Third Report of the Committee (Second Lok Sabha), had put forth the following arguments in support of his suggestion:—

- (i) A licencee of one district might acquire property in some other district and hold a licence for the two districts; and he might be known in both the places or the towns, but he might not be known or recognised in between the two places.
- (ii) At least once or twice, every villager goes to a town and can easily get himself photographed.
- (iii) To prevent *purdah* women from misusing their licences and to apprehend them, if necessary, it is essential to have photographs attached to their licences.

- (iv) Further the people and the people's representatives through the Committee on Petitions, First Lok Sabha, had suggested the idea of fixation of photographs.
- (v) It would be a step forward like the practice in U.K. and U.S.A. where every one has an identification card, with his photograph bearing his signature. The suggestion would enable ready identification at post offices, banks, railway stations, etc.

The Committee appreciate the arguments advanced by the petitioner and feel that the suggestion might be implemented by the Government.

7. The Committee also note with satisfaction that, in pursuance of their recommendation made on Petition No. 11 (*vide* para 3 of their Sixth Report), three Bills had been introduced in Lok Sabha on the 27th August, 1959, *viz.* the Public Debt (Amendment) Bill, the Government Savings Banks (Amendment) Bill and the Government Savings Certificates Bill, 1959; and had been passed by the House on the 31st August, 1959.

8. The Committee also considered at their sittings held during the Eighth Session of Second Lok Sabha, 141 representations, letters and telegrams, addressed by various individuals, associations etc. to the House, the Speaker or the Chairman of the Committee, which were inadmissible as petitions.

NEW DELHI;  
*the 8th September, 1959*  
*Bhadra 17, 1881 (Saka)*

UPENDRANATH BARMAN,  
*Chairman,*  
*Committee on Petitions.*

## APPENDIX I

### Petition No. 31

(See para 3 of the Report)

To

Lok Sabha,  
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri V. B. Setty and 573 other residents of the Tiruttani Taluk, Chittoor District, Andhra State,

**SHEWETH:**

We, the undersigned, residents of Tiruttani town and Tiruttani Taluk respectfully beg to state the following for kind and sympathetic consideration by Lok Sabha:

1. As per the award of Sri H. V. Pataskar, a major portion of Tiruttani Taluk consisting of several villages with Telugu majority, including Tiruttani town, has to be transferred to Madras State if the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill, 1959 now pending before Lok Sabha, is passed into law.

2. We humbly submit that great injustice will be caused to the Telugu public of this taluk if the Pataskar award is implemented as the same is against natural law and justice, partial and one-sided. We submit the following in support of our plea for kind and sympathetic consideration of Lok Sabha:

(a) As far back as 1900, the present Chittoor District was a part of North Arcot District. People of Tiruttani Taluk had to go to Ranipet, North Arcot District, for registration of documents where there were two sections of records, namely, Telugu for Tiruttani Taluk and Tamil for Walajha Taluk. As much difficulty was being experienced by the then rulers (British), North Arcot District was bifurcated in the year 1911 into 2 districts, namely, Chittoor District comprising of the Telugu majority taluks, and North Arcot with Tamil majority areas. Even a century-old records show that Telugu was the principal language of Tiruttani Taluk.

(b) This taluk was under Karvetnagar Zamindars and subsequently under the Tirumalai Tirupathi Devasthanams Estates of Lord Sri Venkateswaraswami (Balajee) of Tirupathi. In those days, people whose mother tongue was Tamil had the privilege of residing at the rate of at least one family in almost all the villages, as village Karnams. These Karnams used to submit the consolidated census figures to the Taluk Offices.

Telugu-Tamil agitation had cropped up gradually after the 1951 census. When a fresh census was taken in the year 1951, these Tamil Karnams at the instance of some interested Tamil leaders had increas-



ed the figures of Tamil population by about 19,000 and also reduced the figures of Telugu population by about 12,000. This was clearly pointed out several times to the Government as well as to Sri H. V. Pataskar in our representations to them.

(c) The agreement reached by the Chief Ministers of Andhra and Madras to decide the boundary dispute on the basis of simple majority that is 51 per cent.: 49 per cent., is against the interests of the Telugu Public and against the awards of previous Border Commissions and also against Natural Law and justice in view of the following reasons:

(i) No State border can be determined on the basis of this percentage as 1 per cent. majority can be obtained at any moment; either by death or birth of a single person.

(ii) Even the States Reorganisation Commission headed by the experienced and learned judges, appointed by the present National Government, has given its award that more than 70 per cent. majority of people speaking any particular language should be taken as the basic principle and the area added on to the other contiguous area by taking taluk as a unit. Even this principle was not followed by the two Chief Ministers.

(iii) The agreement reached between the Chief Ministers of Andhra and Madras to suit their own political ends in the matter of elections is not an agreement between the two Governments as the two States Assemblies have not accepted the simple majority basis before the said agreement by both the Chief Ministers.

(iv) From the very beginning, the Public of Tiruttani Taluk are disputing the census figures of 1951. However, a population map was prepared by the Government of Madras and submitted to Sri H. V. Pataskar. Even the map prepared by the Government of Madras was not according to the already disputed census of 1951. The map was prepared disfiguring several Telugu majority villages as the Government of Madras was interested in acquiring the same. For example, with a view to include a particular area in the Madras State, a small hamlet with Tamil Majority, consisting of 12 houses, with a population of barely 90 alone was taken as a border and a big Village "POMPADI" with a population of more than 3,000 with 95 per cent. Telugu Majority was converted as a pocket, thus doing great injustice to the Telugu Public. It is also understood that, even though the Andhra representative was present while preparation of the map, he had not pointed out the correct position. This was found out by the Government of Andhra Pradesh and they raised objections as to the correctness of the population map. This was also pointed out by the Telugu deputationists as well as by the Government of Andhra Pradesh to Sri H. V. Pataskar. But, when Sri H. V. Pataskar called for a fresh and accurate map according to the 1951 census, which is disputed by the Telugu public, the Government of Andhra Pradesh failed to submit the map to the disappointment of the Telugu Public, even though a fresh and accurate map was prepared under the supervision of Sri J. A. Dharmaraj, I.A.S. District Collector of Chittoor.

(v) We humbly submit that the Government of Andhra Pradesh had not represented our case fairly before the arbitrator on some political grounds and had remained *ex-parte*.

(vi) Further the map prepared and submitted to Sri H. V. Pataskar was not an accurate one as Tiruttani Taluk was not surveyed and settlement completed at the time of preparation of the said map, since the area was under *Zamindari* regime.

(vii) The survey and settlement was completed only during this year, and an accurate map can only be prepared now. Even Mr. Arbudanathan, who prepared the old map, had clearly stated in his report that the map prepared by him was only an approximate one. It is submitted that important issues of this type cannot be decided based on an approximate map and inaccurate figures and hence a fresh census in the year 1961 will be necessary; otherwise there will be denial of justice to the Telugu public.

(viii) Even the learned Sri H. V. Pataskar, in his award has pointed out that, as the Government of Andhra Pradesh have failed to submit a fresh and accurate map, he had to give his award based on the map furnished by the Government of Madras which was disputed by the Government of Andhra Pradesh and also by Telugu deputationists.

(ix) We submit that the mere failure of the State Government of Andhra Pradesh to furnish the map should not be taken into account and cause injustice to the public. The arbitrator might have waited for a few more days or directed the Telugu deputationists to furnish a map as offered by them. Hence the award of Sri H. V. Pataskar is only an *ex-parte* award, partial, and one-sided and is liable to be set aside under natural law and justice.

(x) Even in the year 1951, the Partition Committee formed by the then composite Madras State consisting of both Telugu and Tamil Ministers, had placed on record that the entire Chittoor district was an undisputed Telugu district and the Tamil Nad Congress Committee also had passed a resolution to the above effect. Even the Prime Minister of the Indian Union, Pandit Nehru, had stated in Parliament that the Andhra State should be formed with the eleven undisputed districts (including Chittoor District) and three taluks of Bellary district.

3. (a) So far as Tiruttani town is concerned, the Telugus formed 58 per cent., of the population as per the 1931 census. Since this is a pilgrim Centre, several hotels and barber shops with a number of Tamil coolies working have sprung up after the end of World War II. Further, the merger of three surrounding villages and *cheries* consisting of Tamil majority due to the action of the then President of Panchayat Board of Tiruttani before the year 1950 in the matter of elections, has increased slightly the Tamil Majority in respect of Tiruttani town and even according to the disputed census of 1951, the Tamils are only in simple majority, i.e., 51 per cent. Tamils, 48 per cent. Telugus and 1 per cent., others.

(b) It is not our intention to cause embarrassment to the State or Central Governments by inciting public agitation like pulling chains of running trains, picketing Public offices etc. We consider that as the last resort. So, we request that our silence may not be mistaken as weakness, as it was due to the advice and assurances of our accredited leaders like Sri N. Sanjeeva Reddy, Sri Kala

Venkat Rao, etc., that the interests of the Telugu Public will not be neglected and every inch of Tiruttani Taluk will be kept intact in Andhra Pradesh.

(c) The history of Tiruttani Town and Taluk will be written in golden letters as one of its sons Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, is a world-renowned Philosopher and Vice-President of India. The fact that he was born in Tiruttani Town and his mother tongue is Telugu will stand testimony that Tiruttani Town and Taluk is a Telugu majority area.

4. (a) Nearly 80 per cent. of the properties that are immovable are owned by the Telugu Public of Tiruttani Town and Tiruttani Taluk and all the documents and accounts are being maintained only in Telugu for the past 100 years. Even in the educational institutions, the majority of the students are Telugus forming about 80 per cent.

(b) The case of Tamils that the Tamil students are not provided adequate facilities for studying Tamil is untenable since each and every school in Tiruttani Taluk is provided both Telugu and Tamil sections whereas, in the adjoining North Arcot District it is not so, and Telugu sections have been abolished in several schools recently.

(c) Further, the allegation made by the Tamils, that Tiruttani Taluk is backward due to negligence is not true nor based on facts. Under the Community Development Scheme, Pallipat *firka* in Tiruttani Taluk is the only *firka* that stands as the best in the whole of Andhra Pradesh, as declared by Sri C. M. Trivedi, I.C.S., *ex-Governor* of Andhra Pradesh.

5. In respect of recruitment to State Services, both Telugu and Tamil languages are recognized in Chittoor district whereas it is not so in the adjoining North Arcot district of Madras State. So, we humbly submit that, by retention of Tiruttani Taluk in Andhra State, no hardship and injustice would be caused to the Tamil Public in their educational, professional and economical conditions. Whereas, by inclusion of Tiruttani Taluk in Madras State, much hardship will be caused to the Telugu public as they will be forced to learn Tamil which is the regional language of Madras State, where they have already abolished existing Telugu High Schools in the districts of North Arcot and Chingleput and the trade and financial conditions of the Telugu public would be affected as the Telugu public alone possess more than 80 per cent., of immovable properties in Tiruttani Town and Tiruttani Taluk.

6. (a) We humbly submit that the agreement reached by both the Chief Ministers of Andhra and Madras and the Pataskar's award is not acceptable even to the Telugu Public of Tiruvellore and Ponneri Taluks of Madras State which have now to be included in Andhra State, as the principle of simple majority, that is 51 per cent.: 49 per cent., will upset the peaceful life of the public of either side and will affect the trade and financial status of Telugu public.

(b) We also further submit that, in the neighbouring North Arcot district of Madras State, there are a number of villages with 95 per cent., of Telugu majority, contiguous to the Andhra area. This fact was not appreciated by the learned arbitrator even on a representation made by the Telugu deputationists.

(c) Further, we submit that Sri H. V. Pataskar had no idea about the nature of the villages under dispute, as he had not made any individual enquiries to ascertain the wishes of the people in every particular village and the natural resources and boundaries of the village. Hence, the proposed borders will be more devious, leaving several pockets, thus causing great inconvenience for all practical administrative purposes between State to State.

7. We further submit that the award of Sri H. V. Pataskar based on a simple majority i.e., 51 per cent.: 49 per cent., is against awards of previous Commissions, as the principle of simple majority is not being followed in respect of other States of the Indian Union, in determining their boundaries and the same is against principles embodied in Article 14 of the Constitution of India Act, 1950 under which all citizens of India possess the same privileges and will be subject to same liabilities i.e., equality before law.

8. Hence we submit that the agreement reached between the Chief Ministers of Andhra and Madras has caused great injustice to the Telugu public.

and accordingly your petitioners pray that:

(a) the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill, 1959 be not proceeded with;

(b) "Status Quo" might be maintained; or

(c) if it is deemed necessary to divide the boundaries, the award of Sri H. V. Pataskar, arbitrator, might be set aside as an 'ex-parte award' based on wrong figures and disputed map and the Government of Andhra Pradesh might be directed to submit a fresh and accurate map to the arbitrator in consultation with the Telugu deputationists of Tiruttani Taluk and Sri H. V. Pataskar might be requested to give fresh findings based on the fresh map; or

(d) a fresh census might be ordered now itself for the purpose of giving a fresh award; or

(e) the issue might be postponed till the year 1961 when a fresh census will be taken and then an arbitrator appointed to decide the matter based on the principle of more than 70 per cent. majority as recommended by the States Re-organisation Commission and after a fresh accurate map of the area is prepared,

and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Name of the first signatory	Full address	Signature
V. B. SETTY	President, Taluk Congress Committee, Tiruttani, Chittoor District, Andhra State.	Sd/- V. B. Setty.

Countersigned by } Ram Chandra Majhi.  
M. P. 11-8-59.

**APPENDIX II**  
**Petition No. 32**  
(See para 4 of the Report)

To  
Lok Sabha,  
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri B. Subrahmanyam, President, Tiruttani Panchayat, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh,

**SHEWETH:**

Your petitioner understands that a petition was submitted by the President of the Taluk Congress Committee and 573 other signatories requesting Lok Sabha to set aside the award given by Shri Pataskar on the Madras-Andhra border dispute, by not proceeding with the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill, 1959, now pending before the House. They had stated that Tiruttani and surrounding villages populated with Telugu-speaking people were recommended for merger with Madras State on the basis of wrong figures and disputed map. Your petitioner registers an emphatic protest to the said petition, as the award was given with great care by Sri Pataskar after a thorough discussion with the representatives of all the parties connected with the disputes in all respects. Besides the Governments of Madras and Andhra Pradesh have also given their full assent to the implementation of the said award submitted to the Government of India.

2. It was stated that Tiruttani is a Telugu-speaking area. Your petitioner submits that Tiruttani Town consists of nearly 11,000 people of which 3,000 only are Telugu-speaking people. Besides this, during the Panchayat elections held on 3 occasions for this Panchayat, only the candidates set up by the Tamil Nad North Boundary Protection Committee came out successful as Members, President and Vice-President of the Panchayat. Your petitioner regrets very much that incorrect information was given in the petition by the President of the Tiruttani Taluk Committee and requests Lok Sabha not to take into consideration the views expressed therein,

and accordingly, your petitioner prays that this petition might be given favourable consideration by the Lok Sabha at the time of the discussion on the Andhra Pradesh and Madras (Alteration of Boundaries) Bill, 1959,

and your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

Name of the Petitioner	Full address	Signature
B SUBRAHMANYAM	President, Tiruttani Panchayat and Secretary, Tamil Nad North Boundary Protection Committee, Tiruttani, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh.	Sd/- B. Subrahmanyam, 15-8-59.

Countersigned by } N.R.M. Swamy,  
} M. P. 17-8-1959.

APPENDIX III  
Petition No. 33  
(See para 5 of the Report)

To

Lok Sabha,  
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Chittoor District,  
Andhra State,

SHEWETH

The following news appeared on the 17th February, 1959 in "The  
Mail" a daily newspaper of Madras under the caption:

"LORRY HITS TRAIN"

One passenger was killed and four others injured, one of them  
seriously when a loaded lorry dashed against the up  
Renigunta-Katpadi passenger train yesterday.

The accident occurred while the train was running on the  
Puthalapattu-Chittoor Block section of the Renigunta-  
Katpadi section.

A Press Note issued by the Public Relations Officer, Southern  
Railway states:—

"The General Manager regrets to announce that at about  
10.45 p.m. on Sunday, while No. 1153 up Renigunta-  
Katpadi passenger train was on the run on the Puthala-  
pattu-Chittoor Block Section of the Renigunta-Katpadi  
section, a loaded lorry dashed against the train at the  
level crossing at mile 11/2-3.

The impact of the lorry on the train caused slight damage to  
a train carriage and resulted in the death of one pas-  
senger, serious injury to another, and minor injuries  
to three others, all of whom were travelling in the same  
compartment. The injured were given first aid on the  
spot by the train staff and later rushed to Chittoor by  
the same train."

2. Accidents do occur at level-crossings on account of the laziness  
and negligence of the gate keepers and they are daily occurring too.  
It has been remarked by the Inspecting Officers that this accident  
occurred on account of the negligence of the gate keeper and he is  
under trial before a First Class Magistrate at Chittoor. Whether he  
convicts or acquits the accused, the fact remains that the accidents  
had occurred. Government may pay cash as compensation for the  
loss of life to the deceased's family or loss of limb etc. But they  
cannot bring back the dead to life or replace a new limb for the old.

3. The above-cited is a peculiar accident in which a passenger in the train was killed and the owner, driver and the cleaner are safe in the lorry due to lorry-train collision, as the gate was open both the ways for road and rail.

4. The Indian Railways Act (IX) was enacted in 1890 (69 years back) when roads were few and fast-moving vehicles were less. After this accident, the Southern Railway have put up a notice at the level crossings as follows:—

“Normal position of gates: Closed and locked against ROAD traffic.”

There is a definite time for the trains to pass through, but there is no such time for the road traffic as they move day-in and day-out. As the road traffic has increased by leaps and bounds, the notice should be as follows:—

“Normal position of gates: Closed and locked against RAIL traffic.”

If the level crossing is closed and locked against RAIL TRAFFIC, the gate keeper who is paid by the Railway Administration will be alert and he will do his duty properly closing the gates against the road traffic and allow the trains to pass through and again bring the gates to their normal position.

5. Even if a bus sounds its horn 2 furlongs in advance to open the gates, the gate keeper comes leisurely and opens it after 6 minutes, when there are no trains on the line. If the bus has 30 passengers and if it is stopped for 6 minutes, three-man-hours are lost. In the same way, if a double-bullock-bandy is stopped for half-an-hour, one bull-hour and half-man-hour are lost.

6. At present, the gate keeper has to open the gates 100 times for 100 road vehicles passing through the gates at random. If it is normally closed against RAIL TRAFFIC, he has to close it against the road traffic only for a limited number of times as and when trains pass through, with less strain on his nerves,

and accordingly your petitioner prays that:

(a) to avoid such accidents in future at the level crossings and to avoid inconvenience to the public, the gates might be fixed in such a way that (i) the roadside is always kept open (as there are no fixed timings for road traffic); (ii) the railside is blocked, and (iii) whenever the trains have to pass through, the roadside might be blocked and the railside may be thrown open for a limited time (say 5 minutes at the most); and

(b) a revised notice as per specimen below be placed at the level crossings:

"Normal position of the gates: Closed and locked against Rail traffic."

and your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

Name of petitioner	Full address	Signature with date
C. KESAVIAH NAIDU	Member, District Planning and Development Committee, Bheemavaram Village, Narasingapuram Post, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh.	Sd/- C. Kesaviah Naidu 22-6-59.
Countersigned by	}	T. N. Viswanatha Reddy, M. P. 22-8-1959



## APPENDIX IV

### Petition No. 36

(See para 6 of the Report)

To

Lok Sabha,  
New Delhi.

The humble petition of Shri C. Kesaviah Naidu, Chittoor District Andhra Pradesh.

SHEWETH

Your petitioner had submitted a petition (Petition No. 45, First Lok Sabha) suggesting certain amendments of the Indian Arms Act and the rules framed thereunder. One of the suggestions made by the petitioner was that the photograph of an arms licensee should be attached on the licence for easy identification.

The Committee on Petitions, First Lok Sabha, had considered the above petition and made suitable recommendations thereon, in their Sixth Report. The relevant portions of the above-cited Report in regard to the suggestion for affixing of photographs on a gun licence, are re-produced below for information:

*Page 6, para No. 13 of Petition No. 45.*—"Several Gun licence holders have got licences covering a whole district or a State. It is very difficult to identify a licensee. If their photographs were pasted on the licences, the work of the checking officers will become easy and the licensee will not have to produce a respectable person for identification. It will also serve as an identification card to the licensee".

*Comments of the Ministry of Home Affairs—Sub-para (ii) of para 3 of the Report.*—"No real and serious difficulty has been caused in the absence of licensee's photo on the licence and the advantages likely to result from the adoption of the proposal would not be commensurate with the practical difficulties involved on its adoption."

*Recommendations of the Committee after perusing the above comments (Page 2 of the Sixth Report).*—"iv) The fixation of the licensee's photograph on the licence would help in readily identifying the licence-holder."

2. The Committee on Petitions, Second Lok Sabha, after a perusal of the reply given by the Ministry of Home Affairs on the above recommendation, had agreed not to press the recommendation. The relevant portions of Appendix V to the Third Report of the Commit-

are reproduced below together with your petitioner's comments thereon:—

Reply of the Ministry of Home Affairs (Vide App. 1 to the Third Report, Second Lok Sabha)

Comments of your petitioner

(iv) The question of fixing a photograph on the licence for the identification of a licensee was taken up with the State Governments and after carefully considering their views in the matter it was decided to drop the matter. The difficulties which weighed against the proposal were mainly as under :

- (i) Unnecessary inconvenience and expense to the villagers who are generally known to local officers and in whose case it is very easy to establish their identity, without any practicable advantage ;
- (ii) Non-availability of facilities for obtaining photographs in villages in the remote interior areas ; and
- (iii) embarrassment to the arms licensees in the rural areas particularly "Purdah women" and cultivators holding protection licences.

No doubt, the villagers are generally known to the local officers. A licensee of one district may have acquired some property in some other district through his wife or by the death of some near relative and he may hold the licence for two districts. The licensee is recognised in his native place and his mother-in-law's place, but not in between. This is analogous to a Member of Parliament being recognised in his constituency, at Delhi in Parliament, and not elsewhere.

At least once or twice, everybody is in touch with some town or other for something or other, where he can have himself photographed.

If *purdah women* are in possession of guns, it is not certain whether they may either use or misuse. It is necessary to have their photos attached to the licences to apprehend them if there is any such misuse. The petitioner has come across several people who have not taken photos during their life time and their children were taking photos of the dead bodies in loving memory.

5. The people have asked for fixation of the photo on the gun licence and the people's representatives, Members of Parliament, have approved of it through the Committee on Petitions, First Lok Sabha.

6. In U.K. and U.S.A., everybody has got an identification card. An Indian friend of mine has got a motor driving licence in America. His licence has got his photo and his thumb impression also. We might go a step forward at least to have photos attached to the gun licences in order to see that they are readily identified at post offices, banks, railway stations and so many other places easily,

and accordingly your petitioner prays that a provision might be made in the Indian Arms Act, 1951, to attach the photograph of the licensee to the gun licence for purposes of easy identification,

and your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

Name of Petitioner	Full Address	Signature with date
C. KESAVIAH NAIDU	Member, District Planning and Development Committee, Bheemavaram Village, Narasingapuram Post, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh.	Sd - C. Kesaviah Naidu. 29-6-59

Countersigned by } 1. T. N. Viswanatha Reddy (Div. No. 287).  
24-8-1959.  
2. Missula Suryanarayanamurti (Div. No. 155)