

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): Six days before notice was given about this question.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Sir, I would request you to permit me a few minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What for?

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Because so much aspersion is being flung at us. We are perfectly within our constitutional right if we bring in this motion. Nobody can compel us to go and seek clarification from a Minister beforehand. If we do so it may be because of our personal relation with him. I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that this has not been published in an unnamed and unknown paper. It has been published in *News Zeitung*, which is a German language newspaper of the United States High Commission at Frankfurt. We have our diplomatic relations with the United States. I want to know whether the Government have taken any steps. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: ...to obtain an explanation from the U. S. Government for the publication of such a false report. With whatever little political experience I have got, I know that when a false or a wrong report is made regarding any matter of such importance, an immediate contradiction is issued. This report appeared in the *Hindustan Times* and some other important newspapers in the country on the 6th. Till today no contradiction has come forth from the Government. I am surprised and greatly pained that the Prime Minister has not thought it fit to issue a contradiction in order to clarify the situation but flings at us invectives and insults. *(Interruptions)*

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. lady Member is overcome by emotion and cannot see light. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I take a lesson from the Prime Minister. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with other business

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon-cum Mavelikkara): On a point of information, Sir.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No information.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to inform hon. Members that I have re-

ceived the following letter from Shri Chimanlal Chakubhai Shah:

"I am sorry that I am unable to attend the session of the House on account of my illness. I request that I may be granted leave of absence during this session".

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri Chimanlal Chakubhai Shah to be absent from all the meetings of the House during this session?

Leave was granted.

CONSTITUTION (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

Shri Altekar (North Satara): Yesterday I was dealing with the point that the representatives who are sent to this House must be equipped with qualifications, ability and also a wider vision. Here we have to discuss questions of all-India importance, questions like Planning which we have before us, from the aspect of the whole country and not merely of here and there—of local importance. We have to discuss here questions of foreign policy, defence and other matters of country-wide importance and for this purpose, the Members who are returned to this House must be equipped with qualifications that are necessary for discharging their duties in these matters. From that point of view the constituency that is desired is one which can look to these matters from a broad perspective. If we have small constituencies, the result naturally is that the persons who, in those small localities, are of great importance—from the local point of view—will be elected and these lesser dignitaries are not endowed with the qualities of looking at larger questions from a broader point of view. If we restrict these constituencies for representation to the House of the People, then there is the possibility that these persons of narrower vision who look to local matters will be returned to the House and not those who, it is desirable, should come here in this House. The smaller the constituency then persons of local importance and narrower vision are more apt to carry the voters along with them. If we have a small constituency, say, if there is a constituency of a taluka, then the person who is known in that small area, who has considerable influence on account of his handling questions of local importance, is likely to carry the electors, but if we have a wider constituency, say, of the size of a district in these seven or eight

[Shri Altekar]

talukas, he is not likely to be known to that extent. He will be known only in his taluka or small area and if he goes beyond that area, his personality will not be so much known. But if there is a person who is endowed with greater intellectual qualifications, one who has got a wider vision and has worked in the field of social matters and also in other services for the country, then he is a person who is known in that wider area and more likely to be returned than the person who has got purely local importance. From that point of view the larger the constituency—of course contact can be had, but not of a restricted type—the greater the chance of persons of higher qualifications and wider vision being returned to this House. If there is a small constituency, the lesser dignitaries, as I have already said, will be more likely to be returned to this House. Therefore, I say that the constituency must be of a size where such lesser dignitaries, lesser personalities, will be eliminated. Having such a larger constituency as we have got—that of a district—we practically arrive at the desired effect that we have at heart.

Then again there is another aspect and it is this. The larger the constituency, the less the chance for corrupt practice. From that point of view also, such a large constituency as that of a district is more suited for representation to the House of the People.

We are living in an age where the theory of relativity has been propounded. We are all conversant with it. The idea of small or big is after all, a relative thing. A rabbit may appear small to an elephant but big to a mouse. So what may be big to countries like England or Switzerland may be small to a country like India. Ours is a bigger country with a bigger population. Our constituencies also must be proportionate to the size of the country and its population. From this point of view also, I submit that the constituencies that we have arrived at—the size of nearly a district—is the suitable one for representation in the House of the People.

Then it is said that it is more expensive in such big constituencies to fight elections to the House of the People. I submit that in a democratic country and in a democratic set-up of State, it is not the individual who fights the election, but democracy is based on party organisations

and parties are formed and they fight the elections. From that point of view, the fighting of elections in a district is not a difficult thing in a country like India. As a matter of fact, we have got our own experience in the last General Elections and we should not feel any difficulty in conducting propaganda and having contact with the people in our constituencies. So far as individuals are concerned, of course, there will be difficulty for small individuals to fight the elections in these constituencies. But those who are endowed with high qualifications, persons of great service and great abilities find a place, and a place of honour, on the opposite benches. Such people will always find their place here in this House and there are no two opinions with respect to that. But if there are smaller individuals and smaller parties, then certainly, of course, they may not find a place in the set-up of a democratic constitution. Of course, the country would not in any way be the poorer for it. I do not mean any sort of criticism as against such individuals. Nothing is farther from my mind than to make any comment of that type. But what is necessary in a democratic constitution, is that elections will have to be fought on party lines and for that purpose district-wide constituency will not be in any way a greater handicap for being in contact with the masses.

Then, another point that I would like to advance in this respect is that formerly, before we adopted this Constitution of ours, under the Constitution that was working at that time, there were only 144 Members in the lower House of the Central Legislature. We have increased that number by more than three times; and so far as the constituency is concerned, that constituency was seven to ten times larger than the constituency under the new Constitution. We have reduced it to one-seventh or one-tenth of its former size. That is the size which is easily accessible to the Member who wants to go and have contact with the constituency and there should be no difficulty in going there and learning first-hand the desires of the people, making them acquainted with what is happening in this House and being in constant touch with the constituency. That being so, I do not in any way feel that there is any sort of necessity for changing the constituency that we have framed in this respect only two years ago. At the time of the election, we did not feel any difficulty; and merely knowing

what was the result of the census of 1951 or mere knowledge of the exact figures of that time, should not in any way mean that we should further alter them. Therefore, I submit that the constituencies that we have devised need not in any way be materially changed than what they are at present.

Then, what I have to state is that something was said with respect to the number of 500, whether there was anything sacrosanct with that particular number. I would like to say that there is nothing sacrosanct about the figure of 500. No arithmetical number need in any way be sacred. There is no sanctity to any number in mathematics. What is of greater importance is not the figure itself but the idea underlying it, the scheme that is behind it and what placed the number at 500. That 500 was arrived at on the ground that there should be a sufficiently large House for the purposes of such a big country but at the same time the constituency that would be returning its Member to the House should also be of a type and of a size that can easily send the Member to represent it. Taking all these facts into consideration, that number of 500 was arrived at. As against that, if it is suggested that there should be a smaller constituency, one-third or one-half of the size as it is now, then the House will be far bigger. It will be unmanageable and unwieldy, as like a person suffering from elephantiasis or so. So, in order to avoid that, I am holding both these things together for consideration. We know that after properly looking to the advantages and disadvantages, this number of 500 was arrived at. When we are discussing that question here, we have to see the ideology behind it and the scheme behind it. It is from that point of view that it has been arrived at after great deliberation and that need not be touched. If after some ten years it is found that it is in some way rather difficult to have contact with the people, then the Members who may be fighting the elections at that particular time, should there be some Members on the opposite benches who are able to get themselves elected to this House and also in such big numbers of their party as to occupy the benches on this side, then they will at that particular time realise that the scheme that was devised for this Constitution and the figure of 500 that was arrived at was really a better and suitable one for the purpose of conducting the business of this House as also for representing the people of this country. From

that point of view I submit that there should be no necessity of changing this particular figure and that the amendment that is suggested, namely of removing the upper limit should be accepted because in article 170(2) there is also no higher limit to the population that is laid down there for the purposes of representation in the Legislative Assemblies of the States. So, by making this amendment, we will be coming in a line with the provision that is made in article 170(2). Of course, so far as the representation in the House of the People is concerned, that will be in line with the principle that is laid down there. Under these circumstances, I submit that the motion that is being placed before the House should be supported and we need not in any way tamper with lightly and in a haphazard and superficial manner, the principle that was laid down after great deliberations in the Constituent Assembly.

With these few words, I support the amendment that has been laid before the House.

Shri P. Subba Rao (Nowrangpur): This amendment is not really necessary and, at the same time, I am feeling that the number of 500 need not be enlarged. Part C States were given over-weightage and by certain adjustments, notwithstanding this amendment, that state of things may be allowed to continue. It is suggested that so far as the territorial constituencies are concerned, there will be no change practically and that where the population is increased, the Member will have to address larger audiences and that will not entail any inconvenience. But, I have to make one submission. The constituencies are based upon population and not upon territory. There are constituencies with an area of one thousand to one thousand five hundred square miles and there are very big constituencies. My constituency is 6500 sq. miles in extent with a population of 7½ lakhs. So, by not introducing this amendment—for the population has really increased—there is a possibility of the area being diminished. It is already too inconvenient to tour a constituency so very large and I am afraid that in Rajasthan also there may be bigger constituencies, I mean so far as the territory is concerned, and so it will entail hardship upon the candidates to tour very large areas. I have already submitted that the number 500 need not be in any way increased by not effecting this amendment at all.

Shri N. Somana (Coorg): I honestly feel that most of the points that were said against the amending Bill were out of place because I thought it was settled, as a matter of fact, before the matter was sent to the Select Committee that the question of amending part (a) of article 81 was not under consideration at all. So, it was agreed that so far as the number of 500 is concerned, it need not be touched. Then the only question is how this number 500 should be adjusted with the increased population. The Government had brought in a Bill with an upper limit and a lower limit and the Select Committee, after careful scrutiny, going through the whole of the matter, to avoid a repetition of these amendments in future, have very carefully worded the amendment and stated that the upper limit should be removed and the remaining part must be there. They have suggested the removal of the words, "not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population".

As my hon. friend, Mr. Altekar said, if in the future it is found at any time that it is absolutely necessary that the number 500 should be increased or altered, a separate Bill may be brought for that purpose and I think that for the present this is outside the scope of this Bill now to discuss the question whether it should be 500 or more or less. So, I submit that so far as the present Bill is concerned, the amendment that has been made by the Select Committee is quite proper and I think that it should be accepted by all sections of the House without any reference to the number of the House in the future. This amendment, I submit, should be accepted without any opposition as I feel that it is the best under the circumstances.

Shri Raghbir Sahai (Etan Distt.—North East cum Budaun Distt.—East): I rise to support the Bill as it has emerged from the Select Committee. I remember that when this Bill was introduced during the last session by the hon. the Law Minister, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party, made a powerful plea advocating that the Bill should be sent to the country for eliciting public opinion. That plea was accepted by the Government and the Bill was sent for circulation in the country. The opinions have now been received and they are in the possession of every hon. Member of the House. From the trend of those opinions it appears that almost the entire country is of opinion that the number of 500 should not be raised

and the amendment, as has been proposed by the Government, should be accepted. Both Shri H. N. Mukerjee and the other Opposition Members who spoke on this subject on the previous occasion had advanced the argument that instead of article 81(1)(b), article 81(1)(a) should be changed. They said that that would be in the fitness of things, and their suggestion was that the figure of 500 should be raised, as according to the 1951 census the population had increased. They also urged that the Constitution should not be changed from time to time. I admit that there is a lot of force in both the arguments. Nobody in this House, and much less the Government, is desirous of changing the Constitution from time to time. We quite realise and admit that the Constitution should not be changed very easily and at very frequent intervals, but if we look at article 81(3), we would find that some change is inherent in the Constitution itself, for that provision runs thus:

"Upon the completion of each census, the representation of the several territorial constituencies in the House of the People shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner and with effect from such date as Parliament may by law determine."

It is within the knowledge perhaps of every hon. Member of this House that the last General Elections were fought when the census figures were not available, and the President had to issue an Ordinance giving certain figures of population according to which the elections had to be conducted. That order of the President is only applicable for three years after the commencement of the Constitution. So, it is very necessary that according to the Constitution itself this amendment should be brought before the House. I quite realise the force of the argument that changes in the area and size of the constituencies should not be made from time to time, but when according to the census figures we find that the population has increased to a very large extent—and every hon. Member would realise that the growth of the population is not in the hands of the Government or even expert planners—the amendment which has been introduced is quite logical and necessary.

With regard to the number also, I feel that the argument that instead of amending article 81(1)(b), article 81(1)(a) may be amended has some force. In connection with that argument the Opposition Members refer

to the analogy of the House of Commons. They say that in England the House of Commons with a lesser population has got 640 Members. Well, so far as the argument is concerned, it is all right. But always to advance the analogy of the House of Commons in regard to our Parliament is not a very sensible proposition. I remember that after the second world war was over and there arose the question of the rebuilding of the House of Commons which had been badly damaged during the war, there was some talk in high circles there that the new building should be so built as to accommodate all the 640 Members of the House of Commons, and I also remember that it was finally decided that the new Chamber for the House of Commons should be built of the same size as the previous Chamber. Why? The argument advanced was somewhat like this—that if they built a bigger House to accommodate all the 640 Members, the Speaker there would not be able to exercise that amount of control which is necessary and requisite for managing a House of that type. The idea there was that the Speaker should be able to see each and every Member of the House and should be able to know where he is speaking from in the House, what his name is and where he comes from. If the size of the House was enlarged, then it was feared that the House might be reduced to a public meeting. So, the new building of the House of Commons accommodated the same number as the previous building did, and if there used to be an overflow of Members, they found accommodation either in the Lobbies or somewhere else. So, I submit that that argument is not a very relevant or pertinent one. The number that has been decided upon in our case, viz. 500, is really the proper number for a sober and responsible body like the Parliament of this country.

Having regard to all these considerations and having regard to the fact that the census figures have disclosed a growth of the population in the country and also bearing in mind the provisions in the Constitution, it is quite necessary that this amendment should have been brought before the House. By bringing in this amendment, as it has emerged from the Select Committee, the danger of amending the Constitution from time to time has been obviated for the time being, because the upper limit of seven lakhs 50 thousand has been done away with. I submit by doing away with the upper limit, a greater amount of elasticity and latitude has been given in determining the number of the population for the particular constituency.

I support this Bill.

Shri Siddananajappa (Hassan-Chikmagalur): The two important principles which the House has agreed to are provided for in article 81 (1) (a) and (c) of the Constitution of India. Sub-clause (b) coming between these two, in my humble opinion, is neither important nor necessary. At first sight it might appear to be a little funny, but, I submit it is a matter on which we must bestow serious thought.

I submit that what is provided for in sub-clause (b), particularly the fixing up of the upper and lower limits, gives us in the first place a ready-made workable formula which satisfies the two principles contained in sub-clauses (a) and (c). Further it limits the scope of discretion of the Delimitation Commission. Beyond that it does not serve any other purpose. Now, if this sub-clause (b) is regarded as important then that importance applies equally to both the limits, the upper and the lower. If it is regarded as unimportant then also it equally applies to both of them.

Now, in the amending Bill, as reported by the Select Committee, it is sought to retain only the lower limit without any change, and the upper limit is removed. I submit it does not serve any useful purpose at all. If at all it is thought fit to allow any discretion to the Delimitation Commission, then it is better to remove both the limits, or otherwise to fix up both the limits. If we are going to fix both the limits, then these two limits provided for in sub-clause (b), which were all right in the context of things prevailing at that time, no longer hold good now. I submit that the ratio between the number of Members allotted to each territorial constituency and the population of that constituency as ascertained at the preceding census shall be the same throughout the territory of India is the guiding factor; the other guiding factor is the number of seats to be provided for in the House of the People which shall not exceed 500. If these two factors are taken into consideration, then the average number of population which a single territorial constituency should contain can be arrived at by dividing the population by the number of seats to be provided for. Having the average number of population for a single territorial constituency as the guiding factor, and as the central figure, the Delimitation Commission will have to make slight adjustments either downwards or upwards, depending upon the peculiar geographical conditions of a particular constituency and

[Shri Siddananjappa.]

the administrative divisions. But, what is sought in this Bill is to limit only the lower limit and to leave the upper limit to the discretion of the Delimitation Commission.

Further, the population has now increased. If the lower limit is retained at what it is proposed to be now, then it will work as a disadvantage in delimiting the constituencies, because it is far remote from the central figure, that is, the average number of population per territorial constituency which will have to be taken into consideration in the present state of things. Therefore, I submit that either we have to remove sub-clause (b) of article 81 (1) altogether, or if we want to retain it, we must retain it completely, providing for both the limits; and if we are going to retain both the limits, then we must raise the figures higher than what they are now, as was proposed in the Bill originally introduced.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City.—North): Sir, you have done well yesterday at the outset when this debate started by making it clear to the House that the whole of the article 81 is not for discussion and also that article 81, clause (1) (a) was not referred to the Select Committee for its consideration, the consequence being that this House accepts the provision that lays down five hundred as the number of representatives in this House.

Now having granted this maximum number of representatives in the House at 500, the whole business really reduces itself to simple arithmetic. And yet this simple amendment that has been reported upon by the Select Committee has occasioned this very prolonged debate. So far as this side of the House is concerned, it will be apparent from the many speeches since yesterday that this House accepts the recommendation of the Select Committee. The public opinion which was elicited at the instance of the Opposition last session when the original Bill was moved, that public opinion also is overwhelmingly in favour of retaining this maximum number at five hundred and not changing the Constitution in that respect. If that is so, then our task today in this House is simpler. And that is simply to try and answer if we can, as we certainly do want to, the objections raised from the other side.

During the course of the debate since yesterday frequent references have been made to the American Con-

stitution and to the many amendments that have been made to that Constitution. It cannot be claimed that any Constitution can be immutable, and certainly we do not want to make our Constitution immutable. Still, let us remember what has happened to the American Constitution and how often it has been amended. The American Constitution is now almost, or in fact a little over, 175 years old. There were about eleven or twelve amendments, minor ones, in the very first two years of the passing of that Constitution. And then, for the remaining 175 years of the history of that Constitution the number of amendments is less than fifteen. Less than 15 amendments in 175 years. And that too in the case of a people like the American people who have a reputation of being a people always ready to discard old things and to adopt new things.

Now, what are the objections? The objections are really exemplified, or rather I should say the two objections raised by the hon. Member Mrs. Renu Chakravarty really typify the generality of the objections so far raised. What are her objections? They are two. Mrs. Renu Chakravarty entertains an apprehension that with the removal of the upper limit we would be giving a blank cheque to Government to increase the constituencies. It is very clear that having accepted five hundred as the maximum number of representatives in this House, that sets the limit to the size of the constituency by a simple arithmetical operation. Therefore, there is not much substance in this apprehension.

Then her second fear is that if these constituencies are made more numerous than what they are now, then it will make it difficult to keep, what she calls, the "living links" with the people that we represent. Let us remember, for one thing, that even though the population may increase and the number of people in each constituency may increase, the area will remain the same. That is one thing. Also, it is only natural to expect that, in course of time our means of communication with our constituencies are bound to increase. There will be greater literacy, there will be more reading of newspapers, there will be more telephones, more radios, even perhaps television. So, with all these means of communication, which are bound to increase in course of time, the areas remaining the same, a slight increase in the number of people should not make it any more difficult

to keep, what she calls, the living links with our constituencies.

Then there is another aspect of this question, and that is we must not forget that every citizen in this country is being taken care of by three different levels of Government. First he is being taken care of by the Municipal Government; then he is under the State Government; and finally he has to look to the Federal Government. Therefore, it is not as if that in every case of his trouble or his every need, or in every question concerned with his welfare or in his every complaint he has necessarily got to take it up to his Member of Parliament. At these various levels of Government various needs of each citizen will be looked after.

Therefore, in view of all these considerations I do not think there is much foundation for the fears expressed by Mrs. Renu Chakravartty and generally by the Opposition. I, therefore, support the Bill as it has been reported by the Select Committee.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I suggest that the other Bill, namely the Delimitation Commission Bill, may also be taken up. If that is also taken up, we will be able to cover the ground simultaneously.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): How can we take two Bills simultaneously?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: They are allied.

Shri S. S. More: Unless he can quote some authority from Parliament

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): I suggest that his speech may be recorded in the other Bill also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We cannot dovetail one Bill into another, nor can both the Bills be taken up simultaneously. Evidently what he feels is that this Bill is not full of life, flesh or blood. It has only a single clause, and the main point is how far it is going to affect the delimitation of constituencies. Therefore, if we pass this Bill and then take up the Delimitation Commission Bill and then we find certain difficulties, coming back to this Bill may not be easy. In these circumstances, if the rules permit, they may run together until the stage when we put to vote, so that hon. Members may make up their minds as to what they should do in relation to the one or the other, and so that they can get them together for uniformity and avoid any hardship in work. That is what he evidently means.

Shri S. S. More: That aspect has already been taken into account. One Select Committee has gone into both the Bills.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Emphasizing that aspect, the suggestion that both should be considered together in the House also seems to be reasonable. For my part I have no objection. I find hon. Members are getting on leisurely, there seems to have been sufficient discussion on this, and there is nothing more to say on this Bill—except what is going to happen in respect of delimitation. Therefore, if hon. Members have spoken sufficiently, I will allow this to stand over and start with the other Bill. And whatever difficulties arise may be adjusted between the two. Particularly as it was thought necessary at an earlier stage that the same Select Committee should consider both the Bills, unless both are placed before the House and considered before a final decision is arrived at, the House will not have the advantage of having referred them to the same Select Committee. I have no objection to this procedure, the procedure being not that they are running together, but we can stop at this stage and discuss the other Bill. When the consideration stage of both is voted upon, then the House can consider the respective clauses separately.

It is now five minutes to one. After allowing one speech I will keep this Bill to stand over and the other Bill, namely the Delimitation Commission Bill, may be taken up.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): This Bill is to amend the Constitution. There will have to be the two-thirds majority. The other one is an ordinary Bill. Why combine the two?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not a question of majority or minority. Hon. Members must make up their mind as to the implications, how it will be useful in fixing the number. That is why there was one Select Committee for both the Bills.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik—Central): I rise to support the proposals placed before this House by the hon. Law Minister. Yesterday in the evening one hon. Member from the Opposition Benches in a very vehement speech tried to oppose the measure that has been discussed. He suspected that there is an American hand behind it. Some hon. Members in this House recently have started suspecting American hand everywhere. I think it is due to the inferiority complex of some people in this country. This country, five years before, bravely fought the freedom's

[Shri G. H. Deshpande]

battle and won it against heavy odds. It cannot be cowed down by any foreign power on earth. Let that fear be not there. Neither Americans nor Russians can afford to play with us. The freedom has been won. It has been won on democratic lines and it is going to be protected on democratic lines.

In the present democratic set-up of ours in this country, this House is not the only House which functions as the representative of the people. Ours is a federal Constitution. We have gram panchayats, we have municipalities, we have State Assemblies and we have this House which functions for the entire country as a whole. Naturally, there are questions of a broader point of view that are being discussed here which are only of all-India importance. So, it is but in the fitness of things that we should have bigger constituencies than the constituencies of the gram panchayats or of the municipalities or of the local boards or of the State Legislatures and if we have some big constituencies it will not be very difficult for us to maintain contacts if we try to do so sincerely and effectively. For the present no doubt there are some constituencies which are somewhat enormously big but that is simply due to the fact that we have got certain reservations and reservations are to last for a definite period. After that we will have almost single-member constituencies and we will not have the bigger size constituencies which we have for the present in certain circumstances. So, that difficulty will also be solved and there will not be too many districts administratively disturbed on account of the constituencies. It is due to the present provision for the reservation. Let us hope that there will be no need for reservations if we work hard for the backward classes and if the reservations will go according to the Constitution as they are likely to go, then there will not be bigger constituencies and it will be easy for us all to maintain contacts with our people. No doubt, we can learn much from the constitutions of other countries but let us evolve our own Constitution in our own way. Let us develop on our own lines. Let us try to follow that which will be good for us. Let us be rich with experience of others but do not be led away with that and that is why, taking into consideration every practical aspect of the question, I do think that the proposals that are before the House deserve the support not only of this entire House but of the entire country.

Shri Lokenath Mishra (Puri): I agree that the numerical strength of the House of the People should not be increased and the reason why it should not be increased has been well propounded by many hon. Members. Those people who want that the numerical strength of the House should be increased, want it for the reason that this House should be more representative of the people. If that is the whole consideration, I see no reason why this should be increased because India is a big country and an increase of some more Members could not make the representation as perfect as they would like it to be.

But I am in disagreement with the report of the Select Committee. They have maintained the original figure of 500 as the strength of the House. They have deleted the maximum in article 81 (1) (b). They have not thought it proper to increase the minimum. This amending Bill is before the House for the fact that India's population is growing and since population is growing, those two limits, lower and upper, should be changed and adapted but unfortunately they have done away with the upper limit. They have not thought it proper to increase the lower limit. In my opinion the lower limit should be increased because when you assume that the population of India is increasing, the minimum number for one representation should also increase. Otherwise, it may be possible that somewhere only five lakhs of people may have one representative and this will give a free scope to the Delimitation Commission to delimit the constituencies with certain amount of injustice because there may be a constituency which will have only five lakhs of people and there may be constituencies which may have over ten lakhs of people or more. To avoid this contingency, the lower limit should be increased. I, therefore, submit that the report of the Select Committee as only deleting the upper limit and keeping the lower limit intact should be changed.

1 P.M.

I have tabled an amendment. I hope I will have time to speak on that score and for the present I should say that fixing 500 as the numerical strength of the House of People and at the same time not increasing the lower limit would do injustice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This Bill will stand over. The other Bill will be taken up after Lunch.

The House then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The House re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

BUSSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Revenue and Expenditure (Shri Tyagi): With your permission, Sir, I wish to inform the House that quite a large number of enquiries are being made from me with regard to additional information on the supplementary demands. That day it was decided that I should collect all the information required by the hon. Members and supply them. I circulated their questionnaire, so to say, to all the Ministries concerned and in response from them I have got a good bulk of information. It will not be possible for me, Sir, to go to the Press and get it printed. May I have your permission, Sir, to pass on to the Member concerned full details of whatever information was required by him. If you permit me, Sir, I can pass it on. For the benefit of the other Members, I may place a copy on the Table of the House.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Why not circulate it? It will be the collective knowledge of the House.

Shri Tyagi: It will not be possible; it will be difficult for me to circulate. If the same analogy were applied in the case of the annual Budget, the information will become too bulky. I do not think it will be of much use to the Members. I would, therefore, request your permission to pass on to the hon. Member the information on the points on which he had made enquiry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May I suggest that instead of placing on the Table here, the other copy may be placed in the Library?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Instead of one copy, it is better if the hon. Minister could place half a dozen copies in the Library.

Shri K. K. Basu: Quite a number.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Members have concentrated their attention on a particular subject, information on that point will be given to them. For the benefit of other Members, another copy will be there. We ought not to go on making demands. As far as possible, we must meet the Government as they have met the

wishes of this House. We must not make it impossible for anybody to comply with the demands.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): May I make one suggestion, Sir? Previously, when cut motions were discussed in relation to Demands, the practice was that the Parties indicated to the Ministry and to the House the various cut motions on which they wanted to concentrate their attention. Certain Demands were selected so that the House could concentrate its attention upon them. I would like the same convention to be established now so that if hon. Members who have tabled hundreds—if not hundreds, more than 30 or 40—cut motions, were to select a few of them, the whole House would concentrate its attention upon them and study those subjects only. It would be better for discussion also and a lot of labour of the Members will be saved. Otherwise, if all the 50 or 60 cut motions are moved and a desultory discussion takes place without any other person replying to them or concentrating his attention on any one of them, my fear is that we may not have a good debate. I would, therefore, request you, Sir, to ask the gentlemen or Parties concerned to select certain Demands and cut motions. Previously, we used to apportion time. That may not be necessary now. The cut motions may be selected.

Shri Tyagi: Government would welcome this suggestion.

Shri K. K. Basu: Naturally.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If it is not natural, the other inconvenience will be this. We will assume that there are 50 or 60 cut motions. If all attention is paid to one or two cut motions, the rest will be guillotined. There is a time limit. In these circumstances, the practice has been as was stated by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. The Whip of the Congress Party and the Whips of other Parties or Groups or Leaders of Groups may sit together and find out what exactly are the items on which they would like to concentrate their discussion within that period, and leave others to be guillotined. Otherwise, some matter which may not be of the same importance in relation to other cut motions may take up the whole time of the House and other cut motions may be guillotined. Hitherto, Leaders of the Groups and Whip of the Government, used to sit together and choose the particular cut motions, so that the Ministers may also be enabled to answer in detail, and the time of the House may not be wasted. So far as unattached Members are concerned, they may also sit together and propose cut motions equal to their