

consulted here in Delhi, the representatives of other parties. It was a State election and naturally the State representatives were consulted by him.

Now the third point is this. As I have said, we do not want to prolong this President's rule for fourteen months. It will mean coming up to this House twice, a second time for extending the period, that is to say, when six months have passed, we will have to come to this House to take its approval. If we postponed it till the next General Elections are held, i.e. if we held this election along with the next General Elections, it will mean asking for extension twice, coming up to this House and going to the other House also for taking their approval. In the circumstances, Sir, I do not consider it advisable that the period of the President's rule should be continued for a long period of fourteen months by asking not once but twice for the extension of this period.

As regards the heat and other things I need not perhaps go into them. We live in this country and we have to live in all seasons, whether the climate is very cold or warm, or it is raining. We might have postponed it by a month or two, but we could not do it because of the heavy rains in Orissa then, when it becomes almost impossible for a voter to go from one place to another. In these circumstances, Sir, I feel that fundamentally it is important that we should stick to this policy of holding mid-term elections after the Legislature has been dissolved in any State.

I would like just to clear up one point about which Shri A. D. Mani made mention, namely, that the Governor, while issuing the Ordinance, consulted the Chief Minister. He forgot the fact that the Chief Minister was in that interim Government or caretaker Government. He was in that position. Also it was legal and constitutional for the caretaker Government to advise the

Governor. It was not that the Governor consulted Dr. Mahtab as Dr. Mahtab but he consulted him as one of the members of the caretaker Government. Secondly, Sir, when the Governor wrote to us and asked for our opinion about the Ordinance well, I do not want to criticise anybody—the Governor should have waited for the opinion of the Government of India. But before the opinion could reach him, he consulted his law officers, the Chief Secretary and the caretaker Government and came to the conclusion that the Ordinance should be issued as early as possible.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): I want a clarification, Sir, after what the hon. Minister has stated. Now that it has been decided that the election should take place in June, I would like to know whether the double-member constituencies will be continued or, as approved by Parliament recently, they will be discontinued in this election, and if the latter is the case, will the delimitation of constituencies have taken place by then in Orissa?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: There will be single-member constituencies; the Election Commission is in the process of bifurcating the constituencies of Orissa.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Minister said that the Election Commission consulted the Parties. As far as my information goes, they did not consult them as to whether they wanted this mid-term election or not, but they consulted them about the arrangements and other things. In other words, materials to show as to what parties were consulted must be in his possession. I think it would be good if the hon. Minister would make available for us short summaries of the opinions expressed by the different political parties at that meeting.

STATEMENT ON THE TENTATIVE RESULTS OF THE 1961 CENSUS

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI LAL BAHADUR):

[Shri Lal Bahadur.]
Sir, if you will permit me to read, I will read a few lines and then place the statement on the Table of the House.

"The provisional population of India, excluding the populations of Manipur, North East Frontier Agency, Nagaland and Sikkim in pockets of which the census or the collection of totals is still continuing on 1 March, 1961 was 436,424,429. There were 224,957,948 males and 211,466,481 females. Including the probable population of the territories mentioned above, one would not be far wrong to put the population of the whole of India at the round figure of 438 million. In 1951 the population of equivalent territory (no census having been taken in Jammu and Kashmir in 1951, the population for the State in 1951, has been estimated for working purposes as the arithmetic mean between 1941 and 1961) stood at 359,216,905. . . . The increase in the last ten years for the territory and population so far compiled has been 21.49 per cent., 23.01 for males and 22.18 for females. The States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jammu and Kashmir, Madras, Mysore, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh have registered an increase below the average of 21.49 while Assam, Gujarat, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Punjab, Rajasthan and West Bengal have registered increases above the average, Assam showing the highest decennial increase of 34.30 and West Bengal the next highest of 32.94."

Shri Bhupesh Gupta will be happy over it.

"Geographically, States on the north east and on the north west have shown high increases. For the purpose of drafting the Third Plan . . ."

I shall leave out some portion here.

"For census purposes the test of literacy is satisfied if a person can

with understanding both read and write. Literacy figures include persons who can both read and write and have also passed a written examination or examinations as proof of an educational standard.

. . . In 1951 16.6 per cent of the population were literate, 24.9 per cent, males among males, and 7.9 per cent, females among females. In 1961 23.7 per cent. of the population are literate, 33.9 per cent males among males, and 12.8 per cent, females among females. Thus it has increased at an average of 0.7 per cent. per year for the general population, 0.9 for males and 0.5 for females. Not excluding Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan among the States which show an appreciable rise, none has even doubled its 1951 rates except perhaps Himachal Pradesh."

I have not read the whole statement. I am placing the statement on the Table of the House. I would also like to say, Sir, that this publication, which contains provisional population tables, has been placed in the Library. Later on, as soon as an adequate number of copies are printed, they will be supplied to every Member of this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): One point in this connection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only one.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, Sir. You will have seen in the press that the Finance Minister of Madras, Mr. Subramaniam, made a statement challenging the Census figures of West Bengal and has given a rejoinder publicly. A rejoinder has been given publicly by the Chief Minister of West Bengal also. May I know, Sir, if either of them or both of them had written to the Central Government about their position broadly? I would like to know whether in the light of the statement made by Mr. Subramaniam, the Finance Minister of Madras—an extraordinary thing for a Finance Minister to do—the Central

Government asked for an explanation as to on what basis—Census is the responsibility of the Government of India—figures have been given publicly. Another, the Finance Minister of a State makes a statement that the census figures of a particular State—in this case West Bengal—are wrong, and he gave his own estimate. It is an extraordinary thing for a Finance Minister to do. I would like to know whether the Government of India had asked for any explanation because the hon. Home Minister might throw some light on the statement of Mr. Subramaniam in this regard. This is a serious matter. If Ministers start making statements, contradicting the census figures, because they happen to be in particular States, there will be terrific confusion, and I say he has created confusion in Madras. He has created considerable amount of confusion there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to know what is the position in West Bengal. Have we grown or not? Please tell us. Mr. Subramaniam says it is exaggerated. Others might say we have not grown at all. I would like to know from the Home Minister where we stand with regard to our population.

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: The population of West Bengal, as mentioned in the Census Report, is final for us.

Secondly, Sir, Shri Subramaniam has been good enough to write to me. I have just now received a letter from him on this matter and I shall see to it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has just received the letter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Very good. You see, Sir, how relevant I am. I would like to know the contents of the letter.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

THE TELEGRAPH LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Telegraph Act, 1865 and the Indian Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1933, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

As you know, Sir, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs is the licensing authority for the working of broadcasting receivers under section 4 (2) of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 and for the possession of wireless telegraph apparatus under section 5 of the Indian Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1933. With the introduction of experimental television in India, it has become necessary that specific provision for the licensing of television apparatus is provided for in the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, the expression "telegraph" is defined as follows:

"telegraph" means an electric, galvanic or magnetic telegraph, and includes appliances and apparatus for making, transmitting or receiving telegraphic, telephonic or other communications by means of electricity, galvanism or magnetism."

Further, under the Indian Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1933, the term "wireless communication" has been defined as:

"'wireless communication' means the making, transmitting or receiving of telegraphic, telegraphy or other communications by means of electricity or magnetism without the use of wires or other continuous electrical conductors between the transmitting and the receiving apparatus;"

So, the expression "other communications" may broadly or generally cover all the operation or the licensing of the television apparatus. But doubts have been expressed in this