

[Secretary]

ment & Employment and
Labour Bureau.

The Speaker ordered printing, publication and circulation of these Reports under Rule 280 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business.

I lay a copy each of the four Reports on the Table of the House.

12.02½ hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): With your permission, I rise to announce that Government business in this House for the week commencing 23rd April, 1962 will consist of:

- (1) Further discussion of the Railway Budget for 1962-63,
- (2) Discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the President for his Address to Parliament.

As Members are already aware, the General Budget for 1962-63 will be presented to the House at 5 p.m. on Monday the 23rd April, 1962.

12.03 hrs.

RAILWAY BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Speaker: Now we take up the general discussion of the Budget (Railways) for 1962-63. Time has not yet been allotted by the Committee, but there is a tentative proposal to allot four days. Can I have any idea of the time to be allotted? Or, we might begin just now, and then perhaps the Business Advisory Committee would meet and decide what time is to be allotted to this.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Why not decide it in the House?

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):

Instead of days, why not fix it in hours?

Mr. Speaker: That would be all right.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Last time I am told it was 15 hours.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): In this Parliament it should be 20 hours.

Mr. Speaker: If it was 15 hours before, unless there is something special now, we can perhaps stick to that.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): There is a new Minister.

Mr. Speaker: It is not enough reason that the Minister is new and therefore the time allotted should be new.

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): There is enhancement of the rates and fares.

Shri Warior (Trichur): There are many new Members also.

Mr. Speaker: That is all right. The number is the same, whether they are new or old.

Shri Daji (Indore): Last time it was a lame duck session.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow an hour or two more. That is because the rates have been increased.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): May I point out one thing? If the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs looks up the records he will find that the time allotted last year and the year before last was much more. I think the allotment was a little more last time.

Mr. Speaker: If this has to be looked into, I would prefer looking into it

in the Business Advisory Committee because that would be better. Then, it should not be insisted that the time should be allotted just now. We will look into it and see all other things and then, perhaps, we will be able to decide. Then, the House may ultimately take a decision.

Members are aware that ordinarily there is a time limit for speeches in such discussions. Normally, hon. Members would have 15 minutes each; but if they are leaders of groups or they represent groups as first speakers, then, they will have some time more, say 20 to 25 minutes. I think 25 minutes should be enough.

Shri Nambiar: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Railway Minister, in his present portfolio has presented this Budget . . .

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो आप आदेश दे रहे हैं, ये हिन्दी में भी दिये जाने चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बहुत अच्छा जो, मैं इस बात का खयाल रखूंगा। जो आपने हुकम दिया है मैं इस बात का यत्न तो करूंगा, अगर आपको यह भी खयाल होना चाहिए कि इस सर्भा के एक एक मिनट का कितना खर्चा होता है। इसलिए जब मैं आप से बात करूंगा तो हिन्दी में ही करूंगा इसकी आप तसल्ली रखें।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : व्यवस्था देते समय जो आप आदेश दें वे हिन्दी में भी होने चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बहुत अच्छा।

Shri Nambiar: The new Minister with this new portfolio has presented us with a new Budget proposal to increase the fares and freights from now on. He estimates thereby to get an additional revenue of Rs. 21.26 crores, which, I consider, is a gross underestimate. When we come to the actual

figures we will be collecting more than Rs. 21.26 crores from the people. And, those who are using the railways, using the third class and second class compartments and those who consume the goods that are carried by the railways will have to bear the main brunt of this new taxation, which, I consider, is most uncalled for and unnecessary.

While arguing his case for an enhancement of the fares and freights, the hon. Minister quoted the recent enhancement of the dearness allowances of the railway employees as one of the main reasons. I would bring to your notice the figures he has supplied. According to his estimates, the gross receipts for the current year will be to the tune of Rs. 545.38 crores and the expenses will be to the tune of Rs. 356.86 crores leaving a gross profit of Rs. 178.50 crores. Without this increase of fares and freights, Shri Jagjivan Ram, his predecessor, had presented us a Budget a month back wherein he envisaged a gross profit of Rs. 178.50 crores. When we have already got the possibility of getting a gross profit of Rs. 178.50 crores without resorting to this new taxation, what is the justification for the hon. Minister now to come forward with a proposal which hits the common man?

I would request him to take advantage of this surplus and pay the employees the additional dearness allowance which, even according to his own figures, will come to only Rs. 12.20 crores. Why should he resort to this new taxation? He has no justification whatsoever. He says that if he did not resort to this taxation this increase in the fares and freights, he would have the necessity to borrow money from the General Revenues to augment the expenditure of the Development Fund. Here again, I submit that he is misleading the House and the public and is finding an excuse to tax the poor. What is the necessity for such borrowing when there is already a gross profit? The Railways are now in a boom; the

[Shri Nambiar]

profits are increasing every year. When that is the case there cannot be any justification excepting that he finds excuses which I shall narrate later on.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Has the hon. Member taken care to read the Railway Convention Committee report and what they say about the development fund?

Shri Nambiar: I am coming to that; I shall deal with it later on. I can understand if he says that he wants money for the Five Year Plans.

Mr. Speaker: There is one thing that I might request the hon. Member. I am glad he has come back very much enthused and invigorated; I am happy over that.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): He speaks louder.

Mr. Speaker: When we have to say certain things the language must also be moderate; the same meaning might be conveyed but it should be in some indirect form. He said that the Minister was misleading the House. Instead if he had said that the statement made by the Minister was misleading, perhaps that would have been an improvement. I would ask him to take care.

Shri Tyagi: It comes to the same.

Mr. Speaker: It does not. The statement need not be deliberate. Some statement might be made and an hon. Member might think that it is not a correct statement and perhaps some might be misled while some others may not be. But if he says that the Minister is misleading, it means that it is a wilful attempt on his part and that is not good. Let us just lay down certain standards of debates which we must conform to.

Shri Nambiar: I stand corrected. But I submit that the facts would

definitely prove my statement later on. I can understand the hon. Minister telling the House that in order to help the Plan activities he is using the railway mechanism, to tax the poor and get money. There is no objection. But why should he drag unnecessary issues to the forefront and make it appear that because of the enhanced dearness allowances he had to do this? It is not proper. The white paper on the railways states clearly that the Railways had improved during the last eleven years. It is stated that during the last eleven years, there has been 100 per cent. increase in goods traffic in net tonne miles, 25 per cent. increase in the number of passengers originating, 84 per cent increase in capital outlay and 70 per cent increase in working expenses. The facts show that the increase in the number of railway employees is 2,47,161, including casual labour employed, namely, 12,422. With 25 per cent more men the railways had been carrying on 100 per cent more freight during the last 11 years. We can thus see that the railwaymen are under-staffed and as their state of affairs shows, underpaid as well. They are unnecessarily and wrongly brought into the picture now, when fresh taxation is resorted to and they are made to appear responsible for that; they are put in opposition to the public. The public, when they pay the extra tax, will be made to feel that they are paying the tax because of this worker, who is demanding more dearness allowance, this worker who went on strike last year and this worker who is doing all the calamity. But the facts show that it is not so.

Coming to the actual state of affairs in our railways, I would submit that there is a recommendation in the Railway Convention Committee of 1954 that whenever money is required for developmental activities, they can resort to borrowing from the general revenues. In that, it is stated that if there is no possibility of repaying it, normally, it can be done leisurely in

the periods when profit is made. Therefore, even granting the argument that money is required for the development activities, he can do so by borrowing. But here, in this case, even that is not necessary. That is my humble submission. The recommendation permits him to do it. He can do it in the face of that recommendation. The recommendation says that he can borrow monies and use them and repay them leisurely; and there is no necessity for an immediate enhancement of fares and freights on that account.

I am now coming to another aspect of the question. The Railway Convention Committee of 1954 recommended that the depreciation reserve fund should be increased to Rs. 35 crores from Rs. 30 crores. Subsequently, they referred the matter to another Railway Convention Committee. A resolution was brought to Parliament and got approved, and it was arbitrarily increased to Rs. 45 crores. That was the first step.

Another point is this: the Railway Convention Committee of 1960 was made to accept the recommendation of a greater allotment, which is also wrong. According to any procedure, that is being followed in respect of any industry in this country, private or public sector—leave alone the railways—the depreciation allowed cannot be more than 2.5 per cent. In respect of the railway locomotives or carriages, the amount that is spent on capital can be regained during the course of 40 years. That is a well-established fact. According to the latest figures that are given, I submit that the capital-at-charge stands already inflated due to over-capitalisation. Even without granting any exemption from this over-capitalisation, taking it for granted that the capital at charge is Rs. 1,790 crores, by no imagination can the depreciation amount be fixed anything more than Rs. 42½ crores. Now, we are called upon to give Rs. 70 crores per annum in the name of depreciation reserve fund.

Why call it depreciation reserve fund? You just say that Rs. 70 crores are required for the Five Year Plan activities.

Mr. Speaker: The speeches are to be directed towards the Chair.

Shri Tyagi: In that case, he has to be more polite.

Mr. Speaker: That is exactly the purpose why I said so. If he were to address only the Chair, I am sure he will be more polite and more docile.

Shri Warior: If the hon. Member is impolite, you can find out. Why should Shri Tyagi come in? It is for you to find it out.

Mr. Speaker: I leave it to hon. Members also.

Shri Namblar: My humble submission is that all these interruptions should be accounted for and not counted in the time taken for my speech. I have no objection to such interruptions in that case.

Mr. Speaker: These interruptions are also part of the game.

Shri Namblar: If the railways wanted money, they can straightway take it. They should not come under the cover of the depreciation reserve fund.

I submit that there is another fund lying idle, about which much is not being said or discussed. They may say tomorrow that the ways and means position does not permit such a thing. That fund is called the revenue reserve fund. It is a defunct fund. That was lying idle up to the extent of Rs. 55.36 crores. That fund can be made use of and a loan can be taken from it. When so much liquid cash is available with the railways as a reserve amount, why is it after all necessary to touch the poor man who is already taxed from all sides and who is again asked to pay more? Now a third class passenger who comes from Madras to Delhi will have to

[Shri Namblar]

pay Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 more. So also in other lines. What is the justification for doing that? In what way is that passenger getting more in return?

So also the goods that are being carried. The hon. Minister has not cared to leave out even foodstuffs; the very rice, potatoes and fruits that we are getting are going to be taxed more. He may say, it is only small. If it is small, then leave it. The season tickets will also cost more. He says, it is after all only 1 nP per day and for 30 days it becomes about 40 nP. That is his arithmetic. His argument is, it is only one naya paisa, but I am putting it to him: If it is only one naya paisa, omit it, and let not at least the industrial workers, the middle-class wage-earners who go from place to place for duty, be asked to pay more.

Regarding the railways' capacity and the railways' prosperity, the white paper gives the answer. On page 7, it is stated:

"It has also been possible for the Indian Railways to consistently earn a net surplus, after meeting all expenses including appropriation to Depreciation Reserve Fund and the prescribed fixed return on Government capital (dividend) which secures to the general exchequer a margin over and above the average rate at which interest is paid by the Government of India on public debt."

I would like the words "over and above the average rate" to be underlined. Then it says:

"A small margin will still remain, even if allowance is made for some of the higher rated external loans raised by the Government of India in recent years for the Railways."

I want to underline the words "A small margin will still remain". This white paper was prepared by Shri

Jagjivan Ram before he contemplated the idea of enhancing the fares and freights. While our railways are in such a good boom—it is meeting all the expenses and it is giving more to the exchequer; it is so lavish—it is unfortunate that we have to hear from the new Railway Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, with all his newness, that he is taxing the poor again. I have already said that the answer is to be found in the Depreciation Reserve Fund and the Revenue Reserve Fund. There are so much of reserves there.

I for one cannot even agree to this sort of allotments continuing further. The Britishers started these allotments, so that they could give a wrong picture to the public, when they wanted to fleece them. Why should we stick to that method? We should have a straight budgeting—so much gross earnings, so much expenses, so much of profit and from that profit we are allotting so much dividend in the name of interest, so much for depreciation, etc. That will be straight budgeting. We expect the Minister to alter his procedure of accounting and budgeting to one which an ordinary man can understand. I am sure many hon. Members in this House find it difficult to know where the thing is; it is so cleverly put. The Britishers gave the lessons and we should not continue to follow them. We should think of some change in budgeting.

Coming to efficiency, I have all respect for the railway staff, officers, members of the Railway Board and the Minister for whatever improvements have been done. Let it not be understood that I am decrying our railways. But I may submit that the efficiency is the lowest at present. I may be excused for stating a frank truth. 100 per cent increase in ton mileage of freight and 25 per cent in carrying capacity of passengers have been brought about without proportionate increase in staff. How could it go without inefficiency and accl-

dents? I know the condition of a railwayman on the spot. They are terribly under-staffed in lines, loco-sheds and workshops which give room for more accidents.

It is given in the report that 68.8 per cent of the accidents are due to engine failures and failures of rolling stock etc. Why is it that engines and rolling stock fail? It is because of improper maintenance, improper repairs. Why is it that there is improper maintenance and improper repairs? The authorities will immediately put the blame on the employees. They will say that the employees are lazy and they do not work well. But the facts will reveal that they are working under great strain. The mileage of gang-length has been increased from 3 to 4 and the number of men have not been increased. Even the available number of men are not permanent employees, they are put as casual labour on the pretext of economy. The casual labour do not know anything with the result that work of maintenance and repairs on permanent way is not done properly as a result of which accidents occur. When accidents occur, quarrel arises between the engineering department and the mechanical department. The engineering department will say that the track was all right, and the mechanical department will say that the engine was all right. Then how the hell did the accident occur? They say that the accident came about because somebody tried to remove the fish plates, an unknown man is caught and every blame is put on that man. Nobody can find out the truth. Thus, all the departments escape. The maharajas sitting here say it is God's anger that creates accidents and let all pray God that accidents do not occur. But the facts are different. When the Demands come up and we will have an opportunity to say something, we will throw light on many more facts which will prove that my statement is correct.

Then, in the Gangs and in the workshops, workmen do not get suffi-

cient leave reserve. It has come to the barest minimum. I will tell you what happens now. When an employee does not get leave even to attend to his sick mother or wife, he goes to the hospital and reports sick himself. Actually he is not sick, but his father or mother is sick and because it is not possible for him to get any leave he reports himself sick and if necessary pays two or three rupees to a doctor and gets a certificate for two days leave. Then the authorities do manage without him. If that were so, why could they not have managed even otherwise and given him the legitimate leave.

Also, the working hours have been increased. On many important posts on the open line working hours has been increased from 8 to 12. I am not revealing a secret when I say that our engine drivers and foremen are working more than 12 hours per day. Previously the rule was that a driver or a loco running staff man has to work for 12 hours on the Engine Footplate, if necessary, and then claim rest. The former procedure was to calculate the time from the time of 'signing on' to the time of 'signing off'. Then a driver used to go to a loco shed, sign on, take an engine, operate on the line, sign off, after taking it to another loco shed and take rest after working for 12 hours. Now they have changed the rule. Now they say that the time will be calculated from the time the wheel moves. What happens is, a driver takes an engine from the loco shed and goes to the traffic yard and if the train is late he has to stand there for four or more hours with the engine. That time is not calculated for the purposes of his rest and only from the time his engine moves the period of 12 hours work is calculated. That means he can claim rest only after 16 hours. In some cases, I know, drivers could claim rest only after 22 hours. With such state of affairs, can you imagine that a driver can take an engine safely to the destination? We have brought these facts to the notice of the Railway Administration through

[Shri Nambiar]

the agency of trade unions, but they say that the rules have been changed and the period is calculated only from the time the engine moves. That means, once the rules have been made by the nawabs they cannot be changed. The nawabs do not change the rules with the result that our poor travelling public are put to difficulties on the way.

I have to make a mention about the labour relations. Labour relations, the hon. Minister submitted, are good. I wish it to be so. If it is not good, may I ask the hon. Minister whether he is prepared to change some methods by which he can expect better relations. Sir, facts show that partiality, nepotism and favouritism are there in dealing with labour relations—not in the matter of appointments or promotions. Some are favoured groups, some are unfavoured groups. Unfavoured groups get no sort of encouragement in dealing with labour problems and they would not even get a reply to a letter. These are the problems which the hon. Minister has to deal with now.

I must give him some time to look into these matters. I should not accuse him of a thing for which he is not responsible. Therefore, I request him to go into this matter deeply and bring in some formula, some method, which is impartial in dealing with labour matters. Let him not indulge in political quarrels and political squabbles in dealing with labour, because then the labour in turn will have to retort with political squabbles with the result that the railways will go to the dogs. Such a situation should not be allowed to be brought about.

Lastly, I want to say a word about those who were victims during the days of the last general strike. Only a few of those who have been removed from service are yet to be absorbed. I request him to reinstate those poor employees. Also, those punishments which the administration had imposed like stoppage of increment

etc. should be reviewed and those employees made to feel that they are justly treated so that better relations can prevail in the railways.

My only intention in criticising the new taxation measure is to see that the common man should not be made to suffer. My only intention in referring to the labour problem is to see that better relations exist in the railways. I am one of those who is always willing to try to do my best to see that our railways are run as the best in the world and I, not only as a member of this House but as a member of the public, as someone connected with the railway trade union for a number of years, will extend all my co-operation to the Railway Minister to see that our railways progress and improve to the maximum extent possible.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to welcome the Railway Minister to his post and to wish him good fortune. And I think he will need all our good wishes. I feel that he can under no illusion as to the tremendous challenges, the great responsibilities that he will have to face. Without seeking to underline or make any invidious comparison between one Ministry and another, may I respectfully say to him that the Ministry which he has just left will relatively be child's play compared with the enormity of the task that he is now called upon to face. And, unfortunately, he comes to this Ministry which has an extremely mixed legacy. I appreciate his difficulties. He has a tremendous backlog of all kinds of things—track renewals, coaching stock, rolling stock and not the least important a system, or some kind of a tradition which is not healthy, which is a near colonial tradition. He has a good deal of sheer dead wood in the administration of the railways. He has very good people around him, but there is in the railway administration some kind of special bureaucratic affliction.

I do not know why, but it is there. It is a dead blank wall. And may I say this with great respect that over a period of more than twenty years I have found, with few exceptions, that the Ministers are assimilated to this bureaucratic tradition, that they come to it with some kind of forward-looking attitude, some kind of imaginative approach but as soon as they touch the railway administration it deadens them? That is part of this unfortunate legacy. And not the least—perhaps the most important factor—is the tremendous burden that a developing economy has suddenly imposed on the railway administration, more than on any other administration. And I will come to that immediately. I consider that the very core of the problem that the new Minister faces. Here I want to tell you that when two years ago, or rather three years ago, I analysed the allocations and I analysed the provision for increased carrying capacity I noticed, and I said it without qualification, that not only are you grossly under-estimating the additional carrying capacity that you will have to face, but you are doing it to a dangerous extent. I forecast increasingly grave bottlenecks both in regard to the private sector and the public sector and those bottlenecks are there.

I want to deal a little with the backlog. There was your estimate last year of the provision in respect of increased capacity of 15 million originating tons. That was your own target. Your own estimate of increased additional capacity was this, namely, 7 to 8 million tons on account of coal and a similar amount on account of steel. That is, the increased burden on account of coal and steel alone would be in the region of 15 to 16 million tons on your own showing. Yet, you provided or hoped to provide additional capacity of 15 to 16 million tons. I posed this question. I said, "What is going to happen to the rest of trade and industry? Is it going to stand still? It will not only have to stand still but it will have to go backwards." That is precisely what has happened.

No amount of statistical gymnastics is going to do away with this simple arithmetical assessment. Your own estimate was grossly inadequate. Your own estimate was capable of only meeting the increased demands of coal and steel. Your own estimate, as I said, was gravely dangerously understated, but even that understated target you did not achieve. My own interpretation of the figures is that of this target of 15 million additional tons you only achieved 10 million tons.

I ventured to say last year and the year before, that on your own showing, if there were not to be near crippling bottlenecks in respect of trade and industry, on your own estimate you would have to provide a minimum additional capacity of 20 to 25 million originating tons.

Mr. Speaker: I have to request Shri Anthony to address the Chair.

Shri Frank Anthony: I am using the pronoun 'You' in inverted commas. I am sorry.

As I was saying, I felt that this provision at the end of the Second Five Year Plan was grossly inadequate. Even this inadequate target was not achieved. What actually happened? We had a controversy here between the hon. Minister in his previous capacity and the hon. Railway Minister, one hon. Minister blaming the other for bottleneck in respect of transport of coal. But I would ask this question. What figures, if any, have we got with regard to the amount of actual offering by trade and industry even at the end of the Second Five Year Plan? Nothing.

As far as I am aware there is a ceiling fixed to registration at each station. I am not blaming the administration. After all, there has to be a ceiling at Delhi. Delhi is so hemmed in physically that there is no capacity for the Delhi Yard to be enlarged. But there are ceilings in respect of registrations. My own information is that even with regard to those ceilings, even those restricted registrations have not been able

[Shri Frank Anthony]

to be carried through. Either they have not been able to accept the registrations even to the amount of the ceilings or, even if they have been accepted, there has been inordinate delay in transport. Therefore we have absolutely no way of assessing what in fact were the requirements of trade and industry in the country. All I have said is that on your own showing there is a shortfall each year in the last two years of the Second Plan of 10 to 15 million originating tons.

This is what rather perturbs me. There is this gap between promise and performance. Your promise was an understated promise. Even that understated promise you were not able to achieve.

Now, I am wondering what is going to happen with regard to the promised targets in respect of the Third Five Year Plan.

The Railway Minister has set a target of 245 million originating tons in the final year of the Third Five Year Plan. The Minister's target or the Ministry's target in the final year of the Second Five Year Plan was 162 million originating tons. Admittedly, there was a shortfall of 8 million tons in respect of your target at the end of the Second Five Year Plan. A target is being set of 245 million tons in the final year of the Third Five Year Plan. More than that, the Minister's statement says, "Yes, we have set this target, but as a matter of fact we expect to achieve a much higher figure". I hope for the sake of the Railways, and more for the sake of the country, these promises can be implemented.

But I have tried to analyse what in fact has the Ministry promised the country and what the figures were during the Second Five Year Plan. In no year did the Railways achieve additional capacity of more than 9 million tons—in no year. In 1958-59 the additional capacity added was above 3 million originating tons,

though the average during the Second Five Year Plan period was between 7 and 8 million originating tons of additional capacity.

Now, we have been promised additional capacity of an average of 18 million originating tons, more than twice the average which was struck for the Second Five Year Plan period. Can we achieve it? I am not only hoping, but I am praying, that we will achieve it. But, with this overall increase of a mere Rs. 200 crores, are we going to be able to achieve anything like a net addition of 18 million originating tons to our carrying capacity? I doubt it very much.

Assuming that the Railways can, my respectful submission is that even if we achieve 18 million originating tons of additional carrying capacity, it is going to be a hopelessly inadequate provision. That is my own estimate. And on the Minister's own showing, he has said that of these 18 million originating tons, nearly half will be allocated for steel and half for coal, probably 9 million tons. Then what is going to happen to the rest of the public sector? And what is going to happen to the rest of the private sector? I just do not know.

And this is where I join issue with the Government as a whole. I do not blame anybody; Shri Jagjivan Ram has been removed—not removed, moved—for what reasons, I do not know. Unless my friend the new Railway Minister is prepared to fight and to make an issue of it—an issue of it to the extent of saying, "I am prepared to resign"—he will share the same fate as the Railways have shared, but, I hope, not the same fate as his predecessor. Inevitably.

I am one of those who are completely against any pruning of our plans. But I am one of those who say that in spite of this euphemism, there is no real planning, no semblance of co-operation. Here we have

the public sector obviously completely outstripping the Railways. Why? A hopelessly lop-sided development. I join issue completely with my hon. friend Shri Nambiar who seems to think that the Railways have plenty of money. I am not suggesting that there is no waste on the Railways. I am prepared to concede that in every vast undertaking there is bound to be an element of waste. I am prepared to concede even that there is avoidable waste on the Railways. But my own humble estimate is that unless there is some radical re-thinking with regard to the Railways, the whole plan will collapse. It will collapse because the Railways will not be able to carry it.

I think the Minister should have on this—I do not know, I am not enamoured of committees and commissions—but on this I think he should have some high-powered Commission. And don't have too many politicians on it who have their own predilections. Let them go into the matter, because this is the very heart of the success or otherwise of our whole Plan. With steel and coal taking up so much of the additional capacity, what is left for the public sector; and what, if anything, is going to be left for the private sector? Nothing. That is why I feel that this is a grave matter and it will require a good deal of analysis by experts.

My hon. friend here has criticised the Railways for imposing a tax on fares. My own feeling is this, and I make it as a suggestion. If the Railways want money,—and they want money and they certainly want much more money than they have got today—can't this be considered seriously, a complete moratorium on contributions to the Central revenues? I make it in all seriousness. Apart from asking the hon. Finance Minister to give up some of his wild hobby horses like the prohibition,—it is going to be difficult, he has made a large spiritual investment in it, it might release a little more money. Where are the Railways going to get the resources? How are the Railways going to run?

They are going to have to sprint to stand still. Look at this tremendous backlog. I will come to rolling stock. Even that backlog the Railway Ministry is not going to catch up with. How are you going to provide for all the additional requirements in order to meet this additional capacity, I do not know. That is why I seriously feel that there should be a high-powered commission in this matter.

The Railways may have been a favourite milch cow in the past. With this tremendous burden that has been imposed on them, you cannot make the Railways a milch cow any longer. What happened? Apart from the dividends—I have always been against a dividend to the Central Revenues, at least in the face of the present heavy financial commitment—the Finance Minister comes along and imposes a tax on fares. It is a novel device and if I may say so, a somewhat devious device. So far, the Railways have been a milch cow for the Central revenues. A tax on railway fares is a dubious device for financing the State Governments. Tomorrow,—there is a good deal of difference of opinion as to the functioning of mal-functioning of our panchayats; some people say that they are not functioning at all because they have no money—we will get some other kind of tax so that the Railways can be milked again in order to provide revenue to the panchayats. All that has got to be stopped.

I am not suggesting that the Railways are not doing their best. My own view is that, by and large,—because, there are pockets of inefficiency here and there—the Railways are doing more than their best. I have said it before and I repeat it today, that the Railways are flogging all their resources. They are flogging their men, they are flogging their material resources. We are paying the price; we will pay an increasing price. Here are the figures of improvement in operational efficiency. The Railway Minister may say, look at our figures: improvement in wagon miles per wagon day, engine miles per

[Shri Frank Anthony]

engine day, net ton miles per wagon day, train miles per running track day: all show a consistent improvement. I am prepared to accept these figures at their face value. They show a definite improvement in operating efficiency in certain facets. But, what is the obverse side of it? It is significant. The obverse side of it is this. On the broad gauge, what is the locomotive position? In 1950-51, the percentage of over-aged locomotives was 23. In 1960-61, over-age has gone up to 25.4 per cent. That is, there are more over-aged locomotives today on the broad-gauge. And, the broad gauge carries three-quarters of our traffic; more than they carried ten years ago. I agree entirely with my hon. friend Shri Nambiar with whom I do not often agree, that because of this complex of flogging and achieving of these figures of operational efficiency, regard for maintenance has receded. I say this to the Minister and I want him to go into that.

Senior railwaymen today, on the loco side, particularly, want to resign *en masse*. Give them a chance and they will all resign, because you have no arrangements for repairs, because they are driven not only beyond the limits of human endurance but beyond the limits of ordinary safety. I know it. I get hundreds of cases in the year. Because of this fetish for showing this improvement in figures, there is very little maintenance. I do not blame the staff. But repairs are not carried out. People are taking out passenger trains with dummy brakes. There are no big repairs. And they are told 'You will take that engine out; otherwise, you will be suspended'. And senior railwaymen with some sense of responsibility say, 'We will not, and we cannot' and they refuse to work under those conditions.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What happen to the driver of the Ranchi Express?

Shri Frank Anthony: He is only one. But it proves the rule. That is the position today.

My hon. friend may say, 'But, look at the figures for engine-failures; the figures are less'. I quite agree. But may I say with great respect that I am not persuaded to accept these figures with regard to engine failures, because I know the procedure for recording engine-failures? I know that there is a general instruction that all the actual engine-failures should not be recorded. They are deliberately kept down. Therefore, this alleged reduction in engine-failures is not an actual reflection of the actual position.

My hon. friend Shri Nambiar has referred to the increase in the number of collisions. The number of collisions has increased. But what has distressed men is that the hon. Minister states—and I am prepared to accept it—that this increase in collisions, and the collisions generally, or at least 99.2 per cent of the collisions, are due to the failure of the human element. What is it due to. Is it that railwaymen have suddenly become less conscious of their duties? Is it that they have deliberately become inefficient? I do not accept this. Then, why is there this increase? It is there because the men are being driven. They have not got the resources. Maintenance is being kept at a dangerously minimum level. They are being driven. Therefore, there is the failure of the human element. 99.2 per cent of the collisions are due to this.

Then, on the mechanical side, it is admitted that the most pronounced factor in the cause of derailments is mechanical failures. Here again, what are your derailments and your mechanical failures due to? As I said, it is because the railways today are driven. I do not blame the railways. They are being asked to perform an utterly impossible task, and they are handing down that utterly impossible task to their men and also to their materials. And the consequences are plain; the consequences are overtaking us already.

Then, there is the wagon position. I was looking at the wagon user position. That has improved. But the figures with regard to turn-around have shown a deterioration. I do not know whether my reading is correct. This means that wagons are being used more effectively, but that, so far as the loaded wagons are concerned, there is much greater delay in loading wagons and in the carrying of loaded wagons. That means in effect that there is an increase of empty haulage. This, I thought, was something which we should precisely not do, namely increase the haulage of empty wagons. That was my reading of the wagon position.

I would like to ask the Minister as to what is the policy of the railways with regard to the metre gauge. My own information is that at the break of gauge points, that is, at points where you have to change from the metre gauge to the broad gauge and vice versa, bottlenecks not only persist but have become infinitely worse. I do not know whether in the long-term the policy of the railways is ultimately to eliminate the metre gauge so as to remove these bottlenecks. So far as I can make out, there has recently been an extension of the metre gauge system. I would like to know what policy the railways have with regard to the metre gauge system and whether the Minister accepts the position that because we have these different gauges, they are responsible for creating serious bottlenecks in respect of transport.

I do not want to say too much about the increase in passenger fare and freight rates. I join issue with my hon. friend, Shri Nambiar, who has tried to make out that the railways are flushed with money. On the other hand, what little I can see of the railways is that they are trying desperately hard to draw some kind of a facade of solvency over something which is almost near bankruptcy. So far as the increase in railway fares is concerned, to me it seems to be

somewhat of a device. In the final analysis, what we get from fares is not going to represent more than a drop in the ocean of the requirements of the Railway Ministry. I do not know whether it would not have been a wise thing psychologically if the passenger fares had not been put up. As to whether there is a sound economic case for freight rates going up, different people may view it differently. But one consequence is very clear, so far as the freight rate increase is concerned, it is going to give another fierce impetus to our inflationary spiral.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Frank Anthony: I do want to say this, that so far as passenger amenities are concerned, I can see no real improvement. I see that there has been a steady deterioration in the coaching stock position. The overage coaching stock in 1950-51 was 29 per cent; in 1960-61, it has gone up to 35 per cent. As regards the coaching stock, that is, the passenger carriages, those of us who travel will say this, that in many parts of the country, passenger amenities leave everything to be desired. In the coaching stock, we cannot get lights. We get lights, but we cannot get fans. We get fans, but we cannot get lights. And so it goes on. With this increase in overage coaching stock, I can only see a deterioration in the overall position so far as passenger amenities are concerned.

I want to conclude on this note—I shall not refer to one or two other matters I had intended to do. I would make an earnest appeal to the Minister generally so far as the grievances of the staff are concerned. This has been a hardy annual in this House, something which has given rise to bitterness and frustration, particularly on the part of those who have had to deal with railwaymen for some

[Shri Frank Anthony]

considerable time. The Minister runs an organisation which consists of more than a million men. I am prepared to make every concession to discipline, to the need for proper administrative procedures, but I would ask him to bear this in mind that there is this fetish of the 'proper channel' in the Railway Administration. However flagrant an injustice, however blatant an abuse, the chances of getting redress are remote because of this unfortunate near-colonial tradition; the local boss deals with it and whatever he says and does is automatically affirmed right up to the Minister.

13 hrs.

I say this with a great deal of pain. I am hoping the Minister will change this bureaucratic attitude, where savagery is mistaken for discipline, and where a refusal to deal with legitimate grievances is identified with strength. It is a tragedy. To the Railway Minister I say this. I do not expect a judicial conscience from an administrator, but I expect some kind of human, administrative conscience. I do not understand why a Railway Minister should not look into a legitimate individual grievance, why he should take shelter behind this time-worn cliché that the aggrieved person should come through the normal channel, that this has been the decision of the General Manager and so the Minister refuses to look into it. I may here make a reference to a very great Railway Minister, Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar, who, in the very short time he was there, electrified the imagination of the railway workers, who began immediately to attract not only their confidence but their loyalty also. Why? He was not a politician, but he was a great administrator. If any one went to him with an individual grievance, he was not concerned as to whether the General Manager, who might have been his own son-in-law, had rejected it. He would look into it, and within ten minutes he would dictate his decision, overruling the General Manager, even if he was his own son-in-law.

So, I would ask the Railway Minister to be pleased to approach the grievances of the railwaymen in this new and rather imaginative way.

I wish him well because I feel that, quite frankly, the progress and the health of his Ministry is synonymous with the progress and health of our country.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Harish Chandra Mathur.

I expect hon. Members who desire to speak to rise in their seats, so that I might be able to call any on of them.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: The hon. Member who has just preceded me has answered in full the main point made out by the previous speaker, more particularly regarding the revenues of the railways and their development fund. When he was speaking, I had intervened and drawn his attention to the Railway Convention Committee's recommendations where all these matters had been fully discussed. And this House, as a matter of fact had impressed upon the Railway Minister to take good care of his development fund.

Leaving that apart, certain details have been discussed by my hon. friend who is supposed to have certain expert knowledge on this subject, and who has been participating in the debate every year. I have no intention to go into these minor details. I would like to confine my observations to broad principles and certain basic problems which, if taken care of, will give us a good start.

I feel the great trouble with the railways is that even in this year of the Third Plan they have not got any transport policy. In the absence of a transport policy, there has not been the type of planning which we have always desired. I do not know how it happened that even the Planning Commission was awakened to this

important issue only while they were discussing the Third Plan. If you open the Third Plan, you will find that the main point stressed is the absence of any transport policy before us. This House has, from time to time, also impressed upon the Government, the importance of this particular aspect of the question. We have this Neogy Committee, and it is really unfortunate that, in spite of its having been appointed as early as 1958, nobody seems to be worried about it, and it is only the other day that the Chairman of the Committee himself made a complaint that he had received no replies to the preliminary report that they sent out and the factual information which they had placed before the Central and State Governments and so the final report was being delayed. In the absence of this factual data and the answers to these important questions, it is really difficult for us to go into matter. It is really expedient that this Committee's report is expedited and we have a transport policy placed before the House, discussed and approved by the House.

In the present state of affairs I think the railways have got to take special note of the point that they are not only the largest public sector enterprise, but they are almost—not almost, but as a matter of fact, they are—a monopolistic enterprise in the public sector. And when you have a monopoly in the public sector, the responsibility of that enterprise becomes all the more great because there is nothing to compete with it and nothing to tell you the true internal story. The other day when we were discussing the airlines, by hon. friend, the Minister of Civil Aviation, told us that while all the standards were being fulfilled, the cost of the private sector was Rs. 500 compared to Rs. 800 of the public sector. If it is so, it becomes all the more necessary that we look into the working of the railways.

There has been no real enquiry into the working of the railways all these years. Even the Chairman of the

Neogy Committee has observed very recently that even while we were planning, there have been acute and great mistakes in the planning of our transport facilities for the Second and Third Plans. We find there has been trouble all over the country so far as the transport of coal and other things are concerned. The hon. Minister of Railways tells us that there has been no difficulty and that the railways have fulfilled their targets. But I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that it is not only in respect of coal, but in respect of various other commodities also, that when the Federation of Chambers of Commerce met here, they made a special complaint about the transport difficulties. When the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry invited his Advisory Council, again in that Council where all concerned are represented, the main complaint was transport bottleneck. The other day when I asked a question about the movement of cement, I was told that there was no difficulty but I know of a particular cement factory where about 70,000 tons of cement got accumulated and it was not being lifted simply because there was a transport bottleneck. It is only therefore natural that there should be an enquiry. Not only to satisfy this House, but to satisfy the country at large, it is necessary that we have a high power committee which will go into all these matters as also into the working of the railways, and recommend what further improvements can be effected in the railways.

This demand has been made from different quarters in this House, and I think it is time we gave our earnest attention to this matter.

When I ask for a high power commission to enquire into the planning and the working of the railways, I have got in mind a body like the Hoover Commission which was established in America. They appointed teams to go into the various aspects of the working of the railways and every department, and such a tremen-

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

dous good came out of it. I hope it would not be taken that we are charge-sheeting the railways, that we are accusing the railways or making an indictment and that it is because of this that a public enquiry is demanded. It is for the benefit of the railways themselves that this is suggested. They are working in their own groove, in a particular rut, and it becomes necessary that some independent and fresh thinking is done, that such a commission examine the whole thing and all the aspects of the working of the railways.

I will now pass on to the next item; that is about freights and fares. I pointed out at the very outset—and it should be clear from my interruption—that I am not against an increase in freights and fares as such if they are needed; and I do feel it is necessary to augment our Development Fund. But what I wish to submit is that the Freight Structure Committee which we appointed is now almost out-dated and there are certain important aspects of national economy which are not taken into consideration by that committee. What worries me very much is that the increase in the freights which we are now proposing to introduce will have an adverse effect and impact on our development plans. They will adversely affect the decentralisation of the industry. The freight rates have been increased at a flat rate. As a matter of fact, we were all the time pleading that so far as the backward areas are concerned, so far as the decentralisation of industry is concerned, the freight structure on the railways should be so altered as to give an incentive for the development of those areas. But, what we find is just the other way about. The backward areas will suffer a very serious set-back and the development of industries will suffer a set-back. Instead of giving certain incentives for decentralisation, instead of helping the movement of material and the necessary equipment to these backward areas, we have done just the reverse.

I also feel that it is going to have an adverse effect on our export promotion. There is nothing so important at the present moment in the economic life of this country as the promotion of our exports. Of course, the hon. Minister has borne in his mind one particular item, manganese. But that is not the only item which requires consideration. There are various other items; and, therefore, this flat rate of increase of freights will, I think, be most unscientific and will be unsuited to the present requirements of our country. We have got to go into this question further and we have got to revise our freight structure in the light of the policies we have enunciated in our Third Five Year Plan. Our freight structure should be such as to help the fulfilment of the Plan; it should be such as will help the development of the backward areas.

Another thing which I would like to impress upon the hon. Minister is about efficiency of administration. I do hope that if the sort of Commission I have suggested is appointed it will have great effect. It is no use appointing just the type of committee which we have only to examine one particular aspect of railway administration, that is, accidents, under the Chairmanship of Shri Kunzru. We must examine the entire thing. It is not in isolation that we can examine the part played by particular staff and see how these accidents take place. The Commission should be an all-embracing one which would go into all aspects of administration.

Even at present there are two serious things which have got to be taken note of immediately. One is that the inspection on the railways has been very considerably weakened. Previously, we had the independent Inspectorate under the Ministry of Communications. The Railway Board wanted to take it over; but because of certain feelings expressed on the floor of the House and because this question was taken up strongly, the inspectorate remaining independent

under the Ministry of Communications. But that does not play its role; it is not at all now in a position to deliver the goods. If it is to be rendered infructuous it is no use keeping an independent inspectorate. If it is to deliver the goods and if it is to have some importance which it used to have something must be done to rehabilitate it.

Apart from this, it is necessary that the railway administration itself strengthens its inspections. The inspections that are carried out today are almost a formal matter. I do not know if there has been any surprise inspection. If you just give notice that the Chairman of the Railway Board is going to a particular place, everything is spick and span; everything is taken care of. What is there for the Member of the Railway Board to go and see? Particularly those items which strike the general public every day are not there. Even if you go to the railway station here, which is under the direct nose of the Central Government, and where the Ministers go every day, you will find the whole platform littered with all sorts of things and it is dirty. But if you go to a wayside station for inspection, you will find everything is spick and span. It is just because no one takes the trouble of having a surprise visit or inspection. Something must be done about this.

The second thing is the devolution of power on which I have been laying particular stress. I would like the hon. Minister to tell us what has been the devolution of power from the Railway Board to the General Managers, and from the General Managers downwards. This is very important. You should give power to the man on the spot to take steps immediately. What is happening at the present moment is that to save one rupee you waste Rs. 100. If you just spend that one rupee in an unconventional manner you are going to be taken to task. That is the procedure; but, if you waste Rs. 100 nobody is going to ask you any question because by wasting this Rs. 100 you are going to regularise the expenditure of one rupee. It is because there

has been no real parting of power and we have fallen a prey to past tradition. There is not that feeling, right from the top from the Members of the Railway to down below, to change that tradition.

I am not in agreement with the hon. friend who just preceded me that whatever the man at the bottom does goes right up to the Railway Board and even the Railway Minister and is dictated. That is not correct. As a matter of fact, the position today is that nobody is prepared to take the responsibility. Therefore, something must be done about this matter also.

When we discuss the Demands I will go into details. I think the hon. Minister had given a promise on the floor of this House that there would be a further economy drive in the Railway Board itself and that he proposes to reduce the number of the Directors and Deputy Directors. But, when I look at the Budget papers I do not find this has been done. As a matter of fact, I find there are a huge number of clerks. Anybody who looks cursorily at the Budget papers will find that the number of class IV servants has increased by about 30 per cent. We had thought that the number of class IV servants would go down considerably. But we are not going to have anything of that kind. In the Railway Board I do not think the class IV servants are required for policy making; nor are these clerks required for policy making. It only increases the work considerably.

An Hon. Member: That is Parkinson's theory.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I deal with Parkinson's theory when I speak on the Demands of the Home Ministry because this Parkinson's theory which has caught the imagination of many of our friends here is as illusory as it possibly could be. It is not the Parkinson's theory.

I know of a particular section in a Ministry here in the North Block. It would be interesting to know that there are about 11 persons in that particular

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

section and there was not very much work for them. I am not giving the name of the section nor the name of the Ministry. The clerks themselves suggested to the section head that if he would reorganise the whole thing in a particular way the work could be done much more quickly. Nobody would listen to that. But, then, there was a change in the section head himself. The new section head had some drive in him; he listened to the persons concerned; and added something of his own. And, now, instead of 11 persons, they are working with 4 persons. All this is here in the North Block and nowhere else.

I think there is tremendous scope for economy everywhere but I shall deal with these matters later on.

Before I wind up, I would like to refer to a particular procedure which is followed in the Railways. When I address a letter to the Prime Minister or to my friend, the Minister, I get a reply quickly and under the signature of the Minister. But if a Member of Parliament were to write a letter to the General Manager, he condescends to send a reply after a few days signed by his private secretary. It does not hurt my vanity if a reply comes to me from a private secretary but I think it is absolutely wrong and it is against all sense of propriety. I say it is wrong because we do not get even this satisfaction of knowing whether the matter has received the personal attention of the General Manager. I think common courtesy requires that when a letter is addressed, particularly inviting the attention of the General Manager or some such officer, he should not find it difficult to write a D.O. letter back to the Member concerned. I hope the hon. Minister will issue general instructions in this matter that these matters which are referred to by the Members of Parliament may be attended to by the officers themselves and that they should make it a point to give a personal reply.

There is a lot of force in what is being said about personnel matters. The efficiency on the Railways is affected because the personnel concerned are most of the time worried about their personal grievances and we have not been able to devise any agency which will give satisfaction to these people. I spoke at length about it the other day. Even the Home Minister gave us an assurance, when the Pay Commission report was discussed, that they would find some machinery on the lines of the Whitley Council. I do not know what the Railways have done in this matter. Some satisfactory agency must be devised which will give satisfaction. Maybe, what they are doing is correct but there is no agency which will give satisfaction and which bring the staff to the authority concerned and which will give them the feeling that they have represented their matters properly.

श्री प्रिय नृप (कटिहार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, रेलवे बजट पर कुछ कहने के पहले एक चीज की याद दायी है। जब कोई लड़की ससुराल जाती है तो उसको मां बाप का खयाल आता है, भाई का खयाल आता है, बहन का खयाल आता है, पति का खयाल आता है और इन सब के बारे में उसे सोचना पड़ता है। आज जब हम रेलवे बजट पर बोलने के लिए खड़े हुए हैं तो हमें ट्रेवलिंग पब्लिक का खयाल आता है, रेलवे में काम करने वाले जो मुलाजमीन हैं, उनका खयाल आता है, मजदूरों का खयाल आता है, बिजनेसमैन जो हैं, उनका खयाल आता है।

जितना वक्त है बोलने का उसमें लावद नू तो मैं पत्नी की, न भाई की, न बहन की और न बाप की ही झण्डी तरह से सेवा कर सकूंगा। लेकिन मैं कोशिश करूंगा कि किसी तरह से इन सब के बारे में मैं कुछ कहूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : रेलवे बजट का जहाँ तक तात्सुक है, बाप सिर्फ पत्नी ही बनने की कोशिश

इस वक्त करें।

श्री प्रिय गुप्त : किस की पत्नी ? जनता की पत्नी, या किसी और

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जनता की ही । मैंने और किसी की तो नहीं कहा है ।

श्री प्रिय गुप्त : बहुत अच्छा ।

जहाँ तक रुपये पैसे के हिसाब किताब का सम्बन्ध है हमारे एकचुभरी साहिबान जो हैं, दफ्तरो में जो सीनियर एकाउंटेंट साहिबान हैं, एकाउंटस आफिसर साहिबान जो हैं, वे इन तमाम फिगर्ज को देख चुके हैं और हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी इनको देख लिया है । इस वास्ते इस पर आज मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है ।

So far as increase in passenger and goods fares is concerned. मुझे इस

सम्बन्ध में रवि ठाकुर की एक पंक्ति याद आती है :

“जा किछ हाराय गिनी बोलने केस्टा वेटाई चोर”

हर मौके पर उसी मजदूरों को दिये जाने वाले डिप्रनेस भलाउंस की रकम १३ करोड़ रु० का जस्टिफिकेशन दिया जाता है । जहाँ पर भी टैक्सेशन के डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन का सवाल आता है तो उसी १३ करोड़ रु० का उल्लेख किया जाता है । इसीलिये कहना पड़ता है :

“जा किछ हाराय गिनी बोलने केस्टा वेटाई चोर”

इस का मतलब यह है कि कमी भी अगर घर में कुछ खो जाता है तो नौकर बेचारे को पकड़ा जाता है कि वह ही चोर है । खैर, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर देखा जाय तो पता चलेगा कि पहले जो ३० रेलवे जोन थे, उन को काट कर ६ बनाया गया । ४,००० रु० पाने वाले ३० जेनरल मैनेजरों को काट

कर ६ पर लाया गया, इस से कुछ एकानमी हुई अच्छी बात है । भाहिस्ता भाहिस्ता काम शुरू हुआ ।

It is like the abolition of the zamindari system and bringing in the intermediary people in the provinces.

आसाम में जो तमाम माइसेज रेलवे का था और उन में जितने अफसर थे उनको सेपरेट कर के अलग से दो रेलवे क्रिएट की गई और पहले से दो गुने अफसर वहाँ रखे गये । ६ जोन्स की जगह पर ८ किये गये लेकिन अफसर उतने ही हैं ।

I will be glad to know if a single general manager or a single head of the department getting Rs. 2,200 has been declared surplus and forced to retire due to the shrinkage of posts due to the abolition of the 30 railway system and their reduction to six systems.

वे अफसर कहाँ गये ? जो पोस्ट्स सर्प्लस हुई थी वे कहाँ गईं ? वे चादनी रिटायर हुए या नहीं ? क्या उन का पेन्शन दे कर फोर्सै रिटायरमेंट किया गया ?

Is it not bad economy?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Railways (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): Is it the contention of the hon. Member that the railways should work without heads?

Shri Priya Gupta: I do not mean that. I do not know if comrade Shahnawaz Khan does not understand me.

मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है, हुजूर

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस हाउस में सब बराबर हैं, यहाँ हुजूर कहने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री प्रिय गुप्त : मैं रेलवे में मुलाजिम था न, बराबर during the whole year

[श्री प्रिय गुप्त]

३६३ दिन, घंटों तक मुझ में एक तरह का इन्कीरियारिटी काम्प्लेक्स रहता था। वहाँ भले ही सब हाथ मिलाते हैं लेकिन इन्कीरियारिटी काम्प्लेक्स अभी बसता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरा काम है, आप को बतलाना।

श्री प्रिय गुप्त: I am glad; I will keep it in mind. मेरा मतलब यह है कि अफसरों को घटाने के लिये ६ जोन किये गये। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि अफसर जरूर रहें, लेकिन बेजरूरत सब न रहें। जब ६ जोन बनाये गये तो उन ३० अफसरों में से जो ज्यादा अफसर बचे वे कहां गये। इस के लिये मैं ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन यह हमारी एकानमी का नमूना है।

इस के बाद प्लैनिंग का सवाल देखिये। वहाँ पर Plan implementation के लिए ट्रैफिक डिपार्टमेंट में एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट आफिसर है, इंजीनियरिंग डिपार्टमेंट में एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट आफिसर है, एलेक्ट्रिकल डिपार्टमेंट में एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट आफिसर है, मिक्सीकल डिपार्टमेंट में एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट आफिसर है।

These extra officers' posts are आल कार थोकिंग प्लैनिंग सबवेसफूल। इससे लिये क्लर्क एक भी नहीं रखा जाता। उन की जरूरत नहीं महसूस की गई। सारा काम डिस्ट्रिक्ट आफिसर करेंगे। इस किस्म से हमारे यहां एकानमी होती है। मैं आप को फिलहाल एक पोस्ट के बारे में बतलाता हूँ। अगर एक क्लर्क छुट्टी पर जाना चाहता है तो another clerk cannot be appointed as there is an embargo from the Railway Board. Even in regard to casual labour, the head of the department could not sanction another post or take another person in substitute to relieve him because the Railway Board has put an embargo. He cannot appoint even class IV staff on Rs. 45 per month.

४५ रु० मासिक का पानी देने वाला एक कैंजुअल लेबर गोरखपुर के आफिस में लड़की की शादी के लिये छुट्टी पर नहीं जा सका। आप एक ४० रु० का नीकर नहीं बढ़ा सकते लेकिन जहाँ पर एक डी० टी० एस० था वहाँ पर आप से एक डी० थो० एस० और एक डी० सी० एस० की जगहें भलग-भलग कर दीं। एक डी० टी० एस० की जगह पर उतनी ही तन्स्वाह पाने वाले डी० थो० एस० और डी० सी० एस० की दो पोस्टें कर दीं। ब्रिटिश राज्य के जमाने में भी एक ही प्रादमी इस काम को करते थे। डिटेल्स में जाने में बहुत टाइम लगेगा लेकिन इसे एकानमी के ढांचे को मैं समझ नहीं पाता।

मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ। बसने प्रोजेक्ट में हो या कंस्ट्रक्शन में हो क्या रेलवे बोर्ड बतला सकता है कि कैंजुअल लेबर जिस को ४५ रु० मासिक मिलता है, इन्क्लूडिंग एबीसिंग, जो आप के क्लास ४ में आता है, क्या इतने से अपना पेट पाल सकता है? चावल का दाम कितना है, यू हैव अनाउंस्ड, कपड़े का दाम कितना हो, दवा दारू का दाम कितना हो, यू हैव अनाउंस्ड। It is known to you what school fees are.

आल गवर्नमेंट स्टैंडिस्त आप के पास हैं। अगर ठीक से देखा जाय तो ४५ रु० में उस की फीमिली चल नहीं सकती है। जब मैं ने इस के बारे में पूछा तो रेल अधिकारियों ने कहा कि क्या किया जाय, गुप्त जी, देश में रुपया कम है और काम ज्यादा है। काम तो करना ही होगा इसलिये कैंजुअल लेबर रखना ही होगा। मैं ने कहा, मैं यह बात जरूर मानता हूँ, लेकिन एक बात हो सकती है कि जिस तरह से प्रोजेक्ट वर्क में ७५ रु० पाने वाले की जगह एक ४५ रु० का अनाउंस्ड प्रादमी रखा जा सकता है उसी तरह से प्रोजेक्ट वर्क पर जेनरल मैनेजर की जगह पर एक कैंजुअल जनरल मैनेजर रखा जा सकता है और उधे की रिड्यूस्ड पेवी जा सकती है। उस की कैंजुअल

रेट पर रखा जाय। इस वर रेलवे बोर्ड ने यह जबाब दिया कि उस जगह पर काम करने के लिये लायक धादमी नहीं मिलेंगे। मैं ने कहा कंटेन्शन से कि

You can force the engineers on conscription to serve for the next two years after passing college courses by turns, and there will be no dearth in the categories of the engineers and technicians, just as it happened in the American or the British countries in 1945 or so during war periods.

मैं ने कहा कि क्या ४० वं वाले धादमी का पेट काट कर देश का काम बनेगा? लेकिन इस की कोई सुनवाई नहीं होती है।

This is how our country is progressing with the peculiar economic policy during period of our planning!

अब आप रेलवे प्लानिंग की बात देखिये।

Even a man in the street, through a representative organisation, even the smallest shopkeeper in the whole of the country, who has his chamber of commerce and comes through it, submits his opinion on planning.

हर धादमी को कॉन्फिडेंस में लिया गया।

मैं आप को सुनाना चाहता हूँ कि प्लान के बारे में उनकी प्रोपीनियन मांगी गई।

But the poor railway employees were not consulted either through the trade unions or any other organisation. They cannot approach the MLA or MP, because the embargo of the service conduct rules are there. So, the millions of the toiling Railwaymen could not have their say regarding planning in Railways even through unions to get the things done as required to implement the Plan.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे बालूम नहीं कि मैं आप से किस भाषा में कहूँ। मगर बात यह है कि जब हमारे सदन के माननीय सदस्य हिन्दी में बोलते हैं तो हमारे हिन्दी रिपोर्टर होते हैं और जब अंग्रेजी में बोलते हैं तो अंग्रेजी रिपोर्टर होते हैं। अब इस में कुछ कठिनाई आ रही है।

श्री प्रिय गुप्त : अगर इतनी ही कठिनाई है तो इस के लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ जब एक-एक एम० पी० पर १,२०० रुपया खर्च किया जाता है तो उस की भावनाओं के प्रकाशन के लिये हिन्दी, अंग्रेजी, असमिया और बंगला के रिपोर्टर रखे जायें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर धर माननीय सदस्य एक भाषा में बोलें तो रखा जाय। यह तो नहीं हो सकता कि एक मिनट एक भाषा बोलें, दूसरे मिनट दूसरी भाषा बोलें और तीसरे मिनट तीसरी भाषा बोलें तो उसके लिये पंद्रह धादमी रखे जायें। आप किसी एक जवान में बोलें, चाहे हिन्दी में या अंग्रेजी में। हाँ, कोई कंटेन्शन आ जाय तो दूसरी बात है।

श्री प्रिय गुप्त : बाफ कीजिये, मैं कोशिश करूंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बाफ करने का खयाल नहीं है, मैं तो आप को बतला रहा हूँ।

श्री प्रिय गुप्त :

The budget report says that there is an improvement in efficiency. They say all the railwaymen have been working well. There is no doubt. They will admitted it themselves.

पर क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि कितने रेलवेमेन extra hours काम कर रहे हैं?

दोस्तो, मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ

श्री बड़ें (सरगोन) : मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। दूसरी विधान सभाओं में, उदाहरण के लिये मध्य प्रदेश में, इस के लिये दो प्रत्यक्ष-प्रत्यक्ष रिपोर्टर बैठते थे। जब कोई माननीय सदस्य इंग्लिश बोलते थे या कंटेन्शन बगैर रह देते थे तो वह अंग्रेजी रिपोर्टर लिखते थे और जब हिन्दी में बोलते थे हिन्दी रिपोर्टर लिखते थे। तो दूसरी विधान सभाओं की तरह से यहाँ भी होना चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि बजाय इस के कि हमें आप बदलने के लिये

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

कहें, मैं आप से दरखास्त करूंगा कि आप ही एडजस्ट कर लें, जो यहां की प्रैक्टिस बली जाती है, उस के मुताबिक। जो टाइम इस बात चीत में गया है वह मैं आप को और दे दूंगा। मैं आप से यह भी दरखास्त करूंगा कि जब पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर बोला जाता है जो हर एक चीज स्पीकर की तरफ ध्यान दे कर कही जाती है। "दोस्तों" नहीं कहा जाता क्योंकि यह पब्लिक मीटिंग नहीं है।

श्री प्रिय गुप्त : मैं आप से सीखने की कोशिश करूंगा।

Shri Namdar: This is his maiden speech. This is the first time that he speaks here.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, it is my duty to advise him.

Shri Priya Gupta: Provided this is compensated by giving me time.

इस के बाद बात जाती है कि परमानेंट नेगोशिएटिंग मैशिनरी के जरिए आपस में समझौता कर के सवाल हल किये जाते हैं। रिसवेमेन जो हैं उन की जो डिस्प्यूट्स होती हैं उन को हल करने के लिये रेलवे बोर्ड कानून बनाता है। लेकिन जेनरल मैनेजर उन को लागू नहीं करते हैं। कानून में कहा गया है कि क्वार्टर बक्त पर मिलेंगे, युनिफार्म, T.A., O.T., R.A., Leave, Pass वक्त पर मिलेंगे। गैर-कानूनी किस्म से पनिशमेंट देने के बारे में और दूसरी सारी चीजों के लिये भी कानून बने हुए हैं। अगर सारे कानून अफसर लोग मानते तो किसी किस्म की शिकायत नहीं हो सकती थी जेनरल मैनेजर जिस कानून को बनाते हैं अगर उसके डिपेन्डेन्ट अफसर उन को लागू करते तो किसी किस्म की शिकायत नहीं हो सकती थी।

[SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI in the Chair]

Due to the lapses of officers in following strictly the rules laid down as such, the disputes arose and whenever the cases are represented, when individual cases are represented, it is said: "Please refer to clerk so and so, so and so."

तो कैसे हम करें। इंडीबीजुअल केस किस को कहा जाता है? इंडीबीजुअल केस का मतलब क्या है। शिकायत जनरल करते हैं कि इनक्रीमेंट नहीं मिला। लेकिन उसको बगैर इंडीबीजुअल का नाम लिए जनरलाइज कैसे करें। जैसे कि दिल्ली से टेलीफोन किया जाए कि फलां जगह डाका पड़ गया। तो यह जनरल शिकायत हुई लेकिन जब तक यह न कहा जाय कि फलां क्वार्टर में डाका पड़ा है तो उसको इलस्ट्रेटे कैसे किया जाए। तो अगर वक्त पर इनक्रीमेंट नहीं मिलता, या वक्त पर क्वार्टर नहीं मिलता तो इसकी शिकायत जनरल है लेकिन उसको इलस्ट्रेट करने के लिए नाम लेना पड़ता है।

यह है आपकी परमानेंट नेगोशिएटिंग मैशिनरी। यह एक ठंडे मुल्क की चिड़िया है जिसको यहां गरम मुल्क में लाया गया है।

Our Government is also a member of the International Labour Organisation in Geneva. There, there are many commitments and one of the commitments is, they should talk to the railwaymen, through representatives of the union or the federation, and then resolve the grievances.

The meetings should be so arranged that these are resolved through talks this way or that way.

जिस मुल्क से इस परमानेंट नेगोशिएटिंग मैशिनरी की चिड़िया को लाया गया है वहां स्थिति यह है कि अगर किसी अफसर में कोई अफसर किसी क्लर्क से कहता है कि बरत हम को यहाँ करती हदाने में सहारा दो, तो अफसर

बहु बिजी होता है तो कह देता है कि मैं इस समय बिजी हूँ, अगर मैं इस काम में लग जाऊंगा तो मेरे काम को बाधा बंधा की देरी हो जाएगी, आप किसी दूसरे क्लर्क को बुला लें और अफसर दूसरे क्लर्क को बुला लेता है। लेकिन हमारे देश में स्थिति यह है कि चाहे कोई छोटा अफसर भी हो और अगर उसको क्लर्क इस प्रकार का जवाब देगा तो वह कहेगा :

Bloody fool, you carry out my orders. You are not concerned with what work is given to you.

इसी तरह से चार्जशीट देने का मामला है। अगर किसी को आइटम नं० ८ में कांस्टीट्यूशन की धारा ३११(२) के अनुसार चार्जशीट दिया जाता है तो उसमें एनक्वायरी का प्रावजन है। उसको बचाने के लिए उसे छोटे जुर्म में सजा (आइटम नं० ४) दे दी जाती है। एनक्वायरी में बहुत बातें निकलती हैं इसलिए उससे बचते हैं।

He gives a lower punishment for which no enquiry is required.

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे अनुरोध करूंगा कि इस समय रेलवे मन्त्री यहाँ मौजूद नहीं हैं। उनको मौजूद होना चाहिए। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस विभाग के इतिहास को देखा जाए तो आपको पता चलेगा कि किस प्रकार चार्जशीट बनाए जाते हैं कि एनक्वायरी न करनी पड़े और लोगों को इस तरह पीनेलाइज किया जाता है। होता यह है कि वही डिस्ट्रिक्ट अफिसर जो कि चार्जशीट देता है, वहीं एनक्वायरी करता है और पनिशमेंट देता है।

इसके अतिरिक्त जब Permanent Negotiating मीटिंग होती है तो यूनियन वालों को तीस सवाल (dispute) से ज्यादा नहीं करने दिए जाते। अफसरों की गलतफहमी के कारण, और उनके कानून के शोड़ने के कारण लोगों की सरबिस कंटीशन पर आघात लगता है, उनको इनकीमेट नहीं मिलता, क्वार्टर नहीं मिलता, गलत ट्रांसफर

कर दिया जाता है। इस तरह की कई कठिनाइयाँ उनके सामने आती हैं। लेकिन जब P. N. M. मीटिंग में यूनियन या रेलवेमैन्स फेडरेशन के लोग जाते हैं तो उनको कहा जाता है कि आप तीस सवाल से ज्यादा नहीं कर सकते। अब आप देखें कि धीरों की बात कैसे कही जाए। चाहे लाखों मजदूरों की बात कहनी हो सवाल तीस से ज्यादा नहीं पूछ सकते। तो हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि :

This permanent negotiating machinery is a substitute of the provisions of I.D. Act by agreement with the then Railway Minister, Shri Gopalaswami Aiyangar, and Mr. Jaya Prakash Narayan, the then President of the All-India Railwaymen's Federation. This P.N.M. machinery is in lieu of the conciliation procedures as provided under the Industrial Disputes Act. We are taking recourse to the other provisions also. Yet the P.N.M. is not being honoured; the permanent negotiating machinery has become a mockery. Kindly take out from each railway union and each General Manager's office the number of P.N.M. meetings held for the last five years. After the discussions in P.N.M. meetings the only sort of decision is "it is being looked into" or "the matters from District Officers have not been supplied" or "answers will be given in time" or "I will look into the case", etc. That is all. There is no final decision. Even luckily if any dispute is finalised, there is no implementation. This is the condition of the Permanent Negotiating Machinery. The grievances of the workers are being piled up day by day. Who is to resolve them? If they outburst, then bad motives are being attributed.

I now come to the merger of the two Federations. The railways have got two Federations. One is the INTUC—National Federation of Indian Railwaymen—Shri Vasavada's group—and the other is the All-India Railwaymen's Federation that is Mr. Peter Alvares and Shri Guruswamy group. The All-India Railwaymen's Federation is the only Railway Federation in

[Shri Priya Gupta]

Indian Railways since the birth of the railway union. In 1948 by force, a parallel Federation was created by the Railway Administration through the backdoor and passes were granted to them. It was allowed to be nurtured and grown by the merciful attitude of the officers then prevailing. When Shri Jayaprakash Narain was there in A.I.R.F., the I.N.T.U.C. Federation was allowed to grow. At one stage, it merged and again it separated. Again the question came whether it should be merged or not.

श्रीर फर आखर में जस्टिस मजूमदार को दोनों फंडरेशन के मरजर के मामले तय करने के लिए भेजा गया ।

It is not the All-India Railwaymen's Federation, but the INTUC's Federation which expressed the candid opinion that they are not in favour of merging. The policy of the Government of India is that there should be one Federation all-India-wise. Under the same INTUC Federation—NFIR—, Railway Administration had given recognition to two separate unions in each of railways,—in the Eastern Railway, North Eastern Railway and very recently in the N.F. Railway. When they talk of merger, I cannot understand why they are creating parallel unions in each of the railways under the same INTUC Federation. I cannot understand the policy of the Railway Administration in creating multiplicity of unions and creating a rift among the railwaymen, so that actually the railwaymen cannot unite and fight against the autocracy and the bad gestures of the officers of the railway administration. Industrialisation definitely diminishes the number of workers. At the advent of industrialisation, the problem of surplus workers should be solved. The working hours must be reduced and some other devices must be arranged to see that none of the people are made surplus. So, transfers from steam locomotives to diesalisation

must be done in such a way and on such a policy that no hardship is caused to the workers.

इसके बाद मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपके रेलवे बोर्ड ने कार ही परचम का एक क्लॉसिफिकेशन काफ आरट्रिजन स्टाफ, एक ट्राइबुनल बैठाई थी । अब आप देखें कि ३५ से ६० की ग्रेड (prescribed scale) में बेसिक ट्रेड्समैन होते हैं । इनके लिए नियम यह है कि पांच साल में जो स्किल्ड लेबर बाले रिटायरहों या मर जाएं उनकी ३३ १/३ परसेंट जगहों है इन बेसिक ट्रेड्समैन को रखा जाए । सुकिन अगर जब एनेलेसिस करके देखा जाए तो मालूम होगा कि १०० skilled posts में से ८० पर इनको (Basic Tradeamen) रखा गया जो कि कानून के और एवांड के खिलाफ है । ये बी० टी० एम० लोग लरनर होते हैं इनको इतनी ज्यादा संख्या में तथा स्किल्ड लेबर की जिम्मेदारी नहीं देनी चाहिए । यह कानून के खिलाफ है और ट्रिब्युनल के एवांड के खिलाफ है और मैं नहीं समझता कि कैसे इस तरीके से काम चल रहा है ।

Direct recruitment in intermediate categories of Class III and Class IV Staff का सवाल उठाया । फंडरेशन की P.N.M. मीटिंग में हम लोगों को बताया गया था कि in future यह प्रथा बही रहेगी कि खलासी फिट्टर होंगे, फिट्टर्स से मिस्त्री होंगे, मिस्त्री से चार्जमैन होंगे, चार्जमैन से फोरमैन होंगे । यह पहले यह रिवाज था लेकिन अब हास्त दूसरी है और अब यह इंटरमीडिएट कैटेगरी से प्रमोशनस क्लास ३ और क्लास ४ स्टाफ को नहीं दिये जायेंगे । क्लास ३ और क्लास ४ कैटेगरीज से Intermediate Categories में डाइरेक्ट रिक्रूटमेंट लागू कर दिया गया है । ऐसा करने के कारण फंडरेशन को कहा यह जाता है कि इससे न्यु

ब्लड धारणा और एफिशिएंसी बढ़ेगी। पहले के एपाएंटेंट धारणी भाज के जमाने के ऐंटी-बेटेड हो जाते हैं चूकि दिन पर दिन टेक्निकल ऐडवांसमेंट हो रहा है। लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि अगर यही कारण डाइरेक्ट रिक्लूमेंट करने का वहां पर है तो क्यों नहीं डिस्ट्रिक्ट आफिसर्स को जो कि क्लास १ गजेटेड कैडर में प्रोमोशनर्स भरती होते हैं और नौकरी में आवे हैं उन लोगों को क्यों डैपुटी हैड आफ दी डिपार्टमेंट में प्रमोट किया जाय और वहां पर भी डाइरेक्ट रिक्लूमेंट क्यों न हो ? There must be direct recruitment for the post of Head of Department and General Manager's post on par with the direct recruitment policy adopted in the higher intermediate grades of Class III and Class IV staff. District officers recruited 12 years back must have passed out from their colleges in engineering and technology but these branches have advanced. So, these district officers are unfit for promotion beyond the Deputy Head of Department, on the same line of argument put forward for Class III and Class IV staff. जनरल मैनेजर की पोस्ट पर और हैड आफ दी डिपार्टमेंट की पोस्ट पर पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन द्वारा डाइरेक्ट रिक्लूमेंट किया जाय o that fresh blood with more advanced technical knowledge may be available. But the Railway Board does not agree.

१-४-५६ को रेलवे मिनिस्टर ने प्रप-पोजिग का "न्यू डील" निकाला था। इसमें सारी हायर ग्रेडेड पोस्ट्स अनफिल्ड पड़ी हुई हैं और लोअर ग्रेडेड स्टाफ से हायर ग्रेड का काम लिया जाता है जो कि रेलवे मिनिस्टर के वाकदे के खिलाफ जाता है।

Conciliatory machinery for resolving disputes of railwaymen का जहां तक सवाल है, after P.N.M. level with Railway Board here must be a permanent tribunal with a neutral judge. Wherever we disagree at the level of the Railway Board, the issue must be sent to the

tribunal for arbitration and its award must be compulsorily accepted.

इस सिलसिले में मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जस्टिस चंकरचरण टिम्बूनल ने जो एवार्ड दिया था उस एवार्ड को लागू किया गया या नहीं ?

Total number of amounts pending before the railway administration due to arrears of pay, overtime, T.A. & R.A. etc.—are to the extent of crores of rupees. जो स्टाफ रिटायर कर

दिया गया है उसको अभी तक पेंशन का पैसा नहीं मिला है। डिप्यूरन्स एलाउन्स अभी तक अनपेड है जबकि North East Frontier Railway का बिहार, असम और वेस्ट बंगाल में काम करने वाले रेलवे अफसरान को तीन-तीन advance इनकीमेंट्स दे दिये जाते हैं लेकिन इसके विरुद्ध हम देखते हैं कि क्लास ३ और क्लास ४ के गरीब मुलाजिमों को यह तीन इनकीमेंट नहीं दिये गये हैं। मैंने इस और रेलवे बोर्ड का ध्याम दिलाया लेकिन कोई जवाब नहीं दिया गया।

लेकिन टैक्स के बारे में मुझे यह कहना है कि जिसको क्वार्टर नहीं है या पसाने नहीं हैं, जहां पलश टाइप, वाटर क्लोसेट या एकूभा टाइप लेकिन हैं अर्थात् जहां कि बंगी के जाने की जरूरत नहीं होती है वहां भी रेलवे मजदूरों से यह लैट्रिन टैक्स (अंजरवेंसी टैक्स) रिट्रीसपैक्टिव एफेक्ट से काटा जाता है। जब कोई ऐरियस देने की बात होती है तो पेमेंट बेट आफ दी इश्यू आफ दी रेलवे बोर्ड्स लटर से किया जाता है लेकिन जब मजदूरों का कुछ पैसा काटने का सवाल उठता है तो उसको रिट्रीसपैक्टिव एफेक्ट से काटा जाता है।

डिप्यूरन्स एलाउन्स के बारे में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि डी० ए० फिक्स करने के लिए रिजर्व बैंक आफ इण्डिया जो नीम अर्थात् कौन्सिल आफ लिबिन इंडेक्स फिक्स करता है

[श्री प्रिय गुप्त]

उसमें रेल मजदूरों का इनकीज्ड क्वार्टर रेंट का ऐमाउण्ट जोड़ा जाता है कि नहीं। रेलवे मिनिस्टर साहब अपने बजट में सिर्फ यह बतला रहे हैं कि इनकीज्ड रेंट से डिभरनेस एलाउस देने में १३ करोड़ रुपये खर्च हुआ लेकिन वह यह क्यों नहीं बतलाते हैं कि आज तक उनकी तिजारी में increased quarters rent तथा कंजरवेंसी टैक्स की सूरत में जो कि मजदूरों से वसूल किया जाता है कितना रुपये जमा होता है ?

जहां तक विजिलेंस प्रागॅनाइजेशन का ताल्लुक है मेरा निवेदन है कि यह सिर्फ क्लास ३ और क्लास ४ स्टाफ के लिए ही नहीं होनी चाहिए बल्कि इसको क्लास १ अर्थात् रेलवे अफसरान के बारे में भी जांच-पड़ताल करनी चाहिए।

I want to know from this House what has happened to Mr. Lobe, District Engineer of Pandu. Is there anything going on in connection with some theft case or corruption case?

उनको किस अवस्था में रक्खा गया उसके बारे में मैं सफाई चाहता हूँ। Our Railway Sectional officers are not allowed to function properly under the SSP due to intervention by the Railway officers. They are threatened that they will again have to come back in the regular Railway cadre and that R.S.O's. feel their services shall be endangered since R.S.O's. posts are tenure posts on loan from Railway Cadre for 3 to 4 years. R.S.O's. must be given the immunity from being victimised.

प्रब होता यह है कि विजिलेंस इंस्पेक्टर केवल क्लास ३ और ४ स्टाफ की चोरियां ही पकड़ते हैं और उनमें ग्रेड १ अफसरान की चोरियां पकड़ने की हिम्मत नहीं होती है क्योंकि उनको मालूम रहता है कि उनको बाद में रिवर्ट होना पड़ेगा।

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: Sir, generally, hon. Members are not allowed

to refer to officers by name in this House.

Mr. Chairman: Let the hon. Member now conclude.

Shri Priya Gupta: Only half a minute, Sir.

For the functioning of the Plan period, to gain the confidence of the labourers without whom the work cannot go on and who are a part and parcel of the national population, I would urge a change in the gesture of the officers, in the approach of the officers, to bring confidence in the minds of our labourers. That way by creating a congenial atmosphere the officers of the Railway Board and of the different Railways would be serving the country at large more if they bring confidence in the minds of the labour.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I welcome this Budget with a mixed feeling. While I appreciate the achievements of the Railways in the Second Five Year Plan, I put myself again the question why enough or much more could not have been achieved in that period.

The record of the Railways in the Second Five Year Plan has been impressive in the sense that it has achieved the physical and financial targets, it has added to the track capacity, new lines and others within the outlay provided in the Plan.

But the question is, after all the achievements in the Second Five Year Plan, why is it that the Railways could not keep up that tempo, could not do up to the expectations of the people in the first year of the Third Five Year Plan. Discussions were held in this House on the interim budget just about a month back, and then also senior hon. Members like Shri Mathur raised the question of transport capacity, as he has done even now, and many important problems regarding the Rail-

Railways which have been very seriously threatening our economic progress in the first year of the Third Five Year Plan. But we could not see any answer coming forward, we could not see anything which could be said to be the reasons saying that these were the possibilities, these were the shortcomings and this is why we failed, we could not keep up the tempo in the first year of the Third Five Year Plan.

Sir, the achievements of the Railways in the Second Five Year Plan had been marvellous and if you reason out the causes for their behaviour in the first year of the Third Five Year Plan I have to come to the conclusion, though most reluctantly, that our public undertaking has failed, it could not keep up to the expectations of the people. Why? I think the reply is that this great enterprise of ours could not see into the distant future, could not catch, arrest and imprison the future circumstances that were likely to arise as a result of our fast growing economy in the Third Five Year Plan. That is why we have this bottleneck.

Sir, the greatest thing that is being mentioned, the greatest blot on the Railway Ministry today is this that they have failed to handle the traffic that has arisen in the first year of the Third Five Year Plan. Just now mention was made—it was mentioned before also—about coal. That is the lifeline of our industry, the lifeline of our steel, the lifeline of millions of hearths and homes. What has been the reply of the hon. Minister? What has the hon. Minister said in his Budget Speech on this very serious matter? He says: "The Railways have been meeting the full demands of the steel plants and washeries; demands for wagons for outlying coalfields were also met in full". If that be the fact we welcome this announcement. But we would like to know from the ex-Minister of Steel and the present Railway Minister whether it is a fact. Is it not a fact that the Railways were not meeting in full the demands of steel? If he contra-

dicts that, then, is it not a fact that the industry in this country is crying from Press and platform that their demands are not fully met. Their representatives even in this House during the last discussion have said that the industry is living from hand to mouth, they have stock of coal hardly for two or three days and because they are able to collect together and pass on the surplus from one industry to another they are able to run their industries. If this is the situation, then shall I not say that the Railway Ministry is devoid of imaginative personnel who can see into the distant future, who can see the demands of our fast growing economy, our fast moving economy and the demands of the Railways. They should have thought this much ahead and should have supplied to this economy the necessary wagons that is demanded of them.

If what is said about the industry is not correct, then I shall stand myself as a witness among the vast millions of our countrymen who need coal for their hearths and homes. We know, even the hon. Minister has said in his speech, that there has been shortage, there has been this bottleneck for some unavoidable reasons. What are they? This is just a cover to hide the fact that they could not do much in respect of coal. It has been said even by the Coal Controller in an estimate that in 1961 they wanted an average of 6150 wagons but they were supplied 4758 and even as early as in January last they could put only 4731 wagons. I heard a big friend in the NCDC saying that the corporation was producing about 7 to 7½ million tons but they were purposely cutting down 3 million tons of production because the Railways could not co-operate with them in lifting that quantity. Is that not the situation? If that be the situation, then we can say that we could not get any assurance from the hon. Minister in his Budget Speech that this will not happen

14 hrs.

We have seen in the last year of the Second Plan that we could not

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

meet the target fixed for raising coal. Then what is the position in the first year of the Third Plan? The target which was short of fulfilment in the Second Plan could not be fulfilled even in the first year of the Third Plan. This is a very sorry state of affairs which must be looked into. The same is the case with cement and other essential commodities. They are not being carried to the far distant places in the country with the result that there will be no roads, no schools or health centres in the villages. It is necessary that the entire transport policy of the railways is re-oriented. Our senior colleague, Shri Mathur, has suggested in the House that there must be an inquiry into this matter. By the word 'inquiry' we do not mean here a charge-sheet; we are not demanding that. What we want is that the Planning Commission should re-assess the value of the railways, must re-assess the requirements of the railways and the part that the railways have to play in the developing economy of the country. Therefore, a commission, either of the Planning Commission itself or outside, must be set up to find out why these bottlenecks are hampering our progress and to suggest remedies.

Whenever we raise the question of the part the railways have to play in our economy, we receive a strange answer. I was going through the debates and I found that one Deputy Minister has replied in very nice terms to this question by saying "What can we do? We should be told ahead as to what requirements will be placed on us. Also, additional funds should be made available to us" as if we have to tell them what the requirements will be and how much funds will be needed. The Planning Commission is always made a scape-goat by the Ministry which cannot function efficiently. Therefore, that Deputy Minister says that it is the Planning Commission which should look into the matter as if the railways have no plan of their own, as if the railways do not know what the demands of the country are.

If they are to say that the Planning Commission must tell them what they are to do, then I would say that the Railway Minister, along with this deputies, should walk out and the Planning Commission and the Planning Minister should come here to look after that work. But that is not the proper thing. I hope the new Railway Minister will tell us that the responsibility is his and that it is the responsibility of the railways to provide the country wagons and coaches to carry the increased passenger and goods traffic.

I agree with the railways in their view that the Planning Commission must assess the requirements on the railways. I am myself of the opinion that the railways are working overtime, working to the saturation point, that it is not possible for the railways to carry additional traffic or to meet the future increasing demands on them. Let the Railway Minister say in all fairness to the Planning Commission and to the Government "Look here, I cannot do it without additional funds; this is my difficulty" instead of making the Planning Commission a scape-goat. We should be told that it is not possible for the railways to increase their capacity with the present limited allocations. I know that it is not possible for the railways to do that. Therefore, I join the Railway Ministry in saying that it is high time that the entire matter is looked into and that sufficient funds should be placed at the disposal of the Railway Ministry to expand on all sides to meet the increasing demands of the country.

When we find that the freights and fares have been increased I would not say like Shri Nambiar that it is a very bad thing. I know that when an under-developed country wants to make rapid progress and go ahead of other progressive nations, it has to suffer and make sacrifices. The countries of eastern Europe took two hundred years to come to their present stage. The U.S.S.R. also had to make

a lot of sacrifices. Compared to that, the progress that we have made during the last 14 or 15 years is remarkable. There is no doubt about it. At the same time, we should not remain content with what we have achieved. We have to march ahead and that requires further sacrifices. So, we know that the fares have to be increased. But, at the same time, we want to be satisfied, the country wants to be satisfied that the increase in revenue has been properly used. To be frank, I am not at all convinced that the railways are working efficiently and that necessary economies are being effected in the railways. The hon. Minister in his budget speech also had nothing to say specially on this point; he just made an indication that economy is being effected. We would like to have the details of it in concrete terms. When they demand from us increased fares and freights, we have certainly the right to demand from them the details of the economy they have effected in the railways. Now we have not been told in concrete terms in the railway budget as to what the Railway Ministry has done in this direction.

If you want an increase in fares and freights to expand your activities, have it. But what about the amenities? In the first Parliament I fought for five years for increased amenities to the passengers. I vividly remember that I had to fight very doggedly against the two spoiled children of Railway Ministry, i.e., caterers Vallabhdas and Keelner to liquidate them. But what is the result? Today when we travel from one part of India to another part we find that the proudly proclaimed and much advertised nationalised caterers are behaving in a shabbier way than the private caterers. So, what I am saying is that when you increase the fares, you must also provide amenities to the travelling public. Then, what about over-crowding? Has it been solved at least partially? Not that we are aware of. The hon. Minister can verify it and see whether we

are exaggerating things. He should know that we, most of us, are experiencing this difficulty almost every day. So, the fact remains that over-crowding is there and the passengers are not provided with enough amenities. We have always been assured in this House that the Government will look into this matter. How far have they looked into the matter? Therefore while you say that in an under-developed economy where you have to meet the growing demands of the country you have to increase the fares and freights, you have to levy taxes, you are certainly entitled to say that but, then, we think we are justified in saying we can support this move of the Railway Ministry only when we feel that we are convinced that economy is being effected in the working of the railways and administrative reforms are being introduced to give effect to that. In our opinion, this is not being done.

So far as administrative reforms are concerned, some of my friends from the opposite side have given certain examples. We can also quote a number of instances. But I would not like to mention individual cases. I find that the Railway Ministry is the greatest culprit in implementing the Parkinson's law. So far as the lower level is concerned, that is to say, clerks and others, they are retrenched on grounds of economy. So far as those who are getting Rs. 45 per mensem are concerned, their number is reduced drastically on grounds of economy. On the other hand, you will find any number of OS, DS and AS, increasing day by day because of the application of Parkinson's law. If A wants to retire, he thinks "I am retiring. Who is the man who will succeed me? It will be B. There must be somebody else also who will aspire for that post so that I will become important. So, I will put C in an important position." Then B and C compete among themselves. B wants one D to be junior to him so that he will look superior. Similarly, C appoints E. In this way, F, G and H are also appointed. As Shri Mathur has pointed out, whenever a

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

Member of Parliament writes a letter he receives a reply "this subject is dealt with by C, who may be contacted". In this way, they create work for them. So, though the work in paper increases, there is no corresponding improvement in the situation and the condition of the railways remains where it was. Therefore it is important that the hon. Railway Minister should look into the question of administrative reforms which will bring in economy.

You always show a big picture, but when we tell you that if you want economy you should extend the Bounsi-Mandarhill line to Deoghar, you would say you have no money; when we tell you that people are crying for a halt at Mamalkha or for a crossing station at Ekchari you would say, "Nothing doing". We who come from that area know that if the Railways want to have revenue, why have this skeleton Bounsi-Mandarhill line. You will say, "It is your fault", but actually the fault is yours. Everybody is not born a Harishchandra.

Mr. Chairman: The fault is not mine.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I am sorry, Sir. It is the fault of the Railway Ministry. They are not providing proper safeguards. It is necessary that it should be looked into. Where you have put in a lot of money, about a crore or so for a line why not put in a few lakhs into it so that it is extended up to a particular place? Have proper provision. Tighten these loopholes through which the entire money goes out in the form of non-travelling. You will not do it. When we ask for a halt or for a crossing, these things have to be looked into. That will definitely fetch in greater revenue.

Therefore in the end my suggestion is that it is high time that the Planning Commission should assess the future role of the Railways in our economy. You have seen the mess of the

Railways not coping with the traffic in the first year of the Third Five Year Plan. So, if that assessment is not done, how will they be able to cope with the 45 per cent increase of traffic that is visualised in the Third Five Year Plan? It is also necessary that there should be another commission to look into the question of proper co-ordination between the railways and road transport. This point is very important. I could not make it out but I am happy that this was emphasised by our friend, Shri Mehta, ex-Member, some time in the last Parliament. As a result of this increased freight, there will be a certain diversion of short distance traffic from the railways to road transport. Therefore it is essential that another commission should be appointed to look into this matter, lest there may be cut-throat competition between rail and road.

With these words I conclude.

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedbad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I join my hon. friends on this side of the House in registering my emphatic protest against the unwarranted and unjustifiable increase in railway freights and fares. The hon. Railway Minister has stated that the fares have remained more or less stationary since 1951. Then how do you get more revenue from the fares every year? It is because the population is increasing. If you look at your own figures, you find that during all these years the revenue from railway fares, to take them first, is increasing rapidly beyond the expectations of the Railway Ministry.

Another point that I would make out is that after all the Railways also are a commercial institution. You serve and you take money. If you give better service, you take more, certainly, from us. But the whole point is: Is the Railway today in a position to give better service to the passengers? The position need not be dilated upon at all. It is as plain as a pike-staff that the third class passenger is

the most aggrieved person in the whole railway system. Crowding is increasing everyday. The number of people who are hanging on by the rails or by the handles dangerously perched near doors is increasing every year. Thus, you get continuously more revenue because for the same number of trains that you are running you are getting more passengers and more fares. You are getting more money from the total fares that you collect every year. Does the hon. Railway Minister hold out any prospect of giving better service to the third class passenger? Does he hold out any hope of reducing this overcrowding in the trains? Time and again I have heard from the ex-Railway Minister in this House that he can hold out no prospect of any substantial reduction in overcrowding. In fact, he may not say it, but the fact is that overcrowding is increasing. People who travel in third class compartments are doing so at great risk to their health, to their safety some times, to their comfort and to their sleep. And the prospect is not likely to be redeemed at all in the near future! If you do not give better service, if the third class passenger is doomed to remain in these crowded overheated compartments without the barest amenities of life for it is impossible sometimes for a railway passenger to go to the bathroom or to the lavatory, so crowded are the passages, if he cannot get the minimum requirements that are necessary for his safety, comfort and happiness, how is the Railway Ministry justified in getting one more pie or one more naya paisa from him? Therefore, on grounds of equity and on grounds of contract between the passenger and the Railways, the entire argument about the increase in fares topples to the ground.

Then you have also to remember that today we are living in very straitened conditions. Whatever the Finance Ministry and the Government spokesmen might say it is a fact that prices are soaring. They are spiral-

ling up, making it difficult for the common man to make two ends meet. Incomes are fixed and steady, rarely increasing to the necessary levels while prices are increasing making things dearer around. Even when dearness allowance is given, as it is given sometimes to some class of employees, even that is not sufficient to meet the increase in the cost of living. I know that in the city of Ahmedamad, for instance, even the Labour Office takes the standard rent of Rs. 4/10/- when actually most of the labourers are paying anything between Rs. 15/- and Rs. 25/- even in some Government quarters. So, when the millions in this land are finding life more difficult to live and to equate their incomes with expenditure, I say in these circumstances it will be a cruel and an unjust wrong to the common man to pile this additional burden of this increase in fares.

So far as the freight charges are concerned, that is another story. Here again, the picture is very dark and sombre. It has been said by many hon. friends on this side that the Railways are not able to cope with the freight traffic as they are not able to cope with the passenger traffic. The line capacity is limited. There are not enough wagons. There are not enough coaches. The number of locomotives is limited. Therefore, they cannot run more trains than they are doing now. But the freight is increasing every year. Compared to the number of wagons and the number of engines, more and more freight is carried; and that naturally gives more revenue to the Railways. I say that during the last ten years, and during the last five years of the Second Plan period, income both from fares as well as from freights has been increasing. And that has been increasing because the population is increasing, their wants are increasing, the amount of goods being transported from one part of the country to another part of the country is increasing. That, naturally, has been giving an increase in the railway income from fares and freights.

[Shri Yajnik]

The point is, is the Railway Board in a position to give better service to the people who want to consign their goods from one place to another? There again, it is a very sad story. Often enough, arbitrarily or according to their own convenience, the Railway Board closes booking from one point to another. And so, whether it is the common man or the merchant, he has to sit with folded hands and wait for the mercy of the Railway Administration to open the booking.

Many things are in short supply. Coal, for one, is in very short supply. In Ahmedabad City, which I have the honour to represent, there was a deputation of businessmen who waited on a senior railway officer. There were mill-owners and merchants; there were coal merchants also—no agitators, no politicians, just hard-headed businessmen. And they represented to the railway officer: "Why are we not getting the coal that we used to get even last year? Why is there this deficiency in coal?" The argument about the three steel plants, is, of course, in front of us. Well, the Planning Commission has taken into account the necessities of all the steel plants and the necessities of all the industries and businessmen in the whole country.

14.23 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

You have planned for the necessities, and you have planned for the equipment for meeting these necessities. Is anything gone wrong with your plans? Did the Railway Administration not know that the three steel plants had to be commissioned and their necessities had to be met in full—iron ore and all the other materials that they required? And then, did they not order the necessary number of wagons, box wagons or the open-type wagons for carrying coal from the eastern parts of India to all the other parts, whether it is U.P., Gujarat, Maharashtra or South or North? But you hear complaints about coal not merely from Ahmedabad or

Gujarat, you hear them all round, you hear them in U.P., you hear them in Punjab, you hear them even in Bengal. But we are time and again told that we have to serve the three steel plants first.

I suspect that something went wrong in planning or in carrying out the plans. Why did not the Railway Ministry take stock of the entire situation beforehand? Why did they not foresee the amount of coal and the amount of iron ore and other necessities to be supplied to the steel plants? And why did they not also take into account the normal requirements of industries that have been established, and of more industries that were being established in the whole country, and order the necessary number of wagons and locomotives in time to meet the total needs of all these industries? I find somebody whispering in my ear that something went wrong in the Railway Ministry. I speak subject to correction, but I believe that the number of box wagons, the number of wagons that were required for carrying coal, sufficient number of wagons, were not ordered in time. And perhaps another type of wagon was ordered instead of the right type of wagon that was necessary for transporting coal. Because, it is just in the matter of coal that the inadequacy of the Railway Administration has been clearly seen. Well, something went wrong. Otherwise, we should not have to lament about this paucity of coal for industries all over India.

Instead of readily confessing their failure and putting the finger on the right spot they go on giving all kinds of wonderful figures to show that all is best in the Land of the Railways and that they have been meeting all the requirements of the steel plants and of the other plants to the best of their capacity. No, Sir, the picture is not as good as is being made out either by the Railway Ministry, by the Railway Minister or by the Chairman of the Railway Board. Something has gone wrong, and I think an en-

quiry should be made into the matter and the persons who are really guilty of serious mistake and mishandling of the Plan should be properly dealt with; because this is a crime that has been committed, a crime against the industries established for long all over the country and against the people who depend on the industries. I do not like as soon as I get up in the morning to read in the newspapers that the Ahmedabad mills are likely to be closed within the next two or three days. And then, when they will open again, we do not know. This prospect is dismal and shocking. The Railways, with all their great finances and with all the great offices that they are running, have failed in this vital matter of meeting the necessary demands of the industries all over the country. And I think that if proper and thorough measures are not taken in time we are likely to suffer from this malady for years and years to come. I therefore plead with the Government to order a thorough enquiry especially into this matter of the transport of coal which is a very vital commodity required for running all kinds of industries. The shortage of coal is so great.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. Member like to finish within the next three or four minutes or to continue his speech on Monday?

Shri Yajnik: I will finish within three or four minutes, because I am leaving tonight.

Shri Speaker: Very well, he may continue.

Shri Yajnik: Having said this much, I have now to cover some other points. The narrow gauge railway is another subject that also requires to be carefully looked into. I know that the narrow gauge railway is to be closed down. But it continues to operate. Government does reap a good harvest from these narrow gauge lines that are run now. They go fully over crowded, and yet, Sir, the primary necessities of life are missing in them. There is no water; and there is no light sometimes when the trains are running at night. It is dangerous for all

people and especially for women and children to travel in grim darkness in the night from one point to another for hours and hours together. The trains are also late. I would plead with the railway administration to inquire into the matter and to see that the primary amenities are arranged for in these narrow gauge railway coaches.

Then, Sir, I am sorry to see that the Saurashtra Railways have been the Cinderella in the whole of the railway system, like the narrow gauge railways. We had been hoping for better days when the Saurashtra Railways were taken over by the Government of India. But the trains are running as slow as ever. Perhaps there might have been some light improvement. They are as irregular as ever; they are as over-crowded as ever and there is not sufficient coordination between the different lines. I must admit that there are a good many lines that are running in Saurashtra. With regard to the new lines that are being opened in Gujarat, I am glad to see some good progress being made with the Himmatnagar-Udaipur line; but I am afraid that hardly any progress is being made on the Zund-Kandla line. The Zund-Kandla line is even more important for the development of the Kandla port than the Himmatnagar-Udaipur line. The Himmatnagar-Udaipur line is all right for connecting Gujarat and Rajasthan. But I would plead with the railway administration to make more money available during this year and to speed up the laying of rails between Zund and Kandla.

Lastly, Sir, I have to say a word about workers' quarters. As I was sitting in my office one day two men came to me pleading with me for some relief. On enquiry I found that they had come from country-side. They were in the railway service—fourth class servants. Not getting any accommodation from the railways and having to work near the railway lines, they had built some kutcha huts within the railway yard. They complained

[Shri Yajnik]

to me bitterly that their little huts had been demolished on that day. I asked them to see the high-ups, the station master and other people. But they said they did not care. They asked them to find their own accommodation. But where are they to go? They are not given quarters. I can understand that. The railway has not sufficient quarters. But when you get a man from countryside, a poor man with family who comes all the way miles and miles away from his hearth and home, when you bring him to a big city like Ahmedabad, permit him to put up his hut in a small corner of the railway yard, where the track is not disturbed. I would plead, therefore, with the Railway Ministry to adopt a more human and humane policy towards its workers and do justice by them.

14:35 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. Speaker: We shall now take up non-official resolutions. Shri Raghunath Singh's resolution has got the first place. No time allotment has yet been made for it. We might now fix some time for this resolution. We shall allot time for the others as they come.

Would an hour-and-a-half be enough for Mr. Raghunath Singh's resolution?

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): It is a very important resolution. It is a burning question not only in India but the whole world. Therefore, I plead that three hours may be allotted for it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We know that. This subject has been discussed earlier as well. If the House so desires, we may allot two hours for it. The next Member should have an opportunity to move his resolution.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Two hours and twenty-nine minutes may be allotted for it.

Mr. Speaker: Two hours and fifteen minutes will be allotted to this resolution. The mover may take twenty minutes. There are many hon. Members who wish to speak on this resolution. They may take ten minutes each.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): I, for the first time, would take only five minutes.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Sir, I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that capital punishment be abolished."

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रश्न भारतीय संसद् में तीन बार उपस्थित हुआ था। पहले लोक सभा में एक विधेयक के रूप में और राज्य सभा में दो बार सकल्प के रूप में प्रश्न आया था। उसके पश्चात् हाउस आफ कामन्स में भी यह प्रश्न उठाया गया था और सन् १९५६ में हाउस आफ कामन्स ने छपनी राय इस प्रश्न पर दी थी। लोक-सभा, राज्यसभा और हाउस आफ कामन्स में जो वाद-विवाद हुआ था उस को मैं फिर यहाँ पर दुहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ। लेकिन मैं उन बातों का यहाँ पर जिक्र करना चाहूँगा जिनके कि आधार पर मैं चाहता हूँ कि मृत्यु दण्ड व्यवस्था समाप्त की जाय।

सबसे बड़ी बीज जिससे अनुप्राणित होकर मैंने यह प्रस्ताव रक्खा है वह ला कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है। उस रिपोर्ट के भाग २ को अगर आप देखेंगे तो पायेंगे कि ला कमीशन ने बहुत से स्थानों पर कहा है कि आजकल न्याय मिलना एक तरह से कठिन काम हो गया है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि मानवता का तकाजा है कि यह प्राण दण्ड प्रथा समाप्त की जाय।

तीसरी बीज यह है कि यह प्राण