

12.12 hrs.

**MOTION RE REPORT OF ROAD
TRANSPORT REORGANISATION
COMMITTEE**

The Minister of Transport and Communications (Shri S. K. Patil): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Road Transport Reorganisation Committee laid on the Table of the House on the 16th April, 1959"

Mr Speaker, at this stage I would make a few observations, if only to indicate the lines on which the mind of Government has been working on this very important subject. Then, at the end of the debate, after knowing what the hon. Members think about it, I will have occasion to reply.

In order to secure the fuller development of motor transport and its expansion to meet the growing needs of the country, it is essential that there should be suitable machinery at the Centre as well as in the States to look after the various problems facing the industry and to plan and foster its development. It was felt that the existing transport administrative set-up in the States was concerned more with the regulation of motor transport than its planned development. As the House is aware, the Road Transport Organisation Committee—otherwise known as the Masani Committee—was appointed in May last year to conduct a comprehensive enquiry and to make recommendations for the reorganisation of the transport administrative set-up in the States. The Committee submitted its report in March this year—in about ten months' time—and it was placed before the House soon after its presentation. Members interested in road transport development would undoubtedly have familiarised themselves with the findings in that report.

As Members would have studied for themselves, the Committee have made exhaustive recommendations re-

garding reorganisation of the transport administrative set-up in the States. They have recommended that there should be a Transport Ministry in each State to deal exclusively with Roads and Road Transport and such a Ministry should be under a Transport Minister exclusively devoted to these subjects. In the Ministry there should be a Roads Wing under a Chief Engineer and a Transport Wing under a Transport Commissioner, and a Secretary for co-ordinating the work of both the Wings. In a sense, the recommendation is that the State Transport Departments should be reorganised on the lines of the system obtaining in the Union Ministry of Transport and Communications.

The Committee have further recommended that under the Transport Commissioner in a State there should be three Deputy Transport Commissioners dealing with (1) enforcement, (2) licensing and registration of vehicles, and (3) planning and development.

They have further recommended that the State transport authorities should be constituted with an official Chairman with judicial experience, two official Members and two non-official Members. The Transport Commissioner should normally be the Chairman of the State Transport Authority. The Committee have also made a recommendation regarding the hearing of appeals and revision petitions by a State Transport Appellate Tribunal constituted with a full-time judicial officer of the status of a District or Sessions Judge.

The Committee have made certain recommendations to overcome the inhibitory factors in the development of road transport. Increased provision for road construction, grant of permits more freely wherever transport facilities are inadequate, use of trailer-truck combinations, and doing away with multiple taxation are some of the far-reaching recommendations made by the Committee. These recommendations conform generally to

(Shri S. K. Patil)

the views held by the Ministry of Transport. It is only a matter of a little time when these recommendations will be implemented.

They have also recommended the formation of State Transport Advisory Committees composed of heads of departments concerned with the various aspects of transport, Members of Legislative Assemblies, representatives of road transport operators, nominees of Chambers of Commerce and other commercial interests

As the hon Members will realise, most of these recommendations have to be studied and implemented by the State Governments. These recommendations were generally placed before the last meeting of the Transport Development Council held in June in New Delhi. The Council felt that the State Governments should in the first instance be consulted. The State Governments have accordingly been asked to give thought to these recommendations and communicate their views to the Government of India as soon as possible.

It is expected that by about the middle of September their recommendations would be received and the Council's meeting would take place some time in the last week of November or early in December when the final decisions are expected to be taken.

I might touch upon briefly another aspect of the problem of road transport. This relates to the so-called controversy between rail and road transport. I merely said 'so-called' because, in fact, such a controversy does not exist.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur)
Conflict may not exist, but controversy does exist.

Shri S. K. Patil: I am talking in the Ministries themselves, there may be opinions outside.

I am sure there are no two opinions in the country that both rail as well as road transport should be utilised to the fullest advantage of the country. The House will remember that once or twice I gave an assurance to this hon House that at the earliest possible opportunity I would appoint a committee in order to report on what should be the national transport policy of this country. Government have recently set up a committee under the chairmanship of Shri K. C. Neogy to recommend what broadly should be the long-term transport policy of the country, so that the development of the transport machinery may be effected in consonance with our growing needs, with economy and efficiency, avoiding duplication to the maximum extent practicable.

I had also read to this House the terms of reference which were jointly arrived at between the Railway Ministry and our Ministry. I have summarised it in what I have said.

Generally, the recommendations of the Masani Committee are in line with the thinking in the Ministry of Transport on this subject. As soon as the views of the State Governments on the various recommendations are received, the views of the Government of India thereon would be finalised and steps taken to implement them. There may be some aspects of these recommendations which could be implemented straightaway without waiting for the recommendations of the States. They will be implemented. I am merely referring to those important suggestions where the State Governments come in and their decisions or their recommendations have got to be taken into consideration.

I must take this opportunity of thanking the Chairman, my hon friend Shri M. R. Masani and the members of the Committee for the very good job that they have done and the intelligent interest they have stimulated in this very vital national activity, our road transport. Beyond that I do not

want to say anything at this stage. At the end of it, I shall have occasion to reply to the debate.

Mr Speaker: Motion moved

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Road Transport Re-organisation Committee laid on the Table of the House on the 16th April, 1959 "

Shri Asoka Mehta: Mr Speaker, I would like to join the Minister in congratulating my hon friend Shri M R Masani and his colleagues on the Committee for having produced a valuable document. I believe the value of the report would have been greatly enhanced if, as is the habit sometimes of this Government, the cart had not been put before the horse.

It is rather surprising to find the Government coming forward with the appointment of a Committee to draw up a national transport policy for the country after we have received the report of this Road Transport Re-organisation Committee. In the last 12 or 13 years, on more than one occasion, this question was raised and particularly when we are nearing the fag end of the Second Plan period, surely, this attempt at evolving a national transport policy should have been done earlier. It was not done before and even today when this Committee is appointed, it is so loaded with official elements and the non-official element in it is so small that I do not know what kind of a report will come out of it.

The Minister just now enlightened us that there is no controversy, leave aside conflict, as far as the ministerial levels are concerned on this question. If there is no controversy, why has the Co-ordination committee been appointed? Why the constant pre-occupation with Co-ordination? Co-ordination becomes necessary because not only there is a controversy, but there is an inherent conflict which has got to be understood and which has got to be

reconciled, and that is not an easy problem.

If the approach of the Government is that there is not even a controversy inside the secretariat at the Ministerial level, I am afraid, then, today, the Ministers seem to be approaching the problem in an unrealistic manner. The result has been that this Committee had first to correct the focus because, at least as far as any important committee is concerned or any important pronouncement on the part of the Government is concerned, the dice was loaded too much on the one side. One of the first jobs which this Committee had to do was, as I said, to correct the focus, and I think, the Committee has done the job magnificently. But, the question that arises is, has the committee stopped there or has it gone too much in the other direction, has the pendulum been allowed to swing too much to the other side? If that is so, again, it becomes the task of some one to set the focus right.

I find that at a later stage, a representative of the Railway Ministry or the Railway Board was appointed to the Committee. But from the report, it appears that there was not much of creative dialogue between the representative of the Railway Board and the other Members of the Committee. The minute of dissent that the representative of the Railway Board has given has to some extent, been answered in the main report. I do not know whether the main report was written after the minute of dissent was drafted or the main report was revised after the minute of dissent was written or the minute of dissent was written after the main report was seen.

Shri M R. Masani (Ranchi-East): Co-ordination

Shri Asoka Mehta: If there was this kind of co-ordination, I agree with the Minister that nothing further needs to be done because there is telepathic co-ordination. It seems certain documents are prepared in certain offices

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

or bureau and the Committee is not a place where there is a meeting of minds. This shows that what the Minister tried to say that there is no controversy is *prima facie* wrong, if he will permit me to say so without being misunderstood.

This report, to my mind, is very unsatisfactory in many ways because the creative dialogue that should have taken place either has not taken place or at least the readers of the report are not being made wise about it.

There are many things in the report which are valuable and which I would accept straightaway. For instance, as the Minister pointed out, the Committee has made a significant contribution in streamlining the administration. The administration had just grown up and there was no kind of order, no kind of any system or pattern about it. The streamlining that has been suggested is a major service that the Committee has done. But, I feel that the Committee has allowed itself to be influenced by a certain philosophy that the Chairman has, and that is where my quarrel starts. Probably the Committee consisted of persons with a lot of practical experience where probably any kind of theoretical considerations were deemed to be suspect. I suggest that in this matter as in many other matters, theoretical clarity is very necessary. There has not been that theoretical clarity.

Consumers' preference: how is consumers' preference to decide things? If consumers' preference is to decide things, then, it is necessary that the rates that are charged or the price that is charged for transport services must be related to and must be in conformity with the cost. Here is a very able study of the British Transport Policy recently brought out. In the basic principles that are enunciated there, these points are very well brought out. On page 14 it is said:

"This suggests that freedom of choice, although something to which users attach great importance, is not a *sine qua non* of

successful co-ordination. If the charges for different services are not fixed at what it costs to provide them, free choice may lead away from, rather than towards, the most economic allocation of available resources."

Further on, on page 15, it is said:

"But as with the principles of freedom of choice, so with the principles of pricing at cost, we must be clear that it is not any kind of moral absolute."

These principles have got to be gone into in detail. They are not absolute principles. I am not suggesting that the Committee has recommended that they be treated as absolutes or any kind of categorical imperatives. But, the fact remains that a certain approach, a certain philosophy, a certain governing philosophy of the Chairman has percolated as it perhaps happens in other committees. Others with other philosophies have been chairmen of committees and other philosophies have percolated. I am not suggesting this as a kind of charge against the Chairman. That happens when a strong personality is put at the head of a committee. What I say is, that is where we have to be careful to see whether the focus has not been corrected too much on the other side.

The Committee agrees that there has got to be what is known as cross-subsidisation inside a transport service. As far as road transport is concerned, they have argued that it is not enough that a particular motor transport organisation be given certain lines which are paying; while it has certain lines which are paying; it must also undertake certain lines which may be losing, which is the meaning of what is known as the principle of cross-subsidisation, that you gain somewhere and out of that you provide a kind of subsidy elsewhere inside the same service.

The railways argue that they have been following this policy of cross-subsidisation. The first question is: to what extent is that policy justified; and the second question that we have

to ask is whether cross-subsidisation is justified only inside a service or can be accepted between two services also. This is a matter which has not been looked into by the Committee at all

The third question that arises is this To be sure that I understood the Committee correctly, I tried to check up my understanding with the Chairman, or rather ex-Chairman—I do not know whether he can be called the Chairman today—because I did not want to waste the time of the House by saying something which probably I might not be justified in concluding I tried to enquire from him, and he said my understanding was correct that if somewhere the railway system has to operate or has to carry a particular category of goods at rates which are lower than the cost,—whether cost means only the direct cost or also includes indirect cost I do not know, but I presume it would include the indirect cost also—then the Committee has suggested that there should be a subsidy given by the Government

This, again, is a matter of great importance It is a principle whether subsidy should be paid from the State Exchequer for this kind of thing This is a matter which has been discussed in other countries considerably This book on British transport policy which as the result, I believe, of a discussion group which was set up by the Fabian Research Society, has come to the conclusion that subsidy is a wise policy But that, as I said, has got to be discussed, its pros and cons considered Maybe practical men might reach certain conclusions which are justified, I do not know, but unless you go into the pros and cons of the question, very often you would find yourself in considerable difficulties later on They have made certain assumptions, assumptions which are not enquired into, assumptions which have been made because there is a feeling, and perhaps a legitimate feeling, that road transport has been treated as a step-child, but a matter of such importance cannot be decided on the basis of this

kind of a priori assumptions That is one of the points that I would like to make here.

Then again, there are other recommendations of the Committee For instance, it has been said that octroi and other duties which are being levied, which are abnoxious, which create all kinds of difficulties for road transport, should be removed. I was in Bombay recently, and I was told that the Bombay Municipal Corporation is anxious to revise its schedule of octroi duties Already, if I am not mistaken, the Bombay Municipal Corporation has made its recommendations to the Bombay Government for getting the Bombay Corporation Act revised As a result of this revision of the schedule, the Bombay Municipal Corporation hopes to increase its revenues by Rs 80 lakhs to Rs 1 crore a year Supposing we think this is wrong I can understand that for the purpose of free transport and in order to remove the hardships from which today motor transport is suffering, this kind of octroi duties should be removed They have given a number of instances where delay takes places, national wealth to the extent of a crore of rupees is wastefully diverted I grant all that, but what is the result? You have then to make provision, the Government has to have some alternative means and methods of providing the resources needed for our local bodies. The whole defect and difficulty in this piecemeal approach is that you look at the problem and say that in order to help road transport, this obstacle should be removed, without realising that by removing that obstacle, you might be creating obstacles for somebody else. They come running to you. Another Ministry gets up, appoints a committee to remove these obstacles In a society that claims to be attached to planning—and from the report I find that even my hon. friend Shri Masani has no objection to planning; social planning, at least as far as this report is concerned—when we say we are

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

attached not only to the philosophy but the practice of planning, this co-ordination has to be weighed. Has it been weighed? What will happen to the finances of the local bodies if we do this?

In the same way, there is another aspect where I do not blame the Committee. I do not expect the Committee to go into that problem, but we will have to go into that problem. It has been suggested that it is necessary to develop truck transport in the rural areas—trucks with or without trailers, whatever it is, but as far as the rural roads are concerned, I believe the suggestion is that there should be only truck transport and not trailers. Supposing we do that, what will be the consequence? The consequence will be a certain impact on the rural economy. I am not referring just now to what will happen to the traditional transport there, the ten million bullock carts. I leave that to my hon friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava because he is more competent to talk about that. But the impact of truck transport on the economy of the rural areas is bound to be far-reaching. If you are thinking of it in a dynamic perspective over a period of 10, 15 or 20 years, of course, all these things, I believe, will get settled, but if you are looking at it with a limited perspective, what will be the impact in the next two, three or five years? I think the whole problem will have to be looked into very thoroughly. This is not a matter which can be decided by the Transport Minister alone. The Transport Minister can pass orders. I know there are difficulties even in passing simple orders, but comparatively it is easy to pass this order, but then some other Ministry will come up with its difficulties, because the injection or the introduction of a modern system of transport into the traditional economy has its inevitable consequences. As I said, I do not expect the Committee to work it out, but the Government, when they sit down and pass orders on a report like this, have to weigh all these things. I am happy to find there are no controversies as far as the Ministries are concerned

So, this matter also, with the lack of controversy, will perhaps be easy to settle.

There are different forms of transport. There is one form of transport which we have not developed at all, which we will be developing in the near future, and that is the pipelines. With the development of the petroleum industry, the pipelines are going to play an important part. In other countries controversies have started on this question also, but this whole problem of co-ordination has nothing whatsoever to do with ideological considerations. At least that is the conclusion to which serious students of this subject have come to. Whether a particular system is nationalised or not, whether it is under private control or under public control, the questions of co-ordination, the matters of co-ordination remain either as difficult or as easy under either set of circumstances.

Here is a very valuable study of the Soviet transportation policy. The railways very often raise this question, I believe the Railway Ministry has over and over again invited the attention of all concerned to the lessons to be learnt from the Soviet Union as far as transportation policies are concerned. I am sure their experts have gone there and studied things for themselves, but a layman like me can only depend upon the reports of recognised experts in the world on this subject, and this particular study is probably the most comprehensive and the most authoritative that we have in the English language, and the conclusion that has been reached there on pages 159 and 160—I shall not waste your time by reading them—is that ideological considerations do not in any way alter the character of the problem. They say:

"There is no evidence that the Soviet transportation system is any more 'unified' than the American transportation system. In a purely technical sense, the reverse appears more accurate. In each economy, difficult technical pro-

blems are confronted, and political slogans do not aid appreciably in solving them"

Then it is argued further and said

"The outlook for river and sea transportation, on present evidence, in spite of Soviet publicity, does not appear promising. On the other hand, while it is true that enormous investment will be required, the USSR appears well launched on a largescale, gradual program for developing automobile transportation"

So, it is not as if any one particular country can give us a kind of a clear-cut answer to these questions. Transport problems are so intimately connected with economic developments, and economic developments are so much shaped by the distribution of resources, by geographical factors, by economic factors, by social factors, and by political factors that I do not think that the lessons of any one particular country can be wholly relevant to any other country. This is a task where we have got to work the solutions ourselves.

The committee has talked about social control. I do not remember the exact expression used there but some kind of social control is envisaged. Now, the complaint of the member of the committee who has appended the minute of dissent is that the committee has not recognised fully the need for regulation.

There is this inter-State transport commission which has been suggested. As far as intra-State transport is concerned, the suggestion is that permits be given freely. It is argued that because there is a kind of an overall ceiling which cannot be easily pierced—it is provided by our limited ability to produce, our limited capacity to produce, trucks and vehicles, so, there is a kind of an automatic ceiling—therefore, the free issuing of permits and licences would perhaps be the best way of meeting the transport

requirements, and cutting through not only the red tape but also the possibilities of corruption and nepotism.

In connection with this red tape, it is very interesting to note that all of us complain very bitterly and very strongly about the Government Departments being overstaffed, when we look at the question generally. But every time you appoint a committee to look into a particular problem or a specific problem, it reaches the conclusion that as far as the activity with which that particular committee is concerned, the Government Department concerned is under-staffed. This is a phenomenon worth studying, because in the abstract, one can always reach the conclusion that there are far too many doing far too little of job; but concretely, when a problem is analysed, why do these committees come to these conclusions? I leave that matter for future consideration.

But here, at least, there is a contradiction which deserves our serious attention.

As I was saying, as far as intra-State transport is concerned probably there will not be much need for regulation as far as the committee is concerned. They have suggested the appointment of certain tribunals of appeal and all that, I think some of these suggestions are very valuable. But when it comes to regulating business inter-State they have fallen back upon, and they have tried to seek inspiration from the functioning of the Inter State Commerce Commission in the USA and similar bodies.

There again a considerable amount of objective study of their functioning has been made. I have before me a very valuable study produced by the Princeton University on *Regulating Business by Independent Commission*. I would invite the attention of my hon friend Shri M R Masani to what this study has to say.

"Above all, regulation is a process which is neither isolated in-

[Shri Asoka Mehta].

its relation to the general and economic environment nor self-contained in its evolution. The public interest is served best when regulation is conceived as a vital element in the comprehensive relationship between Government and the economy. It is served worst when regulation is treated as a phenomenon which is separable from the context of society and, therefore, unrelated to general notions about the proper relations between government and economic life."

I raise the question of the governing philosophy of the chairman for this very reason that where the question of regulation comes, there, philosophy is of major importance. In judging the necessity for the recommendations in this report, certain pre-conceptions that have been introduced into the report have to be borne in mind.

As I said earlier, while it was necessary to correct the focus because of the absence of a creative dialogue between the representatives of the Railway Board and the other members of the committee, we still do not know whether there is a need for subsidisation, mutual subsidisation, between the railways and roads or not. If we do not do that, it is argued, consumer's preference will operate, in the case of certain goods where speed is of great importance, for, railway transport, it has been pointed out, is cheap, but road transport is fast; road transport is three times or four times as fast as railway transport. Therefore, the advantage of these things is there. What do we do then? Do we permit consumers' preference to operate and leave this whole problem of mutual subsidisation or cross-subsidisation to be thrown on the railways completely and unilaterally and thereby throw this whole problem into the lap of this Government, because the committee has said that if a subsidy is to be paid, let Government pay the subsidy? I suggest that this is refusal to face the problem. This is an effort on the part of the committee

to be a champion of a particular point of view, because the way the Railway Board has behaved made it necessary for somebody to come forward and become a champion of the other side. But I am sorry that the committee thought that their task ended there. I would have liked the committee, after having championed the cause of road transport, to go further and look into the question more fully, because, as I said, I find that they have scratched the surface; they have opened our eyes to some of the key-problems, but the solutions they have offered have not been thought out adequately, fully and in a co-ordinated manner.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): I am really grateful to the hon Minister and the hon Member who has preceded me for the appreciative references which they have made. I also appreciate the difficulties with which the hon Member finds himself faced, in understanding and appreciating the recommendations of this committee. If we were to look at the terms of reference, and if we were to examine all that has been said in the background which is very necessary, I think the tone and tempo of the speech of my hon friend would have been a little bit different.

If we look at the terms of reference, we find that the committee was primarily asked to suggest a model administrative set-up for the control and regulation of road transport, and also at the same time to focus the attention of the nation on what the inhibitory factors were and what the essential features which were necessary for the growth and development of road transport were.

So far as the administrative set-up is concerned, the committee has made very far-reaching recommendations. It has not only recommended streamlining of the present administration, but it has suggested complete reorganisation of the present set-up; it has made suggestions which will scrap the present administrative set-up; it wants to recast it and have a certain dynamic set-up. It has also suggested how

the new set-up will be able to do away with the procedural delays as well as corruption which overshadows the present set-up

My hon friend has not said a single word, so far as the administrative set-up is concerned

Shri Asoka Mehta: I have praised you

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur. So, it is quite obvious that he accepts *in toto* all the recommendations which the committee has made so far as the administrative set-up and the changes are concerned, which was the main task of this committee

So far as the administrative set-up is concerned, I do not know why it has not been possible for Government to come to grips with the problem I may submit that these problems are not settled only by conferences and committees, the Central Government must provide the necessary leadership for this purpose, it is only through personal talks and persuasions that my hon friend the Minister of Transport and Communications will be able to bring about a healthy change in the administrative set-up in the States

The committee has recommended among other things the complete re-organisation of the RTA as also the appellate body If only one of the recommendations, the setting up of the STAT, that is a tribunal which will be a single-man tribunal, which would consist of one of the working District and Sessions Judges, is accepted and implemented, I think half the trouble and half the corruption would be removed Because at the present moment, most of appeals go on the administrative side and they go on lingering, and the administrative officers and the Ministers and all sorts of people have got to do quite a lot and there are, naturally, various pulls and all sorts of things If that machinery is replaced and if we have just one serving District and Sessions

Judge in the tribunal, most of the trouble would be over We have also cut most of the revisions and appeals I wish the Minister will take this into his head and will get into touch with the State Governments and I hope thereby he will be able to bring about quite a healthy change in the administrative set-up, which by itself will go a very long way in regulating in a healthy manner the road transport industry

It appears to me from the speech of my hon friend who preceded me that there has been a little swing on the part of the Committee in just championing the cause of road transport I wish he examined the whole aspect in the light of certain very important facts What is the present condition of road transport in this country? Let us have certain facts and figures I do not deny that we have made progress We are bound to make progress, during the course of the First and Second Five Year Plans in the matter of road transport, we have certainly made progress But if we examine certain figures, we will find that India has to make a lot of headway in the development of road transport You will find that even in comparison to our very neighbours even so far as road mileage per square mile is concerned, we stand very low If you take the number of vehicles, you will find that we stand very low In regard to mileage, the present rate is very poor But if you take the utilisation of the present roads, you will find that it is extremely poor Three to four times the present performance could be given by even the present roadways, but because our policies have been extremely restrictive—road transport development has, as a matter of fact, been obstructed in more than one way—that development has not taken place

I will quote the figures of miles per square mile of territory Great Britain 3 24, France 3 03, USA 1 00, Ceylon 0 38 Spain 0 38, India 0 25 In terms

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

of population, it is still poorer: India 82, Philippines 87, Malaya 110, Ceylon 115, Iraq 242, Spain 251, Great Britain 364, and France 152.

It is no use my repeating figures. I only wanted to make a brief reference to them just to indicate that this country has got to make a great headway in the matter of road transport, in the construction of roads and in the development of the transport. Now, this fact has got to be taken into consideration alongside the situation obtaining in this country. Road transport comes in juxtaposition to railways about which my hon. friend talked so much. Is there any likelihood of our railways developing in such a manner as to reach the life of the people in the rural areas? It is only through the development of road transport that we could in the foreseeable future visualise our touching the rural areas and the villages. At the same time, I wish we also take note of how road transport has been developed all over the world. It is very good to talk of certain theories here. Those arguments could be given both ways. But these theories about which we talk so much here have been argued in practical life all over the country. Let us see what the conclusions are. If you take note of the conclusions which we have reached in practical life all over the country, you will find that road transport has developed in all the countries where free economy is the guiding factor; those who espouse the cause of regulation have no other country to quote except the USSR in their favour, saying 'Here is something that is being done in the USSR and we might profitably adopt it'. They could not quote one single free country—by 'free' country, I mean a country where we have a free economy in play—in favour of railways as against roads.

I would quote certain figures. From 1952 to 1955, what has been the sort of development all over the world? Between 1953 and 1955, the gross fixed

investments on roads and road transport as against the railways are as follows: United Kingdom 2.5 per cent on roads and road transport as against 0.4 per cent on the railways, France 2.8 per cent as against 1.1 per cent on the railways, Italy 2.8 per cent as against 0.4 per cent, Belgium 2.9 per cent as against 0.9 and Sweden 4.3 per cent as against 0.7 per cent on the railways. That is, what has been spent on the development of railways is not even 1/5th or 1/10th in certain cases, in many countries, of what has been spent on the development of roads and road transport, during these very important years.

The position is just the other way round in this country. In our Second Five Year Plan, we had originally provided about Rs. 900 crores for development of railways; this has gone up to Rs. 1121 crores. The position is just the other way round so far as road transport is concerned. There we had provided in all—States as well as the Centre put together—Rs. 266 crores. So far as the Central allocation is concerned, even that has been cut down. Theories are well and good but let us see whether these theories and practical suggestions had been taken into consideration in those countries where road transport has developed. If the trends are there, let us see whether this Committee, which was primarily to focus its attention on certain basic issues, has given proper attention to those issues and has taken into consideration the facts which have been proved by practice all over, facts which we discussed threadbare; let us see whether the recommendations it has made are based on those assumptions and conclusions which have been arrived at between ourselves and which have proved themselves on the surface all over the world.

It is really a matter of regret that there has been a sort of controversy between railways and roads. As a matter of fact, a sort of cold war between the two has been started. I think this cold war must be stopped.

I know this Committee has, as a matter of fact, provoked certain thoughts. But the thoughts should be in the right direction. The Railway Minister is as much interested in the national development of transport in this country as the Minister of Transport is.

We very well realise that the Railways are the biggest public enterprise where we have got great stake and where we want that our assets should be fully utilised and the best use is made of those assets and their further progress and development is taken care of properly. But an overall picture has to be taken. I do not see any reason for all these pulls in different directions.

13 hrs.

It was very good of the hon. Minister of Transport to say that there was no controversy. But the controversy is in the air. Everyone reads about it; we know that is quite obviously there. As a matter of fact, this committee for the national transport policy would not have been in the shape in which it is today had it not been for certain issues which have emerged out of the discussions and the recommendations of this committee which are before this House for consideration. I definitely feel that this has provoked thought. It is quite correct. It is very necessary that we take an overall picture and a correct picture of the whole situation and come to a conclusion as to what is best in national interests.

What is this controversy about the Railways? Only in yesterday's paper I read that we are thinking of Asian Highways, that is, we are thinking of constructing roads which will provide transport from one country to another and cross through countries. Such highways exist in Europe which take transport from country to another without a pass or a permit. Here, in

this country, there is difficulty in moving from one State to another. If you go from U.P. to Rajasthan, you are handicapped at 101 places with 101 regulations and all sorts of things. As against this, the present trend in the world is just to have free and long national highways, inter-country highways to take the traffic. As against this, we have here the attitude and mentality of the Railways. 'Please do not issue permits to any person for more than 300 miles.' What does it come to?

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun) There is no such government scheme for any international highway.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Yes; there is none. It is in the UNICEF. They are thinking of that. There is such a thing in Europe. I hope this country will be a party to it. Such a scheme cannot exactly be the scheme of any particular country. That is the trend of developments that are taking place.

As against it, you want to restrict it to 100 miles or 150 miles. What do these restrictions mean and what do they lead us to? What is the purpose of this 300 miles restriction? This rail-road coordination has been putting all these restrictions. What is the meaning of this restriction? If we want a service to operate from Jodhpur to Delhi, which is about 400 miles, they say, 'No, you can go up to 200 miles only from Jodhpur to Jaipur.' So, there have to be two, one from Jodhpur to Jaipur and another from Jaipur to Delhi. You want that there should be a drop somewhere, some harassment to the transport owners as well as the consumers. Beyond this it means nothing. Otherwise, the service that is running from Jodhpur to Jaipur will take on from Jaipur to Delhi.

A very objective view has to be taken on these matters. I really do not appreciate the appointment of this

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

committee for determining the policy of national transport, a committee, which, as my hon. friend said, is heavily loaded with officials. Are the officials going to determine the national policy? I am asking this not only now. Only the day before yesterday, when we were discussing the Electricity Act, I said we have not got any policy on electricity. One of the Electricity Acts provides that certain officials in the Central and the State Boards will determine the national policy for the supply and development of electricity. I do not understand how such things are going to happen. It is my apprehension that it is only because of the recommendations of this committee, because the non-official element in this committee was strongly in favour of a free and fair development that this sort of committee loaded with officials has been appointed. I am glad that they have a chairman who will be able to do some free thinking in the matter. But I strongly recommend that the composition of this committee be reorganised so that at least 2 Members from this House and one from the other House could be appointed on this committee. There is absolutely no reason why when we want to have some conclusions about important matters there has been some controversy and why they leave things that way.

I wish to draw pointed attention of this House to the fact that this industry is of very great significance to us. If you examine the figures given in the Second Five Year Plan, you will find that one of the most important headaches of this nation that is, the employment potential offered by this industry, is one of the most important factors which should have been taken into consideration. It provides such potential for the employment of people that we must give very special consideration to this matter.

This industry is exploited at all levels. The Central Government has

not been able to give a fair deal. My charges are two against the Central Government. One is that they are very ineffective. The Inter-State Commission which we have got has not functioned at all. It was appointed by about 1956 and it has done no job whatsoever. I wish it is strengthened and made more effective. Then the Central Minister asks us, "What can we do, it is a State subject?" If the Central Ministry has got the requisite leadership they can persuade the States by their talks. The Minister of Community Development has not got any regulatory power over the State Governments, but it is only through leadership and only through talks that a great change has been brought about. I think the same thing should be done here.

This industry is also very much exploited at the State level. If you look at the recommendations made by the Planning Commission and various other committees from time to time you will see that the taxation on road transport is the highest in this country as compared to other countries. There is a very good case for reducing it. It is double of what it is in most of the countries, it is even 3 or 4 times than some. I understand that the Planning Commission issued certain instructions even to the State Governments that there should be no further taxation and that it should not be increased. But what we find is that it is only this industry that comes in for increase in taxation from year to year.

This is also an industry which is exploited at the lower official levels also. There is the police. We have made specific recommendations that the administrative set up should be such as not to make inroads on the industry and make room for corruption. I hope at least these administrative checks and administrative reforms will take effect soon.

One thing more and I have finished; and that is about credit. I think this is unfortunately the only industry

which is not being treated fairly in the matter of credit. We find all sorts of facilities are being given to the small-scale industries. I do not see why this poor man should not get credit from the bank directly. We have made certain recommendations that certain banking agencies should be set up. What are these agencies? These agencies just support you with a little money from banks. We have got some Rs. 50,000; and we collect more money, say another Rs. 50,000 from the State Bank. With a little money from myself and a little money from the State Bank, I am going to exploit this poor operator. I do not see why the Ministry should not be able to persuade the State Bank to give loans direct to these bus and lorry operators. They have got a vehicle which can be insured and pledged. They should get direct credit facilities if this industry is not to be exploited as it has been. It would be a surprise for anyone to hear that this industry pays 12-24 per cent interest to the money lenders or intermediaries springing up because of the policy of the Government. It needs immediate revision and these people must get direct loan.

Now, there is a certain misunderstanding about viable units. We have made it absolutely clear that we do not stand for any monopoly. As a matter of fact there was a lot of discussion and it was made absolutely clear that the smallest man will have the chance. We have recommended strongly that even individual operators should not be debarred. If he is efficient and if he fulfils all the qualifications, he can go into the industry without any let or hindrance. The viable unit which we have visualised is one which can be constituted only by a loose association of these people coming together for the sake of management and operation. Every effort has been made to see that efficiency is not marred and that the necessary number of vehicles and the service facilities are there and that

the common man, the poor man and the individual is not eliminated so that he remains in the picture but he is so regulated that he forms himself into an association so that he is able to give efficient service to the nation.

As you have been ringing the Bell twice, I am concluding though there are many points which require clarification.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Chingleput):
Sir, I am thankful to the hon. Minister for not having enunciated a policy at the outset. After all it would be an advantage to listen to us in the House and then come forward with a definite policy when he replies to the debate. I agree with those who have preceded me in paying a tribute to the Committee for having undertaken a painstaking study of all the problems involved in road transport and having provided us with a mine of information. It may be that we cannot agree with some of the suggestions but even where we do not agree with them, they have provoked us to think and I would be doing less than justice to myself, if I do not pay a tribute to the constructive endeavour which has been made by them.

I want it to be understood very clearly that it is most important to encourage the development of road transport. It is time some of us introduced a sense of perspective into these matters. It is time that some of us, apart from speaking theoretically, understood the environment in which we are operating and pleaded for a more rapid development. We have to realise that one of the great dangers of the Second Plan has been its emphasis on heavy investment without taking into account the problem of greater employment. Considering the great advantages that ensue from road transport, considering the imperative necessity of opening up hinterlands of our economy, I venture to think that anybody who is inclined to tackle the problem of employment seriously in the coming few years

[Dr Krishnaswami].

would have to concentrate on road transport since it is essentially labour-intensive. It is this aspect which has not been borne in mind by the expert of the railways and I am very sorry that in all his pleadings, I hear only the vice of a monopolist pleading for a sectional interest and not taking into account the major aspects of issues that face our country. We have also to realise that road investment is not necessarily capital hungry, we would also be saving a great deal in the way of foreign exchange—an important consideration which has to be borne in mind, particularly as we are not suffering from an abundance of foreign exchange resources.

My hon friend, Shri Asoka Mehta who preceded me spoke of the various recommendations made by the Committee in respect of taxation rebates. He pointed out that it did not consider these problems fully. The Committee cannot be a committee of encyclopaedias. They have necessarily to concentrate on certain issues. But may I point out to him and to those who have given some thought to this question that if we are thinking of an expanding industry as this Committee is thinking, it necessarily follows as an inevitable corollary that we are increasing the receipts for the various State Governments and local authorities. One can not work out all these things fully because when the Committee is dealing with the general recommendations, it cannot possibly envisage what amount of development would be there, how many lorries would be there, how much increase would be there and so on because all these things have necessarily and rightly been left rather vague.

But I would like to consider some other aspects which have occupied a great deal of the time of the House. In viewing transport one has to take into account the different agencies of transport and find out what means we propose for co-ordination. Co-ordination is a very much abused word, it is as much abused today as it was

during the Second World War when co-ordination was used by a Field Marshal or General of a particular section in order to suppress the scheme of the other. In looking into this report and the minute of dissent, I venture to think that the representative of the railways has undoubtedly thought of co-ordination as nothing less but suppression of road transport. It is a point which has to be stated clearly and forcibly so that at least we might have a sense of perspective. I do not blame the railways for the attitude that they have adopted in the 30s, when we were suffering from a slump, the railways were the first to advocate intense prohibition on road transport. Probably that was the only solution which occurred to them in the 1930s. In the 1950s when we are suffering from the benefits of planned economy it would be wrong to follow or suggest such restrictive policies as they have suggested in the 1930s.

I would like to place before this House certain elementary facts which have escaped the attention of some of those who participated in the debate. It is clearly recognised even by the representative of the railways that the cost of carriage on long distance transport by rail is cheaper than the cost of carriage by road transport. It is admitted that over 200 miles it is definitely cheaper to have goods transported by the railways. It is admitted by the railways' representative that the petrol and diesel tax, registration tax and excise duties on tyres, income-tax paid by bus and lorry operators and others indulging in road transport contribute not only to the direct cause but also to the indirect cause of the general Exchequer. Such is the state of affairs. But, in spite of the bias in favour of the railway transport, if the consumers choose road transport for long distances, there must be something wrong according to those in charge of our railways. It is a fact on which the railways ought to do some thinking. Let us put aside for sometime the theory and let us concentrate on the practical aspects. A consumer is faced with either availing

himself of the road transport or of railway transport. According to the railways it is clearly admitted that the cost of carriage is cheaper. Yet in spite of the fact that it is cheaper, he prefers to use the road transport. Now, what is the social interest that should prevent you from utilising the road transport? What is the mal-distribution of resources that is involved? One should not employ words without knowing what they mean. Theory can easily degenerate into jargon as it has done in the case of the dissenting minute appended by the railway expert. I have never read, and I say it with the greatest hesitancy, so much fantastic nonsense as is included in the dissenting minute of the expert of Railways, and I shall only show one or two instances of the utter lack of logic that is displayed in that dissenting minute. I do it with great reluctance, but I have to do it in order that the same mistake may not be repeated again and again and we may not have the iteration of the same points advanced by others.

13.21 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Now, Sir, this is what he states in his dissenting minute, and I should like my hon. friends to consider what the implications are. He suggests on page 84 that railways being nationally owned and managed are already under public control and it follows that the regulation necessary must be predominantly towards control of motor transport. What are the implications of this statement? Just because they are nationally owned—railways—and managed, it does not follow that they are under public control. The logic underlying this argument is that any nationalised industry is *per se* superior in terms of social purpose. Clearly, this is not the case. The question to examine is whether the railways' policies are imbued with social purpose and what are the mechanisms through which this is executed. Similarly, the mere fact that parts of road

transport are privately owned and managed does not detract from its social usefulness. Here again, we can, if necessary, strengthen the machinery by which they can play their part fruitfully in the scheme of things.

Now, I ask this question, why is it that even over long distances, notwithstanding the greater costs of carriage, consumers prefer road transport to Railways? Speaking as one who knows something about the Railway Administration, having served on the Railway Corruption Enquiry Committee, I can point out, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that one of the reasons which has led people to switch over to road transport is the inadequacy of railway transport. Transport is essentially a perishable commodity. If one does not have the transport facility at a particular time, then it cannot be stored up. It is an elementary fact which has been understood and which is recognised on any elementary book on railway economics, which, I suppose, those in charge of the Railway Administration must have read and digested to great profit. But it has to be understood that if there are goods lying in different warehouses for months together, if business is handicapped in many areas, what else can a man do except to avail himself of another sort of transport? The very fact that there has been this inadequacy blows to bits the great theory about maldistribution of resources, about duplication of investment and all that jargon which is hurled in the face of Parliament in the hope that it will swallow these words without clearly making an analysis of what their implications are.

I tell you, Sir, that having read that dissenting minute I have come more and more to the conclusion that this Parliament should put its foot down on such specialised pleading and should make them adopt a more enlightened approach on this question.

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

I do not say that one should respect the consumer's free choice on all occasions. Of course, the paragraph to which my friend, the author of the dissenting minute, makes a reference is rather ambiguous, but I should like to point out that consumer's freedom of choice is not anything which is a moral absolute. Freedom of choice must be related, as my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta pointed out, to the fact that the choice is there as between two articles where the prices charged bear relation to costs. If, for instance, there are two commodities one of which is offered free absolutely, then, undoubtedly, there is no freedom of choice. In fact, that was a celebrated example given by a French economist nearly 200 years ago when he pointed out that if you have a person who ferries you across the river free and if you have another person who ferries you for a few francs that you pay, then, undoubtedly, there is no freedom of choice because, obviously, you are not comparing two things which are comparable but you are having two different commodities altogether. I venture to think that when we people talk of the consumer's free choice we have in view the charges that are levied in relation to costs. Can anyone who has thought over this question of road transport and the many taxes that we have levied say that the costs of road transport and prices that road transporters charge are anything less in relation to costs? Indeed, the argument is that the prices charged by road transporters for anything over 300 miles are much higher than rail transport and yet they are being preferred for other reasons.

The same argument came up before the British Transport Commission. My hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta referred to cross subsidisation and many other complicated matters. It is very valuable to have cross subsidisation, but do let us remember that in this matter of costing we are still in an uncharted world. Even the British Transport Commission has recognised

it, and while it may be valuable as a principle we have still to investigate further before we can come to any definite conclusion. The Committee has suggested certain things which ought to be subsidised. One may or may not agree with its recommendations in this respect, but one cannot blame it for investigating further, because even now the great theorists who are handling this subject have not been able to investigate this problem further. All the same, it is a valuable idea which ought to be taken into account and investigated by specialists in government departments to find out how far they can compare.

Now, Sir, I shall deal with some of the other recommendations of this Committee. My hon. friend, Shri Mathur, referred to the solicitude of the Committee for the small man and the small operator. On this I have certain observations to make and I should like to tell him why I feel I have certain doubts. It is perfectly true that the recommendations relating to credit facilities being given to the small man are excellent, and I entirely endorse the recommendation that he made that the Minister should use his influence to see that credit facilities are made available to the small operator directly. In fact, the great bane of our economy has been, if I might point out, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the absence of the small man coming up. It looks as though in spite of our taxation policies it is only those who have already made their way in life that are able to survive and make their way further and those who have not yet made their way are hardly able to get a footing. But I would like to suggest that while the Committee has rejected this idea of a ceiling on the number of buses or lorries that are to be owned by a particular person, one must understand, in practice, that we have to, if we think of encouraging the small operator, place some sort of a limit on the number of buses or lorries that persons could have. You may not have an actual ceiling, to introduce an arbitrary figure like that may not be possible,

but at the back of one's mind one must realise, from the point of view of social purpose, that it is essential that the small man should be encouraged.

In paragraph 53 on page 30 there is rather an ambiguous recommendation, which, I, with your permission, Sir, should like to read out. It says:

"While it is possible that a one-vehicle unit might satisfy most or even all these criteria, it is likely that a fleet owner would be in a better position to meet the test. The Committee is, therefore, of the view that the formation of efficient and viable enterprises should be encouraged in all reasonable and legitimate ways. On the other hand, the Committee is opposed to any ban being placed on the owner of a single truck in the case of goods transport."

Now, Sir, I would rather have much wished the Committee to have suggested ways of encouraging the small man, and I should also like to point out to the members of the Committee that so far as the system of licensing is concerned one of the main reasons for having a system of licensing is to see to it that the small man survives. If we did not have a system of licensing, then all the people would operate and there would be cut-throat competition and eventually there would be what is known as the merger of many units into one single unit. It would be growth of monopoly. And, therefore, even from the point of view of licensing, I venture to suggest that we should more and more encourage the small man and not have too many of these big fleet owners really operating.

There are certain advantages of a large-scale economy in these big fleet operators but they are outweighed by other disadvantages and certainly in the case of road transport the main reason for encouraging it is because it gives an opportunity to the small

man to come up. In fact, in road transport the small man is very nearly on equal terms with the big man. The capital invested is limited and all the operating expenses are common and even the expenses on management would not be very high. I venture to think that the Committee in its bias should have been more biased in favour of the small man rather than in favour of the fleet owner or the bigger owner.

It is not as though one suggests that there should be something like an arbitrary ceiling, but I do think that when the Committee has made many wise recommendations to promoting the social interests it should have certainly devoted some attention to the small man. I am all in favour of regulation of the different agencies of transport. But I am very much opposed—and I reiterate it—to any prohibition of any particular method of transport, say, beyond a certain mileage. The railways, in the name of regulation, in the name of co-ordination, are attempting to prohibit and emasculate road transport, a thing which is opposed totally to social interests, a thing which is opposed to our employment policy. I hope and trust that on this matter the Government, after due deliberation, will come out strongly and set its face against monopolies. It should be a great gain not only to the Government and the various State Governments but even to society and the consumers of whom there are large numbers in our country, waiting anxiously for a correct solution of these problems.

सरदार इकबाल सिंह (फ़ीरोज़पुर) :
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सब से पहले इस कमेटी के मेम्बरान का शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि उन्होंने कम से कम तमाम देश की ट्रांसपोर्ट प्रोब्लम्स को एक जगह धीरे एक बंग से इस रिपोर्ट में देखा के सामने रक्खा है और नौका बिना है कि उन की तरफ पूरे

[सरकार-प्रश्नान्न सिद्ध]

और वर देसा जा सके । उस कमेटी ने यह रिपोर्ट पेस कर के केन्द्रीय सरकार, राज्य सरकारों, पालिसामेंट और दूसरी संस्थाओं को भी इस का मौका दिया है कि वे ट्रांसपोर्ट प्रोजेक्ट्स को देस सके और उन को उन रेकमेंडेशन्स की रोशनी में हल कर सकें । इस में कोई शक नहीं कि इस कमेटी ने बहुत अच्छी सिफारिशों की हैं लेकिन इसी सिमसिके में मुझे पुरानी कमेटियो और रिपोर्टों की याद आ जाती है जोकि सन् १९५० के बाद बनी । पहले मोटर वहीकल इनफ्रास्ट्रक्चर कमेटी बैठी और उस ने अपनी रिपोर्ट पेस की । स्टडी ग्रुप ने अपनी सिफारिशों पेस की । उस के बाद एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी ने अपनी बहुत सी सिफारिशें दी । उस के बाद ट्रांसपोर्ट कमिश्नर कान्फेस हुई और उसने बहुत अच्छी अच्छी सिफारिशें की । पिछले साल भ्रमूरी में एक कान्फेस हुई और उसने भी कुछ सिफारिशें की और उस के बाद यह आखिरी कमेटी है जिस ने कि अपनी सिफारिशें की हैं । यह सब बतलाने से मेरा मतलब यह है कि रेकमेंडेशन्स तो हमेशा अच्छी होती हैं और डाक्टर हमेशा अच्छा इलाज तजवीज करता है लेकिन पता नहीं मरीज को डाक्टर पर ऐतबार नहीं या मरकार को उस डाक्टर के इलाज पर ऐतबार नहीं जो वह उस पर भ्रमल नहीं करते और हमेशा एक के बाद एक नये डाक्टर बदलते जाते हैं लेकिन इलाज किसी का मग कर नहीं करते । इन तमाम कमेटियो की जिन का कि मैं ने अभी जिक्र किया करीब करीब एक ही सी सिफारिशें थी लेकिन गवर्नमेंट ने उन को कभी इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया । ऐसा मालूम देता है कि गवर्नमेंट को डाक्टर की सिफारिशों पर विश्वास नहीं है और इसीलिये वह एक नया डाक्टर और लाई है और इस कमेटी के बाद उन्होंने नियोगी कमेटी कायम कर दी । अब नियोगी कमेटी सेन्ट्रैरियट लेबिल की कमेटी है और मालूम ऐसा देता है कि उस के बाद मिनिस्टर्स की

कमेटी इस के लिये बैठेगी और उस के बाद फिर वह तमाम मामला प्राइम मिनिस्टर के पास जायगा और तब ही कोई फैसला हो सकेगा । मेरा निवेदन इतना ही है कि अगर गवर्नमेंट वाकई कुछ करना चाहती है तो उस के पास इतनी सारी कमेटियों की अच्छी अच्छी सिफारिशें हैं उन को भ्रमल में लाना चाहिये ।

भाज भी हम देखते हैं कि इस रिपोर्ट पर बहस हो रही है । गवर्नमेंट ने कुछ अपने खयालात और कौन्सिलर्स दिये हैं लेकिन मेरी समझ में यह बेहतर होता अगर गवर्नमेंट इस मौके पर एक डेफिनिट पालिसी को ले कर हाउस के सामने आती और वह यह कहती कि इस की १०० सिफारिशों में से ५० हम मजूर करते हैं, बाकी ५० पर हम गौर करने और देखने कि वे मजूर करने के काबिल हैं या नहीं । लेकिन जैसे मैं ने पहले कहा हम भाज ६ वर्ष गुजर गये, उसी स्टेज पर खड़े हुए हैं जिस पर भाज से ६ वर्ष पहले थे । मैं जानता हू कि हमारे ट्रांसपोर्ट मिनिस्टर साहब की रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट को बेहतर करने और उस में काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों का लौट बैठ कराने के लिये बहुत हमदर्दी है और मैं समझता हू कि जितनी हमदर्दी उन के दिल में है उतनी भाज तक किसी मिनिस्टर के दिल में नहीं होगी । लेकिन वह बेचारे मजबूर हैं और मजबूर हैं उस व्यूरोक्रेसी से जिस व्यूरोक्रेसी में कि वह बसते हैं और जिस के कि कारण वह अपने खयालात को भ्रमली जाना नहीं पहना पाते, इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं कर सकते । मैं जानता हू कि वे बहुत कुछ करना चाहते हैं लेकिन पता नहीं उन की मजबूरिया कहां तक जाती हैं जो वे मजबूर हो कर नहीं कर पाते, बहुत दूर नहीं जा सकते और इसी का यह नतीजा है कि हर बार वह मजबूर हो कर एक नई कमेटी बिठा देते हैं लेकिन

वह पिछले डाक्टरों द्वारा करीब करीब एक सा बताया गया इलाज नहीं कर पाते और हालत यह बन रही है कि मर्ज बढ़ता गया ज्यों ज्यों दवा की ।

मेरा तो उन को कहना यही है कि इस कमेटी ने जो सिफारिशों की हैं गवर्नमेंट को उस सिफारिशों पर गौर करना चाहिये, स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स को गौर करना चाहिये और कम से कम अगले पाब, छै महीनों में उन पर कुछ न कुछ अमल होना चाहिये । अगर ऐसा नहीं किया जाता है तो फिर इस कमेटी, पिछली तमाम कमेटियों और दूसरी कमेटियों के बैठाने का कोई मतलब नहीं रह जाता है । असल में देश की जो हम प्लानिंग करते हैं और प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाते हैं तो यह प्लानिंग से पहले ट्रान्सपोर्ट की पालिसी तय हो जानी चाहिये और वह मामला निबटा दिया जाना चाहिये । अगर आप ट्रान्सपोर्ट की प्लानिंग नहीं करोगे चाहे वह रेलवे का हो चाहे रोड का हो और चाहे वाटर का तब तक आप की कोई भी प्लानिंग सक्सेसफुल नहीं हो सकती क्योंकि आप फूड ज्यादा प्रोड्यूस भले ही कर लें लेकिन अगर उस के डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन का आप ने पहले से प्रीपर एरेंजमेंट नहीं किया हुआ है तो वह बस्त पर कन्ज्यूमर्स को नहीं पहुंच सकेगा । उस हालत में आप के ज्यादा प्रोडक्शन करने का कोई मतलब नहीं रह जाता है लेकिन आज बिलकुल उलटा काम हो रहा है । पहले कारखाना बन जाता है प्रोडक्शन शुरू हो जाता है लेकिन उस के डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन का कोई माकूल इतजाम नहीं किया जाता । असल में ट्रान्सपोर्ट पालिसी प्रोडक्शन को प्रिंसीपल करनी चाहिये । रोड ट्रान्सपोर्ट के बारे में मैं कह सकता हू कि पिछले १०-१५ साल में रोड ट्रान्सपोर्ट ने अपने तीर पर तरबकी की है लेकिन सरकार की ओर से उसे एक अच्छे ढंग पर लाने के लिये आज तक कोई यत्न नहीं किया गया है । एक रे आफ हीप इस एक्ट में थी । मैं जब उस एक्ट की सेलेक्ट कमेटी का मेम्बर

था, एक इंटरस्टेट ट्रान्सपोर्ट कमिशन बनाया गया और वह उम्मीद होने लगी थी कि यह रोड ट्रान्सपोर्ट का मसला हल करेगा । आज उस कमिशन को बने साढ़े तीन साल हो गये लेकिन कोई काम नहीं हुआ । मैं पूछता हू कि अगर उस की सिफारिशों पर अमल नहीं करना था तो फिर उस कमिशन को बनाने का मकसद ही क्या था ? इस के तो बेहतर यह है कि आप कम से कम इस्टीमेटेशन न बनायें जिस से लोगों को खाम-खाह उम्मीदें तो न हों । ऐसा इस्टीमेशन बनाने से क्या फायदा जोकि कुछ काम न करे । उस कमिशन के चेयरमैन और मेम्बर्स ने टूट क्रिये हैं लेकिन क्या खाली टूट करते से ही कोई मसला हल हो सकता है ?

सन् १९५० में रोड टैक्सेशन इनक्वायरी कमेटी बनाई गई और उस ने सिफारिश की कि रोड टैक्स बढ़ाना नहीं चाहिये और रोड टैक्सेज के सिलसिले में कुछ रिलीफ मिलनी चाहिये लेकिन उधर कुछ नहीं किया गया ।

कम से कम एक बात पर हर एक कमेटी ने एग्री किया कि इन्फ्लेशन आफ टैक्सेशन नहीं होना चाहिये लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि हर एक जगह पर उन पर टैक्स लगता है । जिस ढंग से इस देश में ट्रान्सपोर्ट का काम चलता है अगर मिनिस्टर साहब उन के साथ बैठ कर दौरा करे तो मालूम हो जायगा कि उन को कितनी शिकायतें हैं । अब इस में मैं समझता हू कि हर एक मुतफिक है कि टैक्स केवल एक जगह पर लगना चाहिये चाहे जितना भी लगे लेकिन साथ ही वह इतना रीजनेबल तो होना ही चाहिये कि वह रोड ट्रान्सपोर्ट सर्विसेज को अनएकॉनामिक न बना दे । आज रेलवेज की बात होती है । रेलवेज पर माइल कीस्ट ६ नया पैसा है जबकि पीट्रोल पर ७.४४ नये पैसे टैक्स हैं और डिजेल प्रायल पर ४.२८ नये पैसे टैक्स हैं । अब गवर्नमेंट खुद अन्धाधा मथा

[सरदार इकबाल सिंह]

सकती है कि उन पर टैक्स की क्या दर होनी चाहिये। अगर स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स इस के लिये कुछ नहीं करती हैं तो कम से कम सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट अपने तौर पर एक बिल लाये और प्रिंसिपल्स आफ टैक्सेशन ले ड्राउन करे। मोटर वैहिकल्स के सिलसिले में पता नहीं स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स ने कोई इस तरह के उसूल टैक्सेशन के ले ड्राउन किये हैं कि नहीं लेकिन कम से कम कास्टीट्यूशन में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को यह अधिकार हासिल है कि वह स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स को कह सकती है कि वह इतना टैक्स लगाये और अगर नहीं भी ऐसा कह सकती है तो कम से कम वह प्रिंसिपल्स ले ड्राउन करने के भास्ते पार्लियामेंट में एक बिल तो ला ही सकती है और वह बिल यहा पास हो सकता है। सविधान इस चीज की इजाजत देता है। अगर आप नेशनल ट्रांसपोर्ट पालिसी बनाना चाहते हैं तो प्रिंसिपल्स आफ नेशनल टैक्सेशन भी बनाये और उस के लिये बिल लायें।

जहा तक क्रेडिट की सुविधा देने की बात है मैं अपने आई डा० कृष्णस्वामी की भावाज में अपनी भावाज मिलाना चाहता हूँ। आज हालत यह है कि स्मोल प्रापरेटर्स को काफी सूद देना पड़ता है, २५, ३० और ४० फीसदी तक सूद देना पड़ता है। बड़े भादमियों को तो काम करने के लिये पैसा मिल जाता है लेकिन छोटे भादमियों को काम शुरू करने के लिये यह क्रेडिट फॅसिलिटी ठीक ढग से नहीं मिलती है। छोटे ट्रांसपोर्ट के काम करने वालों को बजाय सहूलियत के डिस्करेजमेंट मिलता है।

गवर्नमेंट ने स्टेट बैंक आफ इंडिया को धर्मैड किया ताकि रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट में सगे लोगों को क्रेडिट की सहूलियतें बहम पहुँचाई जा सकें लेकिन आज तक स्टेट बैंक ने दो, तीन बड़ी बड़ी कम्पनियों को छोड़ कर किसी और को कोई कर्ज की सहायता नहीं दी। यह बड़े धफ्तोस का मुकाम है कि रोड

ट्रांसपोर्ट जोकि देश में मोस्ट प्रीनेस्ट सविध है और डे टू डे धर पर जा कर सविध करती है और मोस्ट प्रीनेस्ट सविध करती है उस को कोई सस्ती दर पर क्रेडिट बँकरह की सहूलियत बन्त पर नहीं मिलती है। छोटे काम करने वालों को मदद देने का कोई तरीका नहीं है। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो भी फैसला हो उस में सब से पहले उन छोटे छोटे बस प्रापरेटर्स वगैरह को यह लोन और क्रेडिट वगैरह की सहूलियतें पहुँचाई जानी चाहियें। मैं टैक्सेशन के सिलसिले में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। मेहता जी कहते हैं कि आप एक तरह का फायदा करेगे तो दूसरी तरह का नुकसान करेगे। वह कहते हैं कि म्यूनिसिपल कमेटियों को बचाना चाहिये, शहरो को बचाना चाहिये क्योंकि शहर हमेशा बचे रहते हैं। वह कम दें। उन को आकट्टाय भी मिलना चाहिये।

आप हैरान होंगे राजस्थान की मिसाल सुनकर। अगर एक ट्रक किसी म्यूनिसिपैलिटी से गुजरता है तो वह कहते हैं कि पहले २००० रुपया जमा करो, क्योंकि हो सकता है कि तुम माल रास्ते में ही कहीं उतार दो, और प्राब्लिरी चुगी पर यह रुपया ले लेना। अगर वह ट्रक दस चुगियों में से गुजरता है तो उसे हर जगह एक एक या दो दो हजार रुपया जमा कराना होता है और फिर दो घंटे बाद वापस लेना होता है।

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र भाबूर (पाली)
राजस्थान ही क्यों उत्तर प्रदेश में भी तो यह होता है।

सरदार इकबाल सिंह मैं उत्तर प्रदेश की तरफ भी भाता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय . अगर आप सारे हिन्दुस्तान के रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट को सेंगे तो आपको बहुत बन्त लगेगा। आपका वक्त १५ मिनट ही है।

सरदार इकबाल सिंह : मुझे थोड़ा सा और बक्स दें । मैं बहुत सी प्रेक्टिकल बातें कहना चाहता हूँ ।

राजस्थान के झलावा में आपको झालाम की मिसाल देना चाहता हूँ । वहाँ पर एक रोड का परमिट देने के लिए ३५०० रुपया किया जाता है । यह तमाम टैक्स आखिर में जाकर कांजपुर पर ही पड़ता है । जो मिडिल क्लास है वह कुछ नहीं देगा । वह उतना किराया प्यावा ले लेगा । तो मेरा कहना यह है कि सारे देश में यह टैक्स यूनिकार्म होना चाहिये ।

इसके झलावा में पुलों के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ । ११० पुल बनने में, जिनमें से ५० या ६० तो सैकिड फाइव इधर प्लान में बनेंगे और कुछ तीसरी फाइव इधर प्लान में बनेंगे । मुझे अफसोस है इस बात का यह मिनिस्ट्री अपने लिये कुछ कोशिश नहीं करती । रेलवे को ३० करोड़ का फारिन एक्सचेंज मिला, पोर्ट आथॉरिटीज को ३० करोड़ का फारिन एक्सचेंज मिला । रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट मिनिस्ट्री पुल बनाने के शिड्यूल में पीछे है अगर इसको जो ५ करोड़ का फारिन एक्सचेंज मिला है उसको भी पूरा काम में नहीं लाया जा रहा है । आप एक नेशनल हाईवे बनाते हैं और तो उस पर पुल नहीं बनते और बनते हैं तो बहुत बहुत देर में, दो दो, तीन तीन, चार चार साल में बनते हैं । मिसाल के तौर पर उत्तर प्रदेश में गडमुक्तेश्वर के पुल का मसला तीन साल से शुरू है और धायद उसमें अभी दो साल और लगेंगे । आपको चाहिए कि आप नेशनल हाईवेज पर तो पुल बनाये जो कि इसलिये नहीं बन पाने कि उनको जरूरी चीजों के लिये फारिन एक्सचेंज नहीं मिल पाता । मिनिस्ट्री को इसके लिये कोशिश करनी चाहिये । अगर आप नेशनल सिस्टम में रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट बनाना चाहते हैं तो उसके लिये आपको नेशनल हाईवेज बनानी होंगी और उन पर जब तक पुल बनैरह नहीं बसते उनसे फायदा नहीं हो सकता ।

एक बात मैं रूरम ट्रांसपोर्ट के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ । यह देहात का मसला है । पहले आप पंजाब को लें । रेलवे ने यह दिया कि हम सैकिड फाइव इधर प्लान में एक नीम भी रेलवे नहीं दे सकते । तब देहात में जो लोग बसते हैं उनके लिए भी तो कोई तरीका होना चाहिए । वह रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट का ही तरीका हो सकता है । ट्रकों के जरिये ही किसानों की पैदावार को मंडियों तक ले जाया जा सकता है । इसके लिये जरूरी है कि सड़कें बननी चाहिए ताकि मूसाफिरो और माल को लाने ले जाने के लिये उन पर ट्रक और बसे चल सकें । इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ सड़कें नहीं हैं वहाँ सड़कें बननी चाहिए और उन पर चलने के लिये ट्रकों और बसों को लाइसेंस और परमिट मिलने चाहिए ताकि जिम मकसद के लिये सड़कें बनायी गयी हैं वह मकसद पूरा हो सकें ।

अब मैं ट्रक ट्रेलर के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ । हर एक श्रावमी यह मानता है कि सस्ते ट्रांसपोर्ट के लिये ट्रक ट्रेलर का होना जरूरी है । और दूसरे मुल्को में इसकी इजाजत है । गवर्नमेन्ट को सोचना चाहिये कि अपने देश में भी इसकी इजाजत दी जाये ।

आजकल जिस तरीके से ट्रक के बेट का श्रन्दाजा लगाया जाता है वह सही नहीं है । पंजाब में यह २५००० पाउंड है । दिल्ली में २७००० है, राजस्थान में यह १६००० रह जाता है और मध्य प्रदेश में १७००० और उड़ीसा में ६ हजार ही रह जाता है । इसकी क्या बजह है । आखिर जब एक सी सड़कें हैं तो यह फर्क क्यों किया जाता है । एक ही किस्म की गाड़ियां हैं मगर एक सूबे में उनके लिये एक फायदा है दूसरे में दूसरा । कोई बजह नहीं मालूम देती कि ऐसा क्यों किया जाता है जब कि सब जगह नेशनल हाईवेज बन रही हैं । आप यह कह सकते हैं कि दूसरी किस्म की सड़कों पर यह गाड़ियां न चले । तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह एक्सिल लोड की पाबिसी गलत है । उनकी

[संरक्षार इकवाक विह]
वाकूवें सरीके से ढोड भिसना चाहिए और
ज्यादा ढोड भिसना चाहिए ।

भाषिअर में में इस भिनिसूरी और स्टेट
ट्रांसपोर्ट भिनिसूरीक के सिलसिले में कुछ
कहना चाहता हूँ । मुझे लगता है कि इस
भिनिसूरी को अपने भाप पर कानफिडेंस
नहीं है । जो भी बात होती है तो वह
पहले दूसरों की एडवाइस के लिए जाती है ।
पहले रेलवे बोर्ड को पूछेंगे । मैं इसके खिलाफ
नहीं हूँ कि कोआर्डिनेशन के लिए पूछा
न जाये लेकिन कोआर्डिनेशन होना चाहिए
सबाॉर्डिनेशन नहीं होना चाहिए । हम
देखते हैं कि जो बात दूसरों की होती है वह
इस भिनिसूरी में चलती है । इस भिनिसूरी
को भी अपनी तरफ से कोशिश करनी चाहिए
और जिस मकसद के लये यह भिनिसूरी
है वह मकसद इसे पूरा करने की कोशिश
करनी चाहिए । जो कमेटी बनती है तो पहले
उसमें रेलवे बोर्ड का मेम्बर आता है । वह
हर तरह की पाबन्धिया लगाता है, यह
परमिट नहीं भिसना चाहिए, यह सबक
नहीं बननी चाहिए अगर बननी है तो ३००
मील या १५० मील से ज्यादा नहीं बननी
चाहिए । जिम तरह से कि इस भिनिसूरी
की कमेटियो में रेलवे बोर्ड का भादमी आता है
उसी तरह से रेलवे बोर्ड की कमेटियो में इस
भिनिसूरी का भादमी नहीं जाता । मैं नहीं
समझता कि यह कोआर्डिनेशन है । मैं पूछना
चाहता हूँ कि क्या किसी रेलवे बोर्ड की कमेटी
में इस भिनिसूरी के किसी भादमी को एडवाइस
के लिये बुलाया गया । यही हाल स्टेट लेविल
पर है । वह बेचारे तो समझते हैं कि हमारा
काम तो सिर्फ परमिट देने का है । लेकिन
उनका इससे बड़ा काम है स्टेट के ट्रांसपोर्ट
को रिआरगेनाइज करना और प्लान बनाना
ताकि उस स्टेट की इकानमी में तरक्की हो
जो वाटिअनैक्स है वे दूर हों और जो मुषिकसात
हैं उन को कम किया जाये । इस भिनिसूरी

में कुछ अपने में कानफिडेंस होना चाहिए ।
वह भिनिसूरी कमजोर है और इसी भिवे
स्टेट भिनिसूरीक जो कि इसी के हिस्से है
वह भी कमजोर है । उनके पास अगर रेलवे
की चिट्ठी आ जाती है तो वे समझ लेते हैं कि
इससे घाने हमें नहीं चलना है ।

मैं भाषिअर में भाप से फिर कहना चाहता
हूँ कि देहात के लोग भी सफर करना चाहते हैं
और जब रेलवे की सरविस बहां नहीं जा
सकती तो भापके यह कहने का कोई हक नहीं
है कि जो लोग देहात की सेवा कर रहे हैं और
जो मोटर बस चला कर और ट्रक चला कर
मुसाफिरो को लाते ले जाते हैं और किसानों
की पैदावार को मंडियों तक लाते हैं उनको
यह करने का कोई हक नहीं है ।

मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Khadi-
kar

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I
have a submission to make You have,
Sir, observed that in the speeches
that have been made the railways find
an important place So, I would sub-
mit that it would be better if the
Railway Minister is also here to listen
to the speeches

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then there
would be the fear of subordination.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: No.
The Members of Parliament have
strength enough to withstand anybody.
It will be a pity if he is not present
here.

Shri Khadlikar (Ahmednagar): My
hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, who
opened the debate looked at the prob-
lem from an aerial academic point of
view and, unfortunately, certain eco-
nomic theories that he had presented,
and which counteract the suggestions
contained in the Report, are such as
in my opinion are absolutely inappli-
cable to our country. I am looking at
it from the pedestrian's point of view,

the point of view of a villager belonging to a village where there is neither motor truck, nor a railway line, nor even a bullock-cart approach road. But for the one word that my friend, Shri Masani has introduced in his contention the "consumers' choice", the report on the whole is a good document. He has borrowed the phrase from old economic theory which is as dead as mutton in the modern context. I do not want to revive this ghost theory in this House and so would restrict myself to the problem that is before us.

While dealing with economics, before coming to the main problem, my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta advanced a very strange theory that if you open the rural hinterland, the people there will be affected because they will come in contact with the so-called commercial world. My point of view is different. At the present juncture in every village which is cut off from the main commercial centre the small producer is entirely at the mercy of the market economy. But he has no market nearby and so he has got to deal with some agent or sub-agent of a big merchant in Bombay or Calcutta. That is the pity of it. So, my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta ought to realise while advancing a theory that when he goes to a village, a very interior part of the country where he is cut off from the ordinary normal channels of trade or communication he has been put at a disadvantage though his prices are more or less regulated by the market mechanism. He has no market where he could dispose off his goods or buy them. This is the position. Therefore, all the reports that he has quoted—I have some of them here—whether they be about the British transport system or American system or, for that matter, the Soviet Union, are absolutely inapplicable in the context of our country. Therefore, I would certainly thank the Masani Committee except

for the introduction of "consumers' choice", because I am a poor consumer, because my choice is not determined by the market; it is entirely determined by my pocket and the availability of things near about me, for other recommendations. In the modern context "consumers' choice" has no meaning. It is an absurd concept altogether in the face of a growing economy as in this country.

Now that the little economic cobwebs that were raised have been cleared up, I would come to the main report that is before us. Unfortunately there is a sense of unreality about the whole discussion. We know there were four committees before this Committee went into this business. There was the Motor Vehicles Enquiry Committee. The Study Group appointed by the Planning Commission was the second. Then there is the report of the Estimates Committee, which is a very valuable document. Then there are the recommendations of the Transport Commissioner and Controllers. What Shri Masani Committee has done now is really to put the material in a comprehensive manner what was formerly done in a piecemeal way. Now he has brought out a report and presented the picture of road transport in this country in a proper way. Even now, after the report is published and some months have elapsed, the Transport Ministry, let me state very plainly, they have cold-stored the Report. I am afraid, we have no report alive. It has been cold-stored, because a sixth committee under the chairmanship of Shri Neogy has already been appointed. And if you go through the terms of reference of the new committees, they are almost similar, if not identical, to that of the Masani Committee.

Is this the way to deal with the Report. Road Transport is the anaemic rickety part of our transport system. If I may draw a comparison, you call one doctor. He prescribes a

[Shri Khadlikar]

certain medicine. He says the child will be all right, provided you give the medicine. Then you call another doctor. Then you call a third, fourth and fifth doctor. In the meanwhile the child is getting more and more rickety and anaemic. In such a position if you do not administer a proper medicine in time and say "No we are going to have a sixth expert" I do not know what I should call the Ministry concerned which has appointed this Committee and wasted the tax-payers' precious money over it. I cannot understand it. This is the most important factor which has been brought before this House and before the country by the Masani Committee. Who is to determine the transport policy of our land? This is the main issue. Is it the Railway Ministry to dictate the policy or is it to be laid down by the Government taking into consideration priorities and needs of the people and our economic development.

From times past since the 1931 measure regarding controlling and regulating road transport was enacted, we have seen that in this land the Railway Ministry or the Railway Empire, on which His Majesty the hon. Shri Jagjivan Ram presides, is absolutely in control of our transport policy. And excuse me for saying this with all the eminence of the senior colleague of Shri Raj Bahadur—he is called by his admirers a tiger who used to howl on issues of which he had no deeper understanding but so far as the Transport Ministry is concerned, Shri Patil has proved himself to be just a paper tiger or just a lamb. Beyond that he has done nothing. I say this because there is a point in this. So far as the determination of the transport policy of this land is concerned, in the context of the developmental economy, you have got to consider certain major issues.

You know there was a team by the International Bank. It has made a definite suggestion for a direction of policy. It has emphasized that we

must resist the temptation to develop railways at enormous cost which requires much foreign exchange. This is a very significant factor in our economy. We know that at the present juncture the Railway Ministry has come practically to an end of its expansion programme except, where big factories are coming up, to connect big factories or big industrial concerns with the main trade route which they are undertaking. In the south, if you see the railway map, where road mileage as per head of the population as well as the general region is very, very low, we have got to depend entirely on either a bullock cart or on a motor vehicle if available and if there is a road where it could go. This is the position.

14 hrs

Therefore I look at the problem from this angle, that is, where economy is breaking ground for want of channels of communication that economy remains stagnant and at a disadvantage to reap the benefit of growth. This is the problem which we have got to face.

My hon. friend, Dr. Krishnaswami, spoke about the small man. I am connected with so many motor operators in the sense that I have known their problems and have tried to study them. On our side it is really a problem. We know that the ordinary cleaner becomes the motor driver and then ultimately he tries to become a motor operator. 99 per cent motor operators or so have hardly more than one vehicle. Except for borrowing money or some credit extended now-a-days by the Tatas, which they do under the new system, he has no means beyond that to ply his trade. Now, are we going to help this man who is helping the economy at the lowest level and who is to decide the policy of this help? This is the problem.

Hon. Shri Asoka Mehta mentioned about octroi and other taxes that are levied by the municipalities and corporations and even by the small local bodies like the Gram Panchayats. He

said: What would happen to their income? He ought to have realised, if he had studied the finances of the local bodies during the last ten years, that because of this greater turnover their incomes have gone up and if for the sake of convenience of a transport system they are really made to suffer a little it would not be a big burden. Therefore I would like to place before this House the main recommendation of the Committee which it should consider and which the hon Minister should consider. It is no use giving us vague promises.

There are three parts I am coming to that. But what we can implement without reference to the Rail way Board is this one recommendation of giving some subsidy in taxation or otherwise where the transport operator is trying to operate his bus in localities where there is no other alternative mode of transport. Unless some such subsidy is forthcoming by way of concession in taxation, by way of some advance, by way of loans or otherwise I am afraid all the risks that he has got to run will never be run. It would be difficult for him and in the process that small operator is likely to be wiped out.

Why I have said this? It is because since the report was published if I were to make a resume of what the hon Minister has said it would throw some light. The hon Minister was there at the All India Motor Union Congress. In that gathering of operators he gave a very optimistic picture and held high hopes. He said, "The Masani Committee's report is coming and then everything will be all right. All your grievances will be removed." Then later on when the actual report came, the language changed. There were more words than any concrete acceptance anywhere. Talking about the report in conclusion he said, "It is something that will stand with us for many years to come. It is a light—a beacon light—so far as the development of transport is concerned." What a good language? Shri Patil knows without substance what

to say in a sort of a flowery language. He said it but without committing himself. This is his position.

Then, in between the Neogy Committee has been announced. I think that this is a matter which this House must take seriously. Why should another Committee be appointed when one Committee's report is available which has not yet been debated and when Government has not said whether it can or cannot implement certain recommendations? Why a third Committee should be appointed? What is this farce of appointing committees? Today what is happening in this country? Let the Treasury Benches take the warning. They held out promises. They published reports every morning. If you look only at the headlines you see this picture. Big promises are held before the people such as every hut will have an electric light and radio soon. All sorts of things appear and the ordinary man feels so, some things are being done as promised. The same thing happened regarding this report and when the question of implementation came the Ministry is sitting tight, almost in a subservient manner accepting the dictation of the Railway Ministry so far as the transport policy of this land is concerned.

I want to fight this issue. Let this House take it up as to who is to lay down the overall transport policy of this country, whether it is bullock cart transport, motor transport, railway transport or shipping transport. All the policies must be related and in the context of our situation and the growing economy of this country. That factor cannot be ignored.

Now, so far as the recommendations are concerned, there are three parts. I will just in brief mention them. The first part is providing funds for more roads for strengthening existing bridges, culverts so as to allow fuller utilisation of vehicles, providing bridges on national highways which are missing. What the

[Shri Khadilkar]

Ministry has got to say about it? Have they said anything? Nothing. The other day, while he was talking about tourists and tourism and in a very intimate language about the hostesses and their dress, I thought a bit uplifted, moving about the country on a sort of a mysterious rug and enjoying this land. But so far as this pedestrian problem of roads is concerned, what the Ministry has done or is going to do?

Some hon Member just now mentioned bridges. I will just cite one instance. On the River Sone there is a bridge at Dehri-on-Sone, which was formerly a railway bridge. There for one maund of load for a vehicle to pass, the Railway is charging one rupee at a time. This is the attitude. Is this co-ordination? I want to ask the hon Minister. If it were co-ordination and co-operation, why should the Railways charge so heavily for goods that are just being transported from one end of the river to the other on this bridge which happens to be in possession of or the property of the Railways? I cannot understand that.

As regards the second part, that is, finding more foreign exchange for vehicle spare parts, tyres, diesel oil, it is a pity that all foreign secured loans have gone to the Railways. But I do not want to refer to that. The main thing is here concerning the States. Where you are coming in, those which have effect on other modes of transport will have to consult the Railway Ministry and those on which action is to be initiated by the Government of India. There are three categories. They have suggested single point tax. Now, in Bombay State recently there was a report of a Committee which has now come before the House regarding sales tax and they have accepted in principle—single point sales tax. It is a very valuable document. So far as this business is concerned, in order to remove the irregularity and the heavy burden of transport, why not

accept this recommendation? Come forward with a legislation which will serve as a model. I do not want to disturb the State economy, but still, if you want to regulate and expand the transport system you will have to persuade, cajole or sometimes, even control the States so far as road transport development is concerned. If you are prepared to do it, then alone can you do something in the matter. Otherwise you have no future. You can say that you are glorified Ministers of Transport, without any authority. You cannot do anything on your own. You have got to refer everything to the Railway Board. The best thing would be, let it be a part of the Railway Board, this Transport business, and then we shall fight with the Railway Board. This is the position.

If you accept some responsibility to the people, some responsibility which ought to be shared and here and now translated into practice in order to help the common man, as I said, the pedestrian like me, then you have to act without delay.

So far as this report is concerned I would like to refer to many other matters. But in conclusion I would say only one thing. As my hon friend pointed out, so far as employment is concerned, this is an employment-incentive proposition. There is no comparison with the Railways. As I said, so far as opening the economic hinterland to the main market centres is concerned, this is the main thing that you have got to do. Otherwise you will find that our whole economy goes into difficulties. The third thing, and a very important factor in this country, is, as I have mentioned, that so far as the small operators are concerned you have laid down a policy of service co-operatives. Here the Committee has suggested viable units. I have tried to organise some co-operation among the operators. My experience is that they are not prepared to pool the ownership. You will have to find out a way of a type of service co-operative where the opera-

tora will join into a co-operative business so far as the running is concerned and the ownership will be retained by the operators themselves. You must be prepared to do it on a small-scale. Take the service co-operatives. This is a field where you can make a beginning and give them direct licences for tyres, for spares, eliminate the middleman, and you can show the way how the service co-operative reaches not only the motor operators but wherever the truck goes, to the farthest end of our land. This is the way to do it.

With these words I will repeat, let the Ministry act and not say things in a vague manner. As I said earlier, all this discussion has a sense of unreality about it, because I feel the report has been kept in cold storage and the key is with Mr. Neogy and Mr. Jagjivan Ram.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the report of the Road Transport Reorganisation Committee has given us a very comprehensive picture of road transport in our country. There have been several reports regarding road transport, beginning from the report of the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee, then the report of the Study Group on Transport appointed by the Planning Commission, and then we had the reports of the Estimates Committee. But this report gives us an integrated and comprehensive picture about road transport. And the recommendations that this Committee have made are very valuable in so far as they relate to items which form part of the terms of reference to the Committee; those recommendations are very good and, if accepted, will go to a great extent towards the development of the road transport industry.

But when this Committee has overstepped the limits of its terms of reference, I am afraid its recommendations are not quite correct.

Firstly, they went beyond their terms of reference and made those recommendations. Secondly, they did not keep the objective, namely the objective of a socialist society, in view when framing those recommendations.

So far as their recommendations about the administrative set-up in the various States are concerned, if the recommendations are accepted they will be very good. Because, today the transport authorities that have been appointed in the various States with a view to regulate road transport in their respective States are really acting in a manner of restricting the development of road transport. In my State, the erstwhile Hyderabad State, the whole of the passenger transport was nationalised, but in the reorganised State only in one section i.e. Telengana area has this passenger transport been nationalised to a very great extent.

Whenever we ask the Road Transport Corporation to extend their services to certain lines, one or two miles, or even to divert the running of those services by even three hundred to four hundred yards, the disposal of the application for permit by the regional transport authorities takes not less than eight to ten months. And it is only eight to ten months when we go and find out from the Road Transport Corporation authorities as to who is responsible for this delay! Then finally, after a delay of two to three months we go and say "we have applied for a permit, and the permit has not been given". When we go and approach the regional transport authority, and tell them that "this service is essential for such and such purpose", even then they say they will consider it, and in spite of our approaching several authorities the time taken for disposal is very long. In the report of the Committee it has been recommended that a time-limit should be fixed for the disposal of these

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

permits. That is, a limit of three months is placed. I think this is a very valuable recommendation which the Government should accept.

Then, Sir, in this Committee's report we find various recommendations with regard to the administration at the Centre, how the Transport Ministry should have various Wings, a Road Wing, an Inspectorate and a Development Wing, and in the States also they have suggested various other things. If these recommendations are accepted they will go a long way in improving the position of road transport.

It has been said: what is the position of the roads in our country, what is the position of our bridges. So many other things are there. Nobody takes care of these things. In some States there is a Transport Commissioner who does not know how the road is. When the application for permit goes to him he does not know the condition of the road in that particular place. I can quote various examples in my State. There can be a through service provided by the nationalised road transport service—a distance of 150 miles. The railways are fully overcrowded and it takes a longer time to cover these 150 miles. People who want to go very quickly would like to take advantage of the road. Through the whole of this 150 miles length of road there is a strip only three miles in length where the road is absolutely bad. Any right-thinking person in charge of roads would take up the question of repairing these three miles so that through connection could be provided. When we go to the Road transport authorities and ask them to run direct service, this comes in the way. We requested them also to suspend the service during the monsoon. But, they did not agree to this proposition. They say, you come to us; why don't you go to the Chief Engineer or the Minister for Public Works and ask him to get it done? There is no proper co-ordination between the various wings which go

to make the transport system efficient.

They have made a recommendation with regard to increasing the laden weight of the trucks, trailer-truck combinations and so on. This point came up before us when we were discussing the Motor Vehicles Amendment Bill in 1956. It came up for discussion in the Joint Committee also. The Chief Engineer and others informed us that most of the bridges as they exist today cannot stand this weight. Unless and until these bridges are strengthened to stand a greater load, we cannot allow it. Here, again, the Committee has made this recommendation. We will have to consider that taking into consideration the strength of the bridges.

Regarding the State Transport Authority, they have made a recommendation as to what should be the composition. I fail to understand this. All the interests are represented there. I respectfully suggest to the hon. Minister that there should also be representation for the workers who man the transport system. It is not a new suggestion that I am making. Take, for example, the Coal Advisory Committee. The Coal Advisory Committee deals with the problems of the industry. It does not deal with problems of labour or the miners working in coal mines. Representation is there in the Coal Advisory Committee for the workers. They who are connected with the industry will be able to give some information for the development of that particular industry. Therefore, I submit for the consideration of the Minister that this should be borne in mind while studying or accepting the recommendation with regard to the composition of the State Transport Authority.

Then comes the question of co-ordination. There is a dissenting note. The Committee by a majority has recommended a sort of unrestricted grant of licences and permits. They have taken into consideration only the choice of the con-

summer. I am afraid this recommendation is very harmful for the development of the transport system as a whole in our country whatever be the transport system in our country. I posed this question about rail-road co-ordination when we were discussing in the Joint Committee the Motor Vehicles Amendment Bill in 1956. A person who had retired after serving the Railway Board as one of its members and Chairman, who had for a long time been the General Manager of a Railway, and who then was in the Hindustan Motors, came to tender his evidence on behalf of the Road transport industry. I asked him the question, how are we to co-ordinate the railway and road transport systems. I specifically put this question because he was formerly connected with the railways and he was now connected with the road transport—automobile—industry, and I thought he would be able to enlighten the Joint Committee with his valuable experience. Unfortunately, what he replied was, the less we talk about this rail-road coordination, the better. We have been talking about this for decades; there is no way out; we have not been able to solve it. This was his reply. Ours is a planned economy. We have got a plan. We have to regulate the transport system. Otherwise it will lead us into anarchy. Today, what is happening? For instance, coal is low-rated traffic. The railways are deliberately charging less for coal because coal is required for industries and factories. Whatever it is, the freight charge on coal is less than the actual cost of haulage by the railways. In the Asansol area, 10 million tons of coal are produced in the West Bengal region in the Raniganj coalfields. All the high-rated traffic is taken away by road transport. The low-rated traffic is not carried at all by the road transport. The whole of the 10 million tons of coal is transported to Calcutta and beyond by the railways. If a planned system is not there, if there is no regulation, the railways will be left

either to carry all the low-rated traffic and incur loss or increase the freight on coal with the result that industries will also be affected. That is why I really appreciate the dissenting note submitted by one of the Members who is connected with the Railway Board. This is not a problem which can be so lightly talked of. We have been discussing how to do this. There is cut-throat competition going on. We have got so many areas which are not served by any system of transport. The only system of transport which can serve is road transport. They do not go to those areas. Nobody goes to those areas. What is the compensation that has been provided? When we were amending the Motor Vehicles Act, we said, if an operator who is displaced is given an alternative route, he shall not be paid any compensation. Even for that, there was a lot of opposition. In our country there is vast scope for development of road transport. We have not reached the saturation point with regard to the development of road transport. But, some how or other, the transport system radiates only in particular areas because they are paying.

Then, I come to the recommendation with regard to nationalisation. They have said that passenger transport should be nationalised where they could run their State transport efficiently. We have already placed an embargo, when we amended the Motor Vehicles Act, which discourages any State Government to nationalise, because, we have said that if a permit-holder's routes are taken over before the expiry of the permit, we have to pay a compensation at the rate of Rs. 200 per month per vehicle. It was Rs. 100 when the Bill was introduced in this House. We asked on what basis this rate of compensation had been worked out. We could not get any answer. At the same time, due to pressure of various people, due to representations it was suddenly increased to Rs. 200 per vehicle per month. When I had

[Shri T B Vittal Rao]

talk with a very large operator with a huge fleet, he said, "The compensation is more than what we deserve" This is what he told me. On account of that, nationalisation has received a set-back. And here we find this Committee stating that nationalisation should be undertaken when in the alternative we can provide a very efficient service.

Then again I find the Committee recommends that nationalisation of the freight services should not be undertaken till ten years after the end of the Third Plan period, that is only in 1977 we can think of the nationalisation of the freight services. I was surprised when the hon. Minister of Transport and Communications in his inaugural address to the All-India Motor Congress at Bangalore said that Government had decided not to nationalise freight services till the end of the Third Five Year Plan. The House has not accepted it. The House has only accepted that freight services will not be nationalised till the end of the Second Plan period. We have not decided about the Third Plan, but the hon. Minister made such a policy statement. Probably, encouraged by that, this Committee has gone a step further and recommended this.

Not only that. How can this Committee go into the question of nationalisation? Is it in the terms of reference? It is not there. And if they say that nationalisation has impeded the development of road transport, they should adduce reasons, because facts before us do not show any such thing, because at the beginning of the First Plan period only ten per cent of the road transport system had been nationalised and at the beginning of the Second Plan period, that is, after five years, this has increased to only 20 per cent, and during this period, while nationalisation was also going on, the transport industry has

developed. There has not been any reduction in the rate of progress of road transport. It has developed in many areas, but still there are areas which are not served by any transport system.

For instance, while I was in Himachal Pradesh in connection with the Road Transport Workers' Conference, I was surprised to learn that the Government was thinking of denationalising the freight services. In Himachal Pradesh road transport is run on very efficient lines, though they may not be making good profits. And the roads are very difficult there. From an altitude of 3,000 ft above the sea level, we have to go up to an altitude of 10,000 ft, but they drive nicely and it is running very efficiently. If it is left to private transport you will know how much it will affect the Road Transport.

Finally, I may say that really this is a very good report wherein several good recommendations have been made. If some of those recommendations are accepted with regard to the administrative set-up, it will go a long way in the quick disposal of the applications for permits and thereby develop our road transport system, but where they have overstepped their terms of reference I am not in agreement.

श्री श्री गुरु० सि० मुखर्जीकर (अमृतसर)
डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट रिफार्मिंग-
नाइजेशन कमेटी की जो सिफारिशें हैं उनको पढ़ कर बाकी बड़ी तसल्ली हुई है। ज्यादातर सिफारिशें ऐसी हैं जिन पर बहुत जल्दी प्रयत्न होना चाहिये और वह है भी बड़ी मुनासिब। मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि शुरू में ही मेम्बरान कमेटी के नामों से मुझे बड़ी तसल्ली थी कि वह रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट की जो प्रॉब्लेम्स हैं उनको ठीक से समझते हैं, और

उन्होंने उन पर बड़ी अच्छी तरह गौर किया है। यह इत्फाक की बात है कि इस वक्त जो हमारे ट्रांसपोर्ट मिनिस्टर हैं वह भी रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट के मामलात में बड़ी दिलचस्पी लेते रहे हैं। मिनिस्टर बनने से पहले ही वह भाल इडिया मोटर प्रापरेटर्स यूनियन के प्रेजिडेंट थे। इसलिये और भी तसल्ली की बात है कि वह हम पर बहुत जल्दी भ्रमल करावेंगे। मगर शुरू में ही एक डर पैदा हो गया है, जैसा कि बाज मेम्बरान ने जिक्र भी किया है कि रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट और रेलवे ट्रांसपोर्ट में मुकाबले की बात बड़ी चल रही है, हालाँकि इस की जरूरत नहीं है। बजट के वक्त मैं ने कहा था कि फारसी का एक मसला है

ए रौघनिए तबा तू बर मन बला शुदी।

मेरा जो अच्छा काम है वह मेरे लिये एक बला हो गया। ट्रांसपोर्ट वाले जो लोग हैं, स्वाह वह पब्लिक सेक्टर में हो या प्राइवेट सेक्टर में, उन की पिछले दिन की एफिशिएसी की काफी चर्चा हुई है। लेकिन उन का रेलवे के साथ क्यों मुकाबला किया जाय? रेलवे तो एक बड़ी भारी कम्पनी है, बड़ा भारी काम कर रही है। एक बड़े पहलवान को क्या फिक्र है छोटे से पहलवान से कि वह मुझे गिरा देगा। इसी तरह से इस कमेटी के शुरू में ही यह खयाल किया गया कि शायद यह कमेटी रेलवे ट्रांसपोर्ट और रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट के मुकाबले की जो बात है उसे अच्छी तरह से डील न कर सके। यह जो शक था उस को भ्रम बढने नहीं देना चाहिये और इस बात का कोई भ्रसर नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं ने रेलवे बजट पर बोलते हुए कहा था कि अगर हम आज साल पैदा करेगे तो बिजिनेस के नुकते खयाल से, पब्लिक के भफाव और पब्लिक के काम के सिहाज से यह बात ठीक बैठेगी।

जो बनराम सिंह (फिरोजाबाद)
साथ तो बढ़ रही है।

मन्त्री यु० सिंह : मुसाफिर साथ कायम होना मिहायत जरूरी है। हम देखते हैं कि आज रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट वालों ने इतनी ताब पैदा कर ली है कि बहुत से लोग बसों में सफर करना ज्यादा पसन्द करने हैं और उस में सहूलियत समझते हैं। सामान को भी सेफ समझते हैं। मेरा यह मतलब नहीं है कि रेलवे ने इस सिलसिले से कोई तरक्की नहीं की। रेलवे में भी बड़े इम्प्रूवमेंट हो रहे हैं। रेलवे के कर्मचारी ग्राफिशल्स और मिनिस्टर सभी रेलवे को अच्छा बनाने के लिये यत्न कर रहे हैं। मगर हम को यह सोच लेना चाहिये कि रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट और रेलवे ट्रांसपोर्ट के मुकाबले में रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट को कोई नुकसान नहीं पहुचाना चाहिये। थोड़े दिन हुए जब मैं अपनी कास्टिटुएन्सी में गया तो एक भाई ने मुझ से कहा कि मेरी एक सीमेंट की गाडी सर्वाई माधोपुर से मई में चली, मगर वह अभी तक यहा नहीं पहुची है जब कि उस से पीछे जो गाडिया चली हैं वह अपने मजिले मकनद पर पहुच गई हैं। मैं ने चिट्ठिया भी लिखी, पता भी लगाया मेरे रेलवे स ताल्लुकात है, मुसाफिर भी हू। मैंने उसे बड़ी तसल्ली दी कि कोई बात नहीं है। यह मैं कोई रेलवे की मजाहमत के लिये नहीं कह रहा हू। सिर्फ यह बयान कर रहा हू कि जहा रेलवे में और बातों में इम्प्रूवमेंट हो रहा है, वहा रेलवे को अपनी साथ भी अच्छी बनाने की जरूरत होगी। तब फिर खुद ब खुद ट्रांसपोर्ट का काम जितना अच्छा होगा डवलपमेंट होगा, मडके बनेगी, रेलवे को ट्रक्स वगैरह से भाल फीड होगा, उतनी ही रेलवे की तरक्की होगी। रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट के इम्प्रूवमेंट से रेलवे का कोई नुकसान होने वाला नहीं है। इस सिलसिले में तो मैं यही बात कहना चाहता था।

इस के साथ ही मैं अपील करना चाहता था कि किसी भी बेरूनी भ्रसर से मुतासिर हो कर ट्रांसपोर्ट के काम को डीला नहीं किया जाना चाहिये और जो कमेटी की सिफारिशात है,

[शाली म० सि० मुस्ताफिर]

उस के अन्दर जो अच्छी मदात है, उन को अमलीजामा पहनाने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये ।

जहा तक नेशनलाइजेशन का सवाल है, वह सिर्फ ट्रास्पोट के सिलसिले में ही नहीं, हर एक बात में एक बनिंग क्वेश्चन है और गवर्नमेंट के लिये बहुत सोचने की चीज है । हमारा ध्येय यही है कि हमे इस तरफ धागे बढ़ना है । हमे सारी चीजों को एक तरह से ऐमा रग देना है जिससे कि कौम की सेवा हो सके । यह ठीक है कि मैं नेशनलाइजेशन के खिलाफ नहीं हू । बल्कि मैं तो सिर्फ इस बात के हक में ज्यादा हू कि नेशनलाइजेशन के लिये, खास कर ट्रास्पोट के अन्दर, मैदान अच्छी तरह से धीरे टैक्टफुली तैयार किया जाना चाहिये । इस कमेटी की जो सिफारिशात हैं उन में एक बड़ा अच्छा रास्ता हम को मिल सकता है । कमेटी ने यह राय जाहिर की है कि दूसरे मुल्कों के मुकाबले में हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर रकबे के लिहाज में, आबादी के लिहाज में, रोड माइलेज बहुत कम है । फिगर्स से ऐमा मालूम होता है कि बड़ा फर्क बताया है । ऐसी सूरत में मुझे कोई शक नहीं है कि हम जितने भी नये रास्ते डेवेलप करे, नये रास्ते बनाये, सडकें बनाये, उन सब को सरकार नेशनलाइज कर ले । लेकिन इस ढग से सब जगह चले यह जरूरी नहीं है । जहा जहा अच्छा काम चल रहा है वही पर आपरेट कर के नेशनलाइजेशन किया जाय, यह जरूरी नहीं है । अगर कोई नई चीज उठानी है तो सरकार के पास उस के लिये बहुतसी चीजें हैं । कमेटी ने एक तरह से यह रास्ता बसा दिया है कि दूसरे कामों को उठाया जाना चाहिये । कमेटी ने यह राय भी जाहिर की है कि हमारे देश में जहा जहा नई सडकें बनाई गई हैं, वहा मोटर ट्रक्स बर्गरह चल सके । लेकिन उन की तरफ भी कोई तवज्जह नहीं दी गई । वहा जाने के लिये भी लोगों को परमिट्स नहीं दी गई । गवर्नमेंट ने खुद इस पर जल्दी अमल करने की कोशिश

नहीं की । इसलिये अगर आज सारी तवज्जह इसी तरफ दे दी जाय कि जितनी भी नई चीजे, सडकें बर्गरह बन रही हैं, सरकार उन पर अपनी बसें चला ले तो इस के दोनों तरफ का फायदा हो सकता है । वैसे एक बाग काबिल जिक है कि इस रिपोर्ट में जो चीजें हैं उन के सिलसिले में गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी होमोजीनियस होनी चाहिये । यह एक बड़ी जरूरी बात है । नेशनलाइजेशन के सिलसिले में पंजाब में भी बड़ी बर्चा रही है । हम लोगों के लिये बड़ी मुश्किल है कि हम कैसे कहे खुले तौर पर जब कि हमारी सरकार का यह मकसद नहीं है । अगर हमारा मकसद नेशनलाइजेशन की तरफ बढ़ना है तो हमे ऐसे हालात पैदा करने हैं कि जल्दी से जल्दी हम उस में कामयाबी हासिल कर में । इसलिये हम लोगों को इस सिलसिले में कुछ जिक्र करने में मकोच होता है । अगर मैं खुले तौर पर कहता हू कि अब पंजाब गवर्नमेंट ने जो फिफटी-फिफटी बेसिस पर एक कारपोरेशन बनाने का फैसला किया है उसमें सब खुश हैं । आपरेटर्स भी खुश हैं और काम भी ठीक से चलता है । इस फिफटी-फिफटी की बेसिस पर काम करने की पालिसी अगर दूसरी स्टेट्स में भी लागू कर दी जाय और पंजाब का यह सिस्टम चालू कर दिया जाय तो यह समझा जायगा कि आधा रोड ट्रास्पोट का नेशनलाइजेशन तो रजामवी से हो ही गया और इस में कोई दिक्कत नहीं रहती और इसके रास्ते में कोई झगडे की बात नहीं रहती । सारी स्टेट्स को ध्यान में रख कर यह बात अगर मुकम्मिल कर ली जाय तो यह एक बड़ी अच्छी बात है ।

अब इस वक्त एक छदशा और जाहिर किया गया है कि इस कमेटी की जी रिपोर्ट है और जो उसकी सिफारिशात है उन पर शायद बहुत जल्दी अमल नहीं हो सकेगा क्योंकि यहा एक कमेटी ब गई है, एडवाइजरी कमेटी, नियोगी कमेटी, जिसके कि नियोगी साहब बेधरमैन हैं और इसलिये शायद उस कमेटी की भी सिफारिशात और

राय जानने के वास्ते इंतजार किया जाय । वह कमेटी इस सिंहाज से एक परमानेंट कमेटी यानी सेंट्रल कमेटी है जो कि ऐडवाइस किया करेगी लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि उस कमेटी की राय जानने के वास्ते इंतजार करने की इस रिपोर्ट के तिलसिले में जरूरत नहीं है । उस कमेटी में एक कमी भी है जिसको कि मैं डिफैन्ट समझता हूँ । उस कमेटी के परसोनल में नान-भाफिशिएल्स का कोई इक्ल नहीं रक्खा गया है । जिनका कि ताल्लुक रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट अथवा रेल ट्रांसपोर्ट से है । इस कमेटी में उन अशाखास को भी रक्खा जाना चाहिए था । अगर इस बेसिस पर स्टेट्स में भी इस तरह की ऐडवाइजरी कमेटियां बना दी जायं तो वह बड़ी मुफीद साबित हो सकती है । मैं चाहूंगा कि सेटर स्टेट्स को ऐडवाइस करे कि वह भी अपने यहां इस किस्म की ऐडवाइजरी कमेटियां कायम कर लें । इस वक्त स्टेट्स में जो परमिट वगैरह देने के लिये कमेटियां बनी हुई हैं तो मेरा कहना यह है कि यह परमिट वगैरह देना तो एक बिल्कुल साधारण सी बात है । बुनियादी बात तो पालिसी ले ड्राउन करने की है और रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट सम्बन्धी पालिसी तय करने के लिये इस वक्त स्टेट्स लेवल पर प्राविशियल लेवल पर कोई ट्रांसपोर्ट कमेटियां बनी हुई नहीं हैं और इस तरह की कमेटियां बहा पर बननी चाहिये । यह ठीक है कि यहां जो कमेटी ने कारपोरेशन के लिये कहा है कि इस वक्त सिर्फ हमारी तीन स्टेट्स हैं जिनमें कि कारपोरेशंस हैं, बाकी की तरफ इसमें ध्यान दिया गया है । मैंने जैसे कि पंजाब की मिसाल दी अगर इस तरह से वह ऐसी कारपोरेशंस बनाई जायं तो वह ज्यादा कामयाब हो सकती है ।

एक बात जो खास तौर पर काबिले जिक्र है और जिसका कि जिक्र कमेटी की सिफारिसात में भी है और वह वाकई सोचने की बात है । यकीनन सरकार ने बोड़ी हूत तबज्जुह की है कि नई कारो पर उन्होंने

कुछ पाबन्दी लगाई है कि कोई आदमी जो एक कार खरीदता है वह दो साल के इन्वर उसे बेच नहीं सकता मगर यह पाबन्दी बसेज और ट्रक्स पर नहीं है । इसकी बजह से ब्लैक मार्केट बढ़ रहा है ।

धब मेरा कहना यह है कि जिसके कि पास परमिट हों या जो बसेज और ट्रक्स वगैरह का काम करता हो उसको तो जरूर सहुलियत मिलनी चाहिये, इजाजत मिलनी चाहिये कि वह अपनी जरूरत के मुताबिक बसें और ट्रक्स वगैरह खरीदे । अलबत्ता वह आदमी जिसके कि पास परमिट नहीं है, जो कि ट्रांसपोर्ट का काम नहीं करता, उसकी खरीद फरोस्त पर जरूर कुछ पाबन्दी होनी चाहिये ।

डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं समझता हूँ कि आपको भी इस बात का इल्म होगा कि यहां दिल्ली में ही ट्रांसपोर्ट मविसेज में काम करने वालों में कितना हाहाकार मचा हुआ है । जो ट्रांसपोर्ट के काम करने वाले हैं, जिनके कि पास अपनी बसेज और ट्रक्स वगैरह हैं, उनको भी टायर्स वगैरह खरीदने के लिये बड़ी मुसीबत का सामना करना पड़ता है । अगर कहीं टायर फट जाय तो कई कई रोज तक उसका काम बन्द पडा रहता है क्योंकि उसे टायर नहीं मिलते हैं । उनको टायर्स मिलने की सहुलियत हर हालत में बहम पहुंचानी चाहिये ।

जैसा कि मैंने रेलवे बजट पर बोलते हुए कहा था कि दिल्ली से जब पंजाब की तरफ बाई रोड जाते हैं तो जो रेलवे क्रासिन्स पड़ते हैं उन पर पुल न होने की वजह से आध आध घंटे तक बसेज और मोटरकारों को रुका रहना पड़ता है, दोनों तरफ ट्रेफिक रुकी पड़ी रहती है और हमारे मिनिस्टर साहबान और चीफ मिनिस्टर वगैरह को इसका जाती तजुर्बा है कि वहीं पर उनको किस बरह आध आध बंटा रुका रहना पड़ा है और इस तरह कितना उनका बेशकीमती वक्त जाय

[श्रीमती सु० सि० कुसाफिर]

हुआ है। हमारे ट्रान्सपोर्ट मिनिस्टर साहब जो कि एक फीम्टरी का उद्घाटन करने गये थे उनको भी क्रीसिंग के पास फाटक बन्द होने की वजह से काफी देर तक इंतजार करना पड़ा था। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस और सरकार तबज्जह दे और इन रेलवे क्रीमिंस पर पुल जल्द भ्रज जल्द तामीर करवाये। फाइनंस डिपार्टमेंट इस तरफ तबज्जह दे और इस काम को करने के लिये रुपये से सहायता करे, माली इमदाद दे ताकि बाहर से जो सामान मगाना जरूरी हो वह मगवा कर इन पुलों को बना लिया जाय और जिन पुलों में मरम्मत वगैरह जरूरी हो उनकी मरम्मत करवा कर उनकी हालत दुस्त कर ली जाय।

डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं हाउस का भ्रब ज्यादा बक्त नहीं लेना चाहता। मैं मल्टी-पल टैक्सेज का विरोध करता हूँ और जो कमेटी ने सिफारिशात की है उनके साथ इतिफाक करता हूँ और मैं कमेटी की इस राय से सहमत हूँ कि इसकी वजह से हमारा ट्रान्सपोर्ट बजाय तरबकी करने के उसको नुकसान पहुंचता है और उसको पी ब्रे की तरफ ले जाता है।

भ्राजकल डिजेल भ्रायल की माग और जरूरत बहुत बढ गयी है। ट्रान्सपोर्ट सविस को फरोग देने के लिये और उमको काम-यात्री के साथ चलाने के लिये और चूकि डिजेल भ्रायल मस्ता होता है इसलिये इस पर ड्यूटी कम होनी चाहिये और इसको बहुत महंगा नहीं होने देना चाहिये। इन भ्रल्फाज के साथ मैं इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को सपोर्ट करता हूँ और भ्रानरेबुल मिनिस्टर की सेवा में भ्रज करता हूँ कि जितनी जल्दी हो सके इसे भ्रमल में लाये और मेम्बरान का यह खदशा दूर करना चाहिए कि वह कोल्ड स्टोरेज में चली जायगी या और किसी जगह महफूज बन्द करके रख दी जायगी।

श्री भ्र० सु० तारिक (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं इस हाउस का ज्यादा बक्त नहीं लूंगा। मैं जहा तक टूरिज्म का ताल्लुक है, कैसे हम इसे डेवलप कर सकते हैं, कैसे उसकी मदद कर सकते हैं, उनके बारे में भ्रपने ख्यालात का इजहार करूंगा।

जनाबवाला, जब यह कमेटी जहर में भ्राई तो मैं समझा था कि हकूमत फौरन इस कमेटी की सिफारिशात को मजूर कर लेगी और जिस हद तक भी यह सिफारिशात होगी, कम से कम भ्रगर सब नहीं तो कुछ छोडी सी तो जरूर मंजूर कर ली जायेगी। लेकिन भ्रब देखने में यह भ्राना है कि —

मैंने कहा कि बज्म त्ताज चाहिए गैर से तही, सुनके सिनमजरीफ ने म्झको उठा दिया कि यू।

जब हमने यह सिफारिशात पेश की तो उन सिफारिशात के रद्द करने के लिये एक और कमेटी को जट्ट में लाया गया और जिसका कि नाम नियोगी कमेटी है। नियोगी कमेटी का परमोनल भी ऐसे भ्रफराद का रक्खा गया जिनके कि बारे में हमें बहुत पहले से इन्म है कि वह इन सिफारिशात को रद्द करने में बहुत कोशिशें मर्फ करेगे।

जनाबेवाला, मैं भ्रापकी खिदमत में हिदुम्तान के एक मशहर भ्रखबार डाइरिक्स भ्राफ इण्डिया की वह चन्द सनरे जिसमें उसने भ्रपनी राय कमेटी के बारे में जाहिर की है, हाउम के साने रखना चाहता हूँ।

"The Masani Committee's Report on road transport will add considerable fuel to the now familiar rail versus roads controversy. Its energetic advocacy of road transport will be another cry in the wilderness unless the Central Cabinet and the Planning Commission resist the tendency by the railways to dominate the country's transport system. The represen-

tative on the Committee of the Railway Board points out in his Minute of Dissent that the 'interests of the railways deserve to be given greater weight'."

हजूरवाला, जहा तक रेलवे का ताल्लुक है यह भी हुनारी ही एक शोभा है और हम यह जानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के डेरेप करने मे रेलवे ने निहायत प्रथम रोल भदा करना है, लेकिन इस रोल के साथ साथ हमे यह भी देखना है कि हम किस हद तक रोड ट्रामपोर्ट को इस मुल्क को डेवेलप करने मे इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं। और उसको हमे लिये किस हद तक डेवेलप कर सकते है। मेरे सामने इसके सिवा और कोई भिमाल नही है कि रेलवे और रोड ट्रामपोर्ट दो भाई है, हुकूमत के दो डिपार्टमेंट है। लेकिन रेलवे बहुत नाजो का पाला हुमा है। हम पर हमने बहुत कसीर रकम खर्च की है। और जिसको हम नाजो से पालते हैं वह कभी कभी आबारा भी हो जाता है। तो हमे यह देखना है कि रेलवे की यह आबारागी, रोड ट्रामपोर्ट को, जिसकी कि अभी कम उम्र है, खा ही न जाए।

मेरे सामने काश्मीर का नक्शा है। अगर आप दिल्ली से काश्मीर जाना चाहे तो दिल्ली से पठानकोट तक रेलवे मे जाना पडता है और उसके बाद एक ही रास्ता है और वह है रोड ट्रामपोर्ट का। वहा मे आप बमो के जरिये या ज्यादा मे ज्यादा हुवाई जहाज के जरिये काश्मीर पहुच सकते है। लेकिन आपको इस बात का पूरा इल्म है कि हम हिन्दुस्तानियो की जेब इन बात की इजाजत नही देती कि हम हुवाई सफर पर ही इकतफा करे और इसलिये हम अपने हालात के मुताबिक अक्सर रोड ट्रामपोर्ट का ही ज्यादा से ज्यादा इस्तेमाल करते है। रोड ट्रामपोर्ट के मानी यह है कि जिन जगहो पर हम बसे चलाना चाहते है वहाँ पर अच्छी सडकें भी होनी चाहिये। लेकिन हमारी पालिसी यह है

कि जहा अच्छी सडकें है वहा अच्छे रास्ते नही है और जहा अच्छे रास्ते है वहाँ सडकें नही है और इसी तरह से हम रोड ट्रामपोर्ट को डेवेलप करना चाहते है। इसलिये मैं पाटिल साहब से और गज बहादुर साहब से भी गुजारिश करुगा कि वे अपनी पूरी कुश्लत और दानिशमन्दी इस्तेमाल करे ताकि जल्द से जल्द मसानी कमेटी की सिफारिशों को अमल मे लाया जाए।

इसके अनावा मे ये दरखास्त करुगा कि जो इटर-स्टेट टैक्सेज है उनको पूरे तौर पर खत्म किया जाए। तमाम स्टेट्स मिल कर यह न कर ले कि कितना टैक्स लेना है वह एक दफा ले ले। अगर आपको दिल्ली से बगलौर जाना है तो आपको १६०० या १७०० रुपया मुम्तलिफ स्टेट्स को देना होगा। और यह टैक्स ट्रामपोर्ट वाले तो भदा नही करते। वह तो हमारे पाम ही से गवर्नमेंट को आता है। मैं समझता हू कि इसमे ट्रिस्ट ट्रैफिक को बहुत-बहुत धक्का पहुचता है क्योंकि कोई शरूम इनना टैक्स भदा नही कर सकता। लोग हर जगह रेलवे के जरिये ही नही जाना चाहते। बहुत जगह यह रोड ट्रामपोर्ट के जरिए जाना चाहते हो ताकि रास्ते मे और भी चीजो का देख सके। अगर दिल्ली मे डिलकम बम चले और उसके रेट मुनासिब हो तो काश्मीर जाने वाले बहुत मे लोग उसका इस्तेमाल करे। इसका मतलब यह नही है कि लोग रेलवे मे नही जाएगे।

मैं सबझना हू कि मसानी कमेटी का और कोई फायदा हो या न हो लेकिन इनना तो जरूर हुमा है कि रेलवे के कान खल गए है। उनकी बीड सी खुल गई है और डोर डिलीवरी और दूसरी चीजो की तरफ उनका ध्यान गया है। इस कमेटी का और कुछ फायदा होगा या नही यह तो अभी नही कहा जा सकता मगर इतना तो जरूर हुमा है।

एक आत्मनीय स्वस्थ धनी सुमारी है।

बी ७० नु० सारिक : सुमारी है लेकिन नीब तो टूट गई है। आगे कुछ होगा या नहीं वह मैं नहीं कह सकता।

इसके अलावा मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें रास्तो की तरफ भी कुछ तबज्जह देनी चाहिये। अगर आप भोखला या विनय नगर या डिफेंस कालोनी की तरफ से दिल्ली के इस तरफ आना चाहें तो तो एक ही रास्ता है और यह रास्ता दिन में तकरीबन दस बार बन्द हो जाता है। कभी कोई हवाई जहाज उड़ता है तो उसकी वजह से बन्द होता है तो कभी कोई हवाई जहाज उतरना होता है तो उसकी वजह से बन्द होता है। एक छोटी सी रेल विनय नगर से आनी है, दिन में आठ बार उसकी वजह से बन्द जाता है। एक डी सडक है। वह इम तरह बार बार बन्द हो जाती है। इस वजह से वहा बार बार एक्सीडेंट भी होते हैं। वहा से हजारो लोग आते जाते हैं। आपके हजारो कर्क उम तर्फ रहने हैं उनको आना होता है, लेकिन इस तरफ कोई तबज्जह नहीं दी जाती। एक छोटी सी रेलवे लाइन है जिसकी वजह से यह तमाम हाहाकार मचा हुआ है। इम सडक पर यहा कोई पुल भी नहीं बनाया गया है।

इसके अलावा, मैं यह गुजारिश करना चाहता हूँ कि तमाम स्टेट्स में होमेजीनियस पालिसी होनी चाहिये। जहा रेलवे से बहुत फायदा पहुचता है वहा रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट से भी लोगो को बहुत फायदा पहुच सकता है। लेकिन हमारे यहा रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट गरीब आदमियो के हाथ में रहा है। करीब ८० फीसदी लोग ऐसे हैं जिन्होंने बीस बीस तीस तीस साल टुक चलाकर अपनी जान पर खेल कर टुक खरीदे हैं और रात दिन काम करके चार पाच छ साल में किस्त भदा करने की कोशिश करते हैं। वह सुबह चलते हैं। रात को चलते हैं। दिन को

चलते हैं। उनके पास धाराम का बक्त नहीं रहता। न जाने हमारे कितने गौजवानो ने इस काम में अपनी जानें गवाई हैं। अगर स्टेट बैंक उनको मदद दे तो उनकी किस्तो की मुनासिब लिमिट हो सकती है और उनको फायदा हो सकता है। हम रेलवे को भी तो करोडो रुपए देते हैं। और उसका फायदा भी होता है। उसमें से कुछ वेस्ट भी होता है। जो रेलवे में वेस्ट होता है अगर वही रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट पर लगा दिया जाए तो उसकी जिन्दगी ही सम्भल जाए। यही मेरी दर-खास्त है। मैं फिर राज बहादुर साहब और पाटिल साहब से दरखास्त करूंगा कि जतनी जल्द हो सके वह इन सिफारिशो को क्रमवत् में लाने की कोशिश करे।

اگرى لے۔ اہم۔ طاریق (جموں و کشمیر) : جناب ذیلی اسپیکر صاحب۔ میں اس سٹاؤس کا زیادہ وقت نہیں لوں گا۔ میں جہاں تک ٹوریزم کا تعلق ہے کہسے ہم اسے تھولپ کر سکتے ہیں کہسے اس کی مدد کر سکتے ہیں۔ ان کے بارے میں اہلے خیالات کا اظہار کروں گا۔

جناب عالی جب یہ کمیٹی ظہور میں آئی تو میں سمجھتا تھا کہ حکومت فوراً اس کمیٹی کی سفارشات کو منظور کر لےگی اور جس حد تک یہ سفارشات ہولگی۔ کم از کم اگر سب نہیں تو کچھ تہزی سی نو ضرور منظور کر لی جائیگی۔ لیکن اب دیکھتے ہیں آتا ہے کہ۔

میں نے کہا کہ ہزم ناز

چاہئے غیر سے تہیں۔

سن کے ستم طریقے نے

مجھے کو اتنا دیا کہ یوں۔

جب ہم نے یہ سفارشات دیکھی

کہیں تو ان سفارشات کو رو کر کے

لئے لٹک اور کمیٹی کو ظہور میں لایا

کہا اور جس کا کہ نام نہوکی کمیٹی
ہے۔ نہوکی کمیٹی کا پرسونل بھی
ایسے افراد کا رکھا گیا جن کے کہ بارے
میں ہمیں بہت پہلے سے علم ہے کہ
وہ ان سفارشات کو رد کرنے میں بہت
کوششیں صرف کرینگے۔

جناب عالی میں آپ کی خدمت
میں ہندوستان کے ایک مشہور اخبار
ٹائیس آف انڈیا کی وہ چند سطریں
جس میں کہ اس نے اپنی رائے کمیٹی
کے بارے میں ظاہر کی ہے اس کے
سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں۔

"The Masani Committee's Report on road transport will add considerable fuel to the now familiar rail versus roads Controversy. Its energetic advocacy of road transport will be another cry in the wilderness unless the Central Cabinet and the Planning Commission resist the tendency by the Railways to Dominate the country's transport system. The representative on the Committee of the Railway Board points out in his Minute of Dissent that the 'interests of the Railways deserve to be given greater weight' "

(حضور والا - جہاں تک ریلوے کا
تعلق ہے - یہہ بھی ہمارا ہی ایک
شعبہ ہے - اور ہم یہہ جانتے ہیں کہ
ہندوستان کے قبولیت کرنے میں
ریلوے نے نہایت اہم رول ادا کرنا ہے -
لیکن اس رول کے ساتھ ساتھ ہمیں
یہ بھی دیکھنا ہے کہ ہم کس حد
تک روتہ ٹرانسپورٹ کو اس ملک کو
قولیت کرنے میں استعمال کر سکتے
ہیں - اور اس کو اس کے لئے کسی
حد تک قبولیت کو سکتے ہیں - سہرے
سامنے اس کے سوا اور کوئی مثال نہیں

ہے کہ ریلوے اور روتہ ٹرانسپورٹ دو بھی
ہیں - حکومت کے دو تہاڑتلیت ہیں
لیکن ریلوے بہت نازوں کا پالا ہوا ہے -
اس پر ہم نے بہت کٹھن رقم خرچ کی
ہے - اور جس کو ہم نازوں سے پالتے
ہیں وہ کہی کہیں آوارہ بھی ہو جاتا
ہے - تو ہمیں یہہ دیکھنا ہے کہ ریلوے
کی یہہ آوارگی - روتہ ٹرانسپورٹ کو -
جس کی کہ ابھی کم عمر ہے - کہا ہی
نہ جائے -

سہرے سامنے کھمبر کا نقشہ ہے -
اگر آپ دلی سے کھمبر جانا چاہیں تو
دلی سے پتلان گوٹ تک ریلوے سے جانا
پوتا ہے - اور اس کے بعد ایک ہی
راستہ ہے اور وہ ہے روتہ ٹرانسپورٹ کا -
وہاں سے آپ بسوں کے ذریعہ یا زیادہ
سے زیادہ ہوائی جہاز کے ذریعہ کھمبر
پہنچ سکتے ہیں - لیکن آپ کو اس
بات کا پورا علم ہے کہ ہم ہندوستانوں
کی جہب اس بات کی اجازت نہیں
دیتی کہ ہم ہوائی سفر پر بھی اتنا
کریں - اور اس لئے ہم ایسے حالات کے
مطابق اکثر روتہ ٹرانسپورٹ کا ہی زیادہ
سے زیادہ استعمال کرتے ہیں - روتہ
ٹرانسپورٹ کے معنی یہہ ہیں کہ جن
جگہوں پر ہم بسوں چلانا چاہتے ہیں
وہاں پر اچھی سڑکیں ہی ہونی
چاہینگے - لیکن ہماری پالیسی یہ
ہے کہ جہاں اچھی بسوں ہیں
وہاں اچھے راستے نہیں ہیں اور
جہاں اچھے راستے ہیں وہاں
بسوں نہیں ہیں - اور اسی طرح سے
ہم روتہ ٹرانسپورٹ کو قبولیت چاہتے
ہیں - اس لئے میں پاتل صاحب
سے اور راج بہادر صاحب سے بھی

[عربی اے - ایم - طارق]

گذارش کروں گا کہ وہ اپنی پوری کوشش اور دائرہ عمل استعمال کریں تاکہ جلد سے جلد مسابقت کمیٹی کی سفارشات کو عمل میں لایا جائے۔

اس کے علاوہ میں یہ درخواست کروں گا کہ جو آلات اسٹیٹ ٹیکسٹریسٹری میں ہیں ان کو پورے طور پر ختم کیا جائے۔ تمام اسٹیٹس مل کو یہ طے کر لیں کہ کتنا ٹیکس لینا ہے۔ وہ ایک دفعہ لے لیں۔ اگر آپ کو دلی سے بلنگلوں جانا ہے تو آپ کو ۱۶۰۰ یا ۱۷۰۰ سو روپے مختلف اسٹیٹس کو دینا ہوا۔ اور یہ ٹیکس ٹرانسپورٹ والے تو ادا نہیں کرتے۔ وہ ہمارے پاس ہی سے گورنمنٹ کو جاتا ہے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس سے ٹورسٹ ٹریک کو بہت نقص پہنچتا ہے۔ کیونکہ کوئی شخص اتنا ٹیکس ادا نہیں کر سکتا۔ لوگ ہو جگہ رہلوے کے ذریعہ ہی نہیں جانا چاہتے۔ بہت جگہ وہ روٹ ٹرانسپورٹ کے ذریعہ جانا چاہتے ہیں تاکہ راستوں میں اور بھی چیزوں کو دیکھ سکیں۔ اگر دلی سے قی لاگس بس چلے اور اس کے بہت مناسب ہوں تو کسمپور جانے والے بہت سے لوگ اس کا استعمال کریں۔ اس کا مطلب یہ نہیں ہے کہ لوگ رہلوے سے نہیں جائیں گے۔

میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ مسابقت کمیٹی کا اور کوئی فائدہ ہو یا نہ ہو۔ لیکن اتنا تو ضرور ہوا ہے کہ رہلوے

کے کٹ کٹ گئے ہیں۔ ان کی نئی سی کٹ گئی ہے۔ اور پورے کٹھنوں اور دوسری چیزوں کی طرف ان کا دھیان دیا گیا ہے۔ اس کمیٹی کا اور کچھ فائدہ ہوگا یا نہیں یہ تو ابھی نہیں کہا جا سکتا۔ مگر اتنا تو ضرور ہوا ہے۔

ایک ماہی سدا سے - ابھی
خساری ہے -

عربی اے - ایم - طارق - خساری ہے لیکن نئی ٹوٹ گئی ہے۔ آگے کچھ ہوگا یا نہیں یہ میں نہیں کہہ سکتا اس کے علاوہ میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ میں راستوں کی طرف بھی کچھ توجہ دینی چاہئے۔ اگر آپ اوکھا - یا ولے ٹکرو - یا قہلےس کا پانی کی طرف سے دلی کے اس طرف آنا چاہیں تو ایک ہی راستہ ہے۔ اور یہ راستہ دن میں تقریباً دس بار بند ہوتا ہے۔ کبھی کوئی ہوائی جہاز اڑتا ہے تو اس کی وجہ سے بند ہوتا ہے۔ تو کبھی کوئی ہوائی جہاز اترتا ہوتا ہے تو اس کی وجہ سے بند ہوتا ہے۔ ایک چھوٹی سی ریل ولے ٹکرو سے آتی ہے۔ دن میں آٹھ بار اسکی وجہ سے بند ہوتا ہے۔ ایک ہی سوک ہے۔ وہ اس طرح بار بار بند ہو جاتی ہے۔ اس وجہ سے وہاں بار بار ایکسپنڈنٹ بھی ہوتے ہیں وہاں سے ہزاروں لوگ آتے جاتے ہیں۔ آپ کے ہزاروں کلرک اس طرف رہتے

ہوں۔ ان کو آنا ہوتا ہے۔ لیکن اس
طرف کوئی توجہ نہیں دی جاتی۔
لیک چھوٹی سی ریلوے لائن ہے۔ جس
کی وجہ سے یہ تمام ہاماگرا مچھا ہوا
ہے۔ اس سڑک پر یہاں کوئی پل بھی
نہیں بلایا گیا ہے۔

اس کے علاوہ میں یہ گزارش
کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ تمام اسٹیٹس میں
ہرموجیٹس پالیسی ہونی چاہئے۔
جہاں ریلوے سے بہت زیادہ فائدہ ہے۔
وہاں ریلوے ٹرانسپورٹ سے بھی لوگوں کو
بہت فائدہ پہنچ سکتا ہے۔ لیکن
ہمارے یہاں ریلوے ٹرانسپورٹ فریب
آدمیوں کے ہاتھ میں رہا ہے۔ فریب
۸۰ فیصدی لڑکے ایسے ہیں جنہوں
نے بیس بیس تیس تیس سال ترک
چلا کر اپنی جان پر کھیل کر ترک
خریدے ہیں۔ اور رات دن کام کر کے
چار، پانچ، چھ سال میں قسمت
ادا کرنے کی کوشش کرتے ہیں۔ وہ
صبح چلتے ہیں۔ رات کو چلتے
ہیں۔ دن کو چلتے ہیں۔ ان کے
پاس آرام کا وقت نہیں رہتا۔ نہ جانے
ہمارے کئی بچوانوں نے اپنی جانوں
گدوائی ہیں۔ اگر اسٹیٹ بنگ ان
کو مدد دے تو ان کی قسمتوں کی
مناسبت قسمت ہو سکتی ہے۔ اور ان
کو فائدہ ہو سکتا ہے۔ ہم ریلوے کو
بھی تو کروڑوں روپیہ دیتے ہیں۔ اور
اس کا فائدہ بھی ہوتا ہے۔ اس میں
بے کچھ ریسٹ بھی ہوتا ہے۔ جو

ریلوے میں ریسٹ ہوتا ہے لڑکھی
رہتے ٹرانسپورٹ پر لگا دیا جائے تو اس
کی زندگی ہی سلہل جائے۔ یہی
مہری درخواست ہے۔ میں پھر
راج بہادر صاحب اور پاتل صاحب سے
درخواست کروں گا کہ جتنی جلد ہو
سکے ان سفارشات کو عمل میں لائے
کی کوشش کریں۔]

15 hrs.

Shri Supakar (Sambalpur). Mr.
Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there is a saying
in English that a Royal Commission is
an umbrella to protect the Govern-
ment against public opinion. I believe
that this excellent report that has been
submitted in the month of March and
which we are discussing today has
created an apprehension in the minds
of some hon. Members that it is on its
way to cold storage. I hope that fear
will be repelled by the hon. Minister
when he replies. That apprehension is
justified by the setting up of the
Neogy Committee which I am sure,
will submit an equally good report.
I do not know what Government will
do if there is a conflict between the
present report and that report. Then,
it will perhaps be necessary to set up
another committee to resolve the con-
flict.

The anxiety of the House about the
early implementation of most of the
recommendations of the committee is
evident from the discussion in the
House and I hope that without waiting
for the report of the Neogy Committee
Government will do their best to
implement the recommendations of
this report and will give a definite
assurance to the House as to which of
the recommendations of the Committee
are going to be implemented forth-
with.

I will only discuss a few points
regarding the recommendations of the
committee and finish. The committee

[Shri Supakar] has discussed in detail about the disparity in control, administration and taxation in different States so far as road transport is concerned. You will see in the past so far as the development of the road system in different States of India is concerned, history moulded geography. Those parts of the country which were the political centres had their roads developed, and the comparatively remoter corners of the country were neglected. There were no roads worth mentioning in those parts—not even village roads were to be found. You will see that though in some of these States, in recent times, in other spheres, after the attainment of independence, some new industries are coming up, still, so far as road development is concerned they remain in the same backward position as they were before.

To add to this, these poorer States do not have funds enough to develop roads. Because they have no roads, they have no vehicles from which they can derive any income and consequently the vicious circle continues. So the poorer States have to have higher taxation not only on vehicles but also on petrol. Consequently, the development is further hampered. I am speaking for example, of States like Orissa and Assam. There are big rivers without bridges and roads are not consequently very helpful in taking buses, cars and goods from one end of the State to the other. The difficulty is greater and the problem of road transport becomes greater still. The road mileage is less and taxation is heavier. If the committee suggests that there should be more and more rationalisation regarding taxation and co-ordination of the roads I believe these backward States which have been neglected throughout the last 100 years and more deserve greater help from the Centre.

Mention has been made of the handicaps like octroi and toll gates and other things which hamper the rapid transport of goods and vehicles. There also you will see that it is due to their financial difficulties. In most cases, the

local bodies, the municipalities and panchayats are obliged to take to such taxation. It further hampers the development of the transport system.

Regarding the controversy between rail and road much has been said and I will not say anything more. As some of my hon. friends have said before, the hon. Minister of Transport should not merely say that there is no conflict between the railways and road transport. It is evident that the Transport Ministry is perhaps not able to assert the importance and the vital necessity of the development of road transport in the face of the railways' apprehension that it is a very keen competitor. Coming to the question of diesel vehicles it is an instance in point which goes to show the fear of the Government of India that if they did not tax diesel cars and trucks very heavily, probably there will be greater competition. I think that if we have to look to the convenience of the people as a whole, we must have a more liberal policy so far as road transport is concerned. The Government of India must have an overall plan and it must be pursued more vigorously so far as the development of roads or the manufacture of vehicles is concerned. There should be rationalisation of the taxation system and I believe that even before the Neogy Committee submits its report, the Government will do its best to see that the transport system is developed and that as many recommendations of the present Committee as possible are implemented. An assurance to that effect should be given by the hon. Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, I believe the hon. Members should be able to condense their remarks within ten minutes.

Shri Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): Sir, we find a peculiar spectacle of Railway feeling that the Road Transport is somewhat like a poor relation. There is another in the picture. The Road Transport is feeling that it has a poor relation in the bullock cart. I would like to mention a point about

the bullock cart. In one of the community project reports, they have come to the conclusion that the bullock cart should be taxed. I want to utilise this occasion to say that the bullock carts should not be taxed. Even if the tax is a small amount, it is bad. The main brunt of the country's transport is even now borne by the bullock cart. We may want to do away with bullock cart mentality but the bullock cart will remain.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): They are being taxed at the gram panchayat level.

Shri Narasimhan: The sooner it is stopped, the better, I think I come from an area where three States meet; it is a meeting point of three States: Mysore, Andhra and Madras. The inter-State traffic is abominably bad in the area. It is far easier to travel hundred miles inside a State. I may give an example so that the hon. Minister may understand it better. It is easier to go to Madras from Krishnagiri—a distance of 160 miles but it is very difficult to go from Bangalore State to another place called Hosur which is in another State though the distance is only 25 miles. You cannot get tickets; the buses are crowded. There is a lot of cheating. People are given tickets on white paper and they get into the bus and then suddenly they simply say that only yellow tickets are valid and the white ticket-wallahs have to get down. That is the sort of thing that takes place just for a travel of a short distance of 25 miles or so. I have been agitating; I have written three or four years ago to the Chief Minister of Mysore himself and also the Madras authorities. They could not do anything in this respect. Recently, they have started a long distance service, namely Madras-Bangalore Express service but that does not solve the problem because they care only for long distance travellers. The Madras office would prefer people who go to Bangalore; similarly people who go to Hosur from Bangalore—only 25 miles—would not be

preferred. The starting point office would give preference to long distance passengers. So, people who want to go short distances are in great difficulties. So, people coming from the Mysore side, after coming 15 miles in the bus, get down at the border and then walk a little distance and get into another bus or come by private irregular lorries and cars which are not giving proper taxes; you can call them illegal transport. Even the officials go by them. Once I had to attend a community project meeting and the Collectorate advised me to come by them. "If you do not get a seat, tell the conductor that you have to attend a Collector's meeting" they told me. I wanted a ticket but the conductor did not even look at me but said "No accommodation." I asked him to look at me and he looked at me and said: "I am sorry; no accommodation." But then I told him that I had to attend a Collector's meeting but he said: "Next bus." Bus services are run for such long distances as Mysore-Pondicherry, crossing three States. But for short distances, there is a great difficulty. I welcome these innovations. The Committee have said that the inter-state travel is worse here than travel between one country and another in Europe. The Minister may please see that this is made easier. It seems that they have to pay double taxes. An operator, if he goes over to the other State, has to pay tax both at Madras and Mysore. Therefore, they just take the longer route and come up to a point and leave the passengers in the lurch.

The Road Transport is an excellent example of the State sector and the private sector doing joint work. The State on its part lays down and constructs the roads. The operation of buses is done mostly by the private sector which does not seem to bother much about the roads; the road authorities also do not bother about the buses. In one way, it is not quite healthy; in another way, it gives freedom of action and everything goes on very well. This example should be

[Shri Narasimhan]

remembered when we start other undertakings. Here we have got perfect co-ordination of both the private and the public sectors. Here, they are doing good work for the common objective of lifting passengers. The heavy responsibility of laying roads is taken up by the road authorities and the buses are run by the operators. We find good results.

There are some other difficulties. When the roads were constructed, they did not visualise the huge lorries and vehicles that are now contemplated. Many of the highways are practically one way with the result if two lorries come from opposite directions, there are serious accidents. There is a great traffic congestion and the road capacity is very limited.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are highways and not wide ways.

Shri Narasimhan: They are narrow ways. The buses ply in them with great difficulty. The bridges are also narrow and much attention has to be paid to our highways, where there are bends or turnings. The Banaras-Cape Comorin national highway runs through the area which I represent. There are a number of bends where many accidents are happening. It is not good to allow such things to continue.

There is another thing. There are highways through which railway lines run but no proper level crossings are provided. In my part of the district, there are three express trains which go to the west and three express trains which go in the opposite direction. These six trains have to pass at an interval of about one hour, and practically the whole night trains are running with the result that certain level crossings are kept always closed because there are no bridges. That affects the road capacity there, the capacity of the roadways from Madras to Bangalore, Salem and so on. The roadway from Madras to Bangalore, Salem and other places is also lifting a lot of goods, but the level-crossings

are closed practically for the whole night. Nobody bothers about it. The road capacity that side has been reduced considerably because of this. The road transport authorities should not imagine that it is somebody else's burden, that it is the burden of the municipality of the village concerned, to construct the necessary level-crossings or overbridges. It should really be the burden of the Central authority itself to provide all facilities for the highways because of the traffic that is done through these roadways. Musafirji was referring to a Minister being held up. Here, it is not a question of a Minister being held up, but it is a question of lorries after lorries being held up which certainly reduces the capacity of big highways.

Then my area is a purely road transport area. There are no trains. After getting down from the train, every passenger has to go by bus to reach my part of the State. The trains do not run to time whereas the buses start at the scheduled time. When we reach our destination by the rail and the starting point of the road traffic, we are very very late with the result that the buses go away and we get stranded. That is the position we are facing at present. When road-rail co-ordination is taken up I hope this aspect of the matter will also be taken up. At least in such places, the railways may be allowed to run what are called "out agencies".

श्री बजराम सिंह उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सड़क यातायात पुनर्गठन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में बहुत सी बातें कही जा चुकी हैं। मैं उन को दोहराने की कोशिश नहीं करूँगा। लेकिन कुछ ऐसी बातें हैं, जिन पर इस सदन का और राष्ट्र का ध्यान जाना बहुत आवश्यक है। यद्यपि इस कमेटी की टर्मज् अफ रेफरेस बहुत सीमित थी, लेकिन सीमित टर्मज् अफ रेफरेस के होते हुए भी कमेटी ने कुछ और बातों की जांच-पड़ताल

की, जो कि मैं समझता हूँ कि दशक-धीन ही था। लेकिन मुझे आश्चर्य है कि कमेटी ने बड़ा रेल-रोड को-आर्डिनेशन की बात कही और सही कही वहाँ उस ने यह मुनासिब नहीं समझा कि वह कुछ गांवों की तरफ बढ़ने की कोशिश करती। जहाँ उसने रेल-रोड को-आर्डिनेशन पर विचार किया, वहाँ यह भी आवश्यक था कि वह ट्रक और बैलगाड़ी के को-आर्डिनेशन और मुल्क में बैलगाड़ी के स्थान की भी बात सोचते। जहाँ हम ने सोचना है कि इस देश में रेलवे की तरफ से सड़क पर डाले जाने वाले ऐसे किसी दबाव का समर्थन न किया जाये, जिस की वजह से कि सड़क के यातायात का विकास न ही सके, बहा किमी ऐसी नीति का भी समर्थन नहीं किया जा सकता है, जिस के द्वारा सड़क-यातायात बैलगाड़ी के बल पर विकसित हो-बैलगाड़ी को सैक्रिफाईज कर के, उस को खत्म कर के—विकसित हो। जो दलील रेल-रोड को-आर्डिनेशन के सम्बन्ध में रेलवे के खिलाफ दी जाती है सड़क के विकास के लिये वहीं दलील बैलगाड़ी के लिये भी सड़क के खिलाफ—ट्रक, मोटर और बस के खिलाफ—सागू होती है। हम अनिश्चित काल तक यह नहीं कह सकते कि हम रेलवे को अपने भूताबिक सड़क की नीति निर्धारण करने का एकाधिपत्य देंगे। जब यह कहा जाता है कि जब चाहे तब रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री सड़क के साधनों पर टैक्स लगायेगी—चाहे वह टायर हो या डीजल आयल—और इस प्रकार सड़क के साधनों के विकास को रोकेगी, तब हम को यह भी सोचना पड़ेगा कि हम ऐसी नीति न बनायें, जिस की वजह से ट्रक और बस के नाम हम बैलगाड़ी को खत्म कर दें और इस नीति का सब से बड़ा पहलू यह है कि जहाँ रेलवे में लोगों को काम मिलता है, उस से कहीं ज्यादा काम सड़क में हम दिला सकते हैं और जितना सड़क में मिल सकता है, उस से कहीं ज्यादा बैलगाड़ी में मिल सकता है। यह अन्दाज किया गया है और कमेटी ने भी कहा है कि मुल्क में एक करोड़ बैलगाड़ियाँ हैं।

प्रश्न यह है कि उन को किस तरह खाना खावे। यह अन्धी बात है कि कमेटी ने कहा है कि ट्रकों और बसों के मालिकों के लिये सस्ते कर्ज की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ। मुझे मालूम है कि मोटर-डैले के मालिकों की कमी-कमी—खास कर एक एक डैले के मालिक को—तीस फीसदी तक ब्याज देना पड़ता है। उन की सारी मेहनत ब्याज में चली जाती है। मुझे इस बात का आश्चर्य है कि बैंकों की तरफ से जो डैलों के मालिकों को कर्ज दिया जाता है, उस का रेगुलेशन क्यों नहीं किया जाता है कि वे कितना ब्याज बमूल करें। इसलिये सरकार अधिक से अधिक यह व्यवस्था करे कि मोटरडैलों के मालिकों के लिये कम ब्याज पर कर्ज का प्रबन्ध हो। लेकिन इस नीति को एक और कदम बढ़ाना चाहिये और कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि मुल्क में जो बहुत ही पिछड़े हुए तरीके की बैलगाड़ियाँ हैं, उन को प्रागे बढ़ाया जाये। जब बैलगाड़ियों की बात कही जाती है, तो बहुत से लोग कह सकते हैं कि यह काम काऊ डग एज—काऊ-डग सम्प्रदाय—की बात है। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुल्क की आबादी बढ रही है और अगर उस बढती हुई आबादी में हम न काम चलाना है, तो हम को सोचना है कि याता-यात के इस तरीके को हम खत्म नहीं कर सकते—हम को उसका विकास करना पड़ेगा।

इन बैलगाड़ियों में सिर्फ यही नहीं है कि बारह महीने काम करने वाले काम करते हैं, उन में ऐसे किसान भी काम करते हैं, जो कि आठ महीने तो अपनी खेती का काम करते हैं और बाकी चार महीने बैलगाड़ियों का काम करते हैं और इस प्रकार अपनी आमदनी को सप्लीमेंट करते हैं—अपनी आमदनी में इजाफा करते हैं। मुझे दुःख है कि कमेटी ने इस पर अपने कोई विचार प्रकट नहीं किये हैं, कोई इस की जांच-पड़ताल नहीं की है, जिस तरह से कि उस ने और भसलों की जांच-पड़ताल की है, उसी तरह

[श्री बख्तराज सिंह]

इस की भी बांध-बड़ताल करनी चाहिये थी और अपनी राय जाहिर करनी चाहिये थी। मुझे धाधा है कि सरकार इस पर जल्दी ध्यान देगी और यह देखेगी कि जहाँ सड़क यातायात का विकास जरूरी है और उस में रेलवे की बाधा नहीं बनने देना चाहिये। चूकि रेलवे एक राष्ट्र यकृत उद्योग है, सब में बड़ा उद्योग है इसलिये इस को हम सुविधा देते रहेंगे तो आखिर राष्ट्रीयकरण के क्या मायने हुए? कुछ थोड़े से अफसर ठंडे या गर्म मकानों में बैठ कर एक नीति बना दे और हम उस नीति को ले कर कहें कि हम दूसरे यातायात के साधनों को स्वतंत्र कर देंगे, इसको हम राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं मान सकते हैं। जब हम देखें कि एक राष्ट्रीयकृत उद्योग ऐसे छोटे छोटे उद्योगों का मुकाबला कर सकता है, जो कि उस से प्रतिस्पर्धा करना चाहते हैं, काम्पिटीशन करना चाहते हैं, तब उस उद्योग की क्षमता, योग्यता और दक्षता को माना जा सकता है, वरना नहीं। आज हमारी मानापली है—एकाधिपत्य है, इसलिये हम उस के नाम पर चाहे जो कुछ कर सकते हैं। इसलिये सरकार की तरफ से एक स्पष्ट नीति बने कि हम रेल के नाम पर सड़क यातायात के विकास को रोकेंगे नहीं, यह नहीं कहेंगे कि रेलवे यह चाहती है, इसलिये हम वहां परमिट नहीं देबे। आज जो डेढ़ मी, तीन मी मील के परमिट दिये जाते हैं उनको क्या परिणाम होता है? एक ठेला माल को डेढ़ मी मील तक ले जाता है, जिस के बाद दूसरा ठेला उस माल को आगे ले जाता है, तब माल अपने स्थान पर पहुंचता है। इस तरह श्रम को बेकार बरबाद किया जा रहा है। जिस श्रम की मुक्त के उत्थान के लिये जरूरत है, उसको बनावटी रुकावटें डाल कर बेकार बरबाद किया जा रहा है।

इसी तरह से हमारे नियम इस तरह के बने हुए हैं कि एक राज्य से दूसरे राज्य में

जाने पर टैक्स लगेगा, या रोक लगेगी या बैकिंग होगी। रुपये पैसे के मामले और दूसरी दिक्कतों को छोड़ते हुए ऐसा लगता है कि हमारे मुल्क में कई मुल्क हैं। एक राज्य से दूसरे राज्य में जाने में लगता है कि हम किसी दूसरे मुल्क में जा रहे हैं। इस चीज को खत्म होना चाहिये। लेकिन मैं बात कह रहा था बैल गाड़ियों की। जहां पर हमें जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम ठेलों के विकास के लिये या सड़क यातायात के विकास के लिये कोई रुपया लगायें, वहां त्रमागे लिये यह भी जरूरी है कि हम बैलगाड़ियों के विकास के लिये भी कुछ रुपया लगायें। गावों की जो सड़कें हैं वह कुछ अच्छी बनाई जा सकती हैं, वह कम पैसों में बन सकती हैं, उन में ज्यादा लोगों को उद्योग मिल सकता है। अभी निकट भविष्य में, दस बीस सालों में हम न कोई इस तरह का सड़क यातायात का विकास कर सकते हैं। न ठेलों का विकास कर सकते हैं और न रेल का ही कर सकते हैं। रेलों में तो हम देखते हैं कि जहा १६, १७ लाख रुपये में एक मील लाईन बनती है, वहां उम १६, १७ लाख रुपये को अगर हम बैलगाड़ियों के विकास में लगा दें तो उनसे हम कितनी मील लम्बों सड़कों का जाल बिछा देंगे यह सोचने की चीज है। हमें इस नीति को निश्चित तरीके से तय करना चाहिये, लेकिन अफसोस होता है कि यहां हम तरह की कमेटीया बनती रहती हैं। एक यह कमेटी बनी, उसकी रिपोर्ट आई, लेकिन उस पर सदन में बहस नहीं हुई उसपर हमारा कोई फ़ैसला नहीं हो पाया है, तब तक दूसरी कमेटी कायम कर दी जाती है। मैं बहुत जोरदार शब्दों में सरकार की इस नीति के खिलाफ अपना विरोध प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ। एक इस तरह की कमेटी जो उमी के द्वारा बनाई गई हो, उस कमेटी ने रिपोर्ट दे दी हो, लेकिन उस रिपोर्ट पर सरकार का निश्चय न हुआ हो, उस निश्चय के बिना ही दूसरी कमेटी बिठा दी जाती है। इस का साफ

मतलब है कि आप का मस्तिष्क साफ नहीं है, आप की नीति निश्चित नहीं है। हम सिर्फ जनता को धोखा देने के लिये कमेटी पर कमेटी बनाते जाते हैं। एक कमेटी की जो राय है उस पर काम न करना, उस के बाद दूसरी कमेटी बना देना, उस के बाद एक रिज्यूइंग कमेटी बना देना, उस के बाद भी कोई नीति साफ न करना, यह ठीक नहीं है। मैं ममझता हूँ कि आप की जो यातायात नीति है, चाहे वह सड़क यातायात हो, चाहे रेलवे यातायात हो या गाब यातायात हो, इस नीति का निश्चय करने में, उसके पक्का करने में बहुत दिक्कत पड़ती है। इस में लोगों में शका बनी रहती है। आप ने एक कमेटी का निर्माण किया है, और कहते हैं कि वह कमेटी निश्चित करेगी सारे देश की यातायात नीति के सम्बन्ध में। लेकिन अन्त में निश्चय कौन करेगा? सेक्रेटरी करेगा, ऐसे लोग करेगा जो कि सरकारी नौकर हैं, वे लोग नीति को निर्धारित नहीं करेगा जो जनता के लोग हो सकते हैं। आखिर पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हो और आम जनता के लोग हो, जिन का सरकार की नौकरी में सम्बन्ध न हो तो उन के कुछ स्वतन्त्र विचार हो सकते हैं, वे लोग अपने स्वतन्त्र विचारों को सरकार के सामने रख सकते हैं। जो सरकारी लोग हो, वे एक्सपर्ट्स हो सकते हैं, विशेषज्ञ हो सकते हैं, आप उन की विशेषज्ञ मर्मित बना सकते हैं और उस में सरकारी नौकर हो तो हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। लेकिन नीति निर्धारित करने वाली कमेटी बने, उस में सरकारी लोग और अफसर भर दिये जायें, तो उस के साफ माने हैं कि आप जनता की जो राय है उस का धावर करना नहीं जानते हैं, उस का निरादर ही करना जानते हैं। इसलिये जो नियोगी कमेटी बनी उस के दारे में भी मैं जोरदार शब्दों में विरोध प्रकट करना चाहूँगा और सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि वह भविष्य में रुकल रखे कि जब एक कमेटी बन चुकी हो और उस की

रिपोर्ट आ चुकी हो, उस पर कोई निर्णय जब तक न हो जायें, सबन को विश्वास में न ले लिया जाय, उस वकत तक इस तरह की कोई दूसरी कमेटी न बनाई जायें। नियोगी कमेटी का निर्माण हो गया है। उस की वजह से इस कमेटी की जो सिफारिशें हैं, जिन को स्वीकार किया जाना चाहिये, उन को टालना नहीं चाहिये। यह नहीं कहा जाना चाहिये कि इन सिफारिशों को सरकार स्वीकार नहीं कर सकती क्योंकि नियोगी कमेटी बनी हुई है और वह जो सिफारिशें करेगी उन में और इस कमेटी की सिफारिशों में कहीं कोई प्रतिस्पर्धा न हो जायें, कोई झंझट न पड़े। यह दलील अच्छी दलील नहीं होगी।

इस कमेटी ने सड़क यातायात को टालने की जो बात कही है उसमें मैं महमत नहीं हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक राष्ट्रीयकरण का सवाल है उसे उस में न लिया जाय जिस सेन्स में कि सरकार ने ही है कि बड़े बड़े अफसरों को मोटी मोटी तनख्वाह देने के लिये, एक कमेटी राष्ट्रीयकरण के लिये बना दी जायें अगर यही मतलब राष्ट्रीयकरण का होता है तो इस राष्ट्रीयकरण में देश की जनता का ज्यादा भना हाने वाला नहीं है। देश की जनता के लिये जो मजबूत चल रही है उसमें देर करना ठीक नहीं है। हम घोषणा कर दें कि तीसरी यात्रा के ग्रान में और इस साल तक सड़क यातायात का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं किया जायेगा, या ममाजीकरण नहीं किया जायेगा, यह गलत बात होगी। और मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार इस शकल में उसे स्वीकार नहीं करेगी। जब मैं कहता हूँ कि सरकार इस रिपोर्ट का स्वीकार नहीं करेगी तो मुझे निवेदन करना होगा कि हमें देश को जनता को विश्वास दिलाना होगा कि जो देश में राष्ट्रीयकरण किने हुए उद्योग हैं उन में कहीं पर कोई फुजूल बर्बाद नहीं होगी है उन में जो रपया जनता की भलाई के लिये जाना चाहिये वह भी मोटी तनख्वाह दे कर

[श्री राजराज सिंह]

बरबाद नहीं किया जाता है, यह हम को ध्यान रखना चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार एक ऐसी निश्चित नीति निर्धारित करे जिस से कम से कम लोगों के सामने यह चीज न हो कि जब एक कमेटी बनी हुई है तो दूसरी कमेटी बना कर और गोलमाल कर के सरकार देश की जनता के सामने कोई साफ और निश्चित नीति नहीं आने देना चाहती।

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Shri Raj Bahadur): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to intervene at this stage to make just a few observations of a general character in regard to the various points that have been made by the hon. Members who have participated in this debate, and I think I shall rest content with that.

I think that, if we analyze the speeches, the observations may be classified into two categories. Firstly, we find some observations which have been made by some hon. Members in regard to the specific matter that is before us for our consideration, namely, the recommendations made by the Committee with regard to reorganisation of the administrative set-up in the various States for the purposes specified in the terms of reference. I think I can say without any fear of contradiction that there has been unanimous support so far as these particular recommendations of the Committee are concerned. We can congratulate the Committee that in their wisdom, after their deliberations, they have succeeded in evolving a pattern which has found favour and acceptance with the House. I can also thank hon. Members for appreciating the labours and the work that have been done by the Committee. I join with them in paying my humble tributes to the Chairman and the various members, six of whom happen to be members of legislatures—three from our Parliament and three from State legislatures. So, it can be

said that these recommendations reflect the representative opinion in the country with regard to the question of reorganisation of road transport in respect of the administrative set-up.

The other category of observations made by the hon. Members refers to the question of development of road transport. A good deal of feeling has been expressed and, if I may say so, some disappointment and resentment also at—if I may use the expression—the so-called "ineffectiveness" of the Ministry of Transport in having the recommendations made from time to time by the various committees and bodies implemented. I would, in all humility, repudiate the charge.

An Hon. Member: Customary.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Hissar): So you accept them!

Shri Raj Bahadur: I would very gladly accept if hon. Members would bear with me and just see what the background is and then let us know what exactly can the Central Government do. We know that transport is a concurrent subject under the Constitution, under entry No. 35 in List III of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution. The executive responsibility for the administration of transport vests entirely in the State Governments. The day-to-day administration comes in their field. The State Transport Authority, the Regional Transport Authorities and all other transport administrative machinery function essentially within the scope of the policies or instructions or guidance laid down for them by the respective State Governments. Where do we come in? We come in for purposes of co-ordination. Co-ordination, of course, is a very difficult thing.

My friend, Shri Harish Chandra Mathur, who is not here now, said that we should show qualities of leadership which should suffice to persuade the State Governments to implement the recommendations made from

time to time. I will try to analyse these two points. What are the recommendations that have been made from time to time and how can they be implemented? What are the obstacles and difficulties in their implementation? So far as the recommendations are concerned, we all stand for the development and expansion of road transport facilities. How can that development come? The development of road transport—of motor transport particularly—is governed by two factors. We should have the tracks, the roads—metalled or even other roads if the motor vehicles can ply on them. We should have an adequate mileage of the roads. We should have good surface also and we should have good, strong bridges too. Then comes the production of automobiles, the motor vehicles, in our country. If the production of automobiles goes up to a level but that level does not come up to the requirements of the country or the needs of the transport industry as such, would a charge be levelled against the Ministry of Transport? After all, all the programmes of production of automobiles and motor vehicles are laid down by the consent of Parliament. From Plan to Plan, if I may submit, we lay down what are the respective priorities even in regard to the railways or the road transport. Was it the Ministry of Transport in 1952, as it was then composed, or in 1956, which alone was responsible for the plans for the development and expansion of the road system and for the development and expansion of the motor transport system? The responsibility will have to be shouldered by this august House as well. The Plan has been accepted and the House in its wisdom thought that the road transport industry should be given Rs. 266 crores and the Railways should get more than Rs. 1100 crores. It was not up to the Minister in charge of Transport at that time to impose his will on the Parliament. So, ever since it came to be separated from the railways, the Ministry of Transport has functioned under these limitations.

We are trying to meet the situation and solve the problems that confront us. I can say that ever since the Ministry has come into being as a separate entity we have at least succeeded in one thing, viz., we have focussed the attention of Parliament and the country on the needs of road transport. The greatest and the most concrete proof lies in the fact that we have got so many doughty champions of the cause of road transport today. We do not find any discordant note in this House about the future or the needs of road transport. The very fact that it has succeeded in focussing the attention of the people on itself is the greatest proof of the success of the road transport industry. That is why I say I cannot entirely plead guilty to the charge that the Transport Ministry has not done anything.

Now comes the question of persuasion. A parallel has been drawn between the Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of Community Development. I have got great respect and admiration for the sister Ministry of Community Development and I take pride in the fact that worthy tributes have been paid to that Ministry, for their achievements. But there it is the question of the Ministry of Community Development giving something to the States. Here it is the other way about. Here we want that the State Governments should limit their taxation on motor vehicles and motor transport. We want to take away something from their revenues. From time to time we have made the recommendation that the totality of the taxes in the various States should not exceed the level of 75 per cent of the taxes obtaining in the State of Madras. I would say that many States find it difficult. Even Madras says, "Why are you putting us as something like a criminal or guilty State before the entire country? After all, we are getting legitimate revenue out of a source which can yield such revenues." There is no denying the fact that the motor transport industry has been yielding that

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

revenue to the State Governments and for very understandable reasons, they do not want to allow any diminution of their revenues from taxation on motor transport.

We would try our level best to persuade them. In fact in one particular matter we have tried to persuade them a good deal just to adopt one uniform principle of single point taxation, viz., normally any vehicle which has paid its tax in one State shall not be required to pay tax again when it crosses the frontier of that State and goes into another State. That is accepted by all the States except Bombay and U.P. The hon. Chairman of the Committee whose report we are considering comes from Bombay and I would at once concede that he has got much more of persuasive power in him than I can ever claim or pretend to have. I think he should also persuade the Bombay Government. Similarly, many hon. Members coming from U.P. who have spoken today could also do the same thing with their Government. We are from time to time discussing this matter with the transport authorities in these States, and we are just trying to persuade them saying, "Please do not charge anything more than what is due" They confront us with the argument that they will lose a portion of their revenue if they accept the principle of single-point taxation. We have not failed to point out the basic principles to them. We have told them that so far as that particular revenue which is got by imposition of double-point taxation is concerned, that particular State Government is not entitled to it and that should rightly go to the State to which the vehicle belongs. We have told this to them, but this is yet to be accepted by the State Governments concerned. It is not that we are oblivious of our duties in their behalf. We are trying to persuade them.

15-45 hrs.

[SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN in the
Chair]

The Inter-State Transport Commission also is trying to do it in its own way. Much was said about the Commission's failure in this regard. Did we ever declare, Mr. Chakravarti, that particular routes in our country are inter-State routes? Have we laid down any definition of an "Inter-State route"? To decide on a definition itself takes some time. The definition should be accepted not only by us, but by the State Governments too. Then, a list has to be drawn up and accepted by all concerned. That list has now been almost finalised, and I think before long, we shall have an authentic list of such routes which can be called inter-State routes. So, it cannot be said that the Commission has been sitting idle and doing nothing. The rules had also to be finalised. Many other things had been done to build up the Commission. In quite a number of cases, the Chairman has gone to the various State Governments, brought the transport authorities of the concerned States together and settled quite a few points. However, I myself feel that we could have perhaps done much more, but it has to be recognised that the Inter-State Transport Commission, came into being only about a year or so ago and would take time to assert itself. It has finalised its preliminaries only so far and I think time will soon come when it will be able to make its existence felt.

But let us also realise, that so far we have not given the Commission all the powers it can be given, namely the power to issue permits. Perhaps when the Commission starts issuing permits on inter-State routes, it will make its existence felt much more than today. Now complaints come about inter-State permits, but they pertain to the State Governments, concerned and do not concern the Commission. So far as the question of making ourselves effective for the implementation of the various re-

commendations is concerned, we can say that we have tried to do whatever was possible within the framework of the present set up.

So far as this particular committee's recommendations are concerned, I submit, we have not been idle for a moment. We got the report printed at once and we took the first opportunity to have it considered formally at the meeting of the Transport Development Council held a couple of months ago. We put it before them and the representatives of the various State Governments, Ministers of Transport, Chief Ministers, etc. came, considered this matter and laid down a definite procedure. We are following that. As the Minister assured in his opening remarks, we think by September, we shall be able to get the opinions of the various State Governments and the matter will again be put before the Transport Development Council at its second meeting in November when some results can be expected. Thus in this matter, also, it cannot be said that we have been wasting time or we have not been up to what was required of us.

I now come to certain specific observations made by some hon. Members. In regard to the emphasis that has been laid by the committee on the consumer's choice regarding modes of transport. Shri Asoka Mehta observed that we shall have to take note of the various factors that are relevant in this connection. He read out some quotations from certain books and reports and said that the charges and rates of transport should also be taken into account while allowing freedom of choice to the consumer. So far as the consumer's choice is concerned, my reaction to Shri Asoka Mehta's observation is that the choice is dictated or governed by various economic factors which are inexorable and which can hardly be overlooked. After all, the consumer weighs the matter in all its aspects and takes a comprehensive view

about it. He judges for himself as to what will suit his pocket best of the particular object he has in view and then makes his choice. The consumer's choice is like a stream running in a particular direction and whatever may be our likes or dislikes about a particular mode of transport, to swim against the current is difficult. At present the current obviously is, as has been demonstrated, in favour of road transport. So, if some emphasis is laid on the consumer's choice, it is not merely to please or oblige the operators, but it is only to take a realistic view of the situation existing today. I think we shall have to take due note of the observations made by the committee in regard to this particular matter.

About "cross subsidisation" new phrase for me, of the freight rates of various commodities, I would only say this is a very intricate matter and perhaps the policy committee could go into it. Here let me point out a difference or a distinction between the Committee that was set up earlier namely, the *ad hoc* committee on Reorganisation of Road Transport which had a specific function confined and restricted only to the examination of transport administrative set-ups in the States. Of course, incidentally it went into other questions too, because its terms of reference did allow that—and the other committee appointed recently namely the Neogy Committee which has been appointed for a different purpose. It is not, as Shri Braj Raj Singh, Sardar Iqbal Singh and one or two other members have stated, that there have been committees after committees, or that one committee has gone and another committee has been appointed. Shri Braj Raj Singh said that after the Neogy Committee another committee the "Yogi Committee" will be appointed. It is rather very surprising that a Member with the "eminence" and ability of Shri Braj Raj Singh could not understand what the committee of Shri Masani was meant for and what the committee of Shri Neogy has been

{Shri Raj Bahadur}

appointed for. Shri Neogy's committee comes as a result of the recommendations that have been made by the various bodies, I think right from before independence, and particularly after the report of the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee, upto date. These recommendations were repeated by the Taxation Enquiry Committee, then by the Study Group of the Planning Commission on Transport, then again by the Estimates Committee as also by the various transport advisory committees. They have all been emphasising the need for the setting up of a committee which should go into the question of evolving principles on the basis of which we could to formulate our "national transport policy". We do want a national transport policy. The need for it was felt for a long time and the demand for it was being repeated from time to time. And it is as a result of these recommendations and demands that this committee has come into being. It has got a specific purpose.

Shri Khadilkar: May I know whether this committee's function is not very limited? It was not supposed to lay down the principle or policy of reorganisation. What is the difference? I have read out the terms of reference of even the Neogy Committee. Will you point out what is the exact difference?

Shri Raj Bahadur: If the hon. Member cares to turn to the introduction, of the Masani Committee report he will see that the introduction says:

"The proposal to set up a committee to advise on the re-organisation of transport administration in the States was first mooted at the First Transport Controllers' Conference in August 1955."

So, they had to advise on the re-organisation of transport administration in the States. That was the purpose. Its terms of reference are given

at pages 104-106. From there it will be seen that these were laid down as follows:—

"In order to secure the fuller development of road motor transport and its expansion to meet the demand created by the Second Plan it is essential that there should be suitable machinery in the States to look after the various problems facing the industry and to plan and foster its development. It is felt that the existing administration in most States is concerned more with the regulation of motor transport rather than with its planned development."

So, it is specifically with the purpose of reorganisation of the administrative set up in the States. Now, the terms of reference of the Neogy Committee have been published. I think I should read only the first sentence

"to survey the existing machinery for the administration of motor transport in the States with particular reference to the working of the regional transport and State transport authorities"

I am sorry, I am reading the same thing. I do not think the other terms of reference is with me. In any case, the Minister has already read it. I think the purpose of the Neogy Committee is perfectly clear. It will go into the larger question of laying down the limits, laying down, if I may say so, the premises within which the various systems and forms of transport in the country will expand or develop, keeping in view the requirements of our agriculture, our commerce, our industry, our finance, trade and other social requirements. So, I think the purposes of the two committees are quite clearly different and distinguishable. It is not as if the report of one committee is being shelved for the other.

I will now come to one or two observations of an important character which were made by other

friends. Shri Asoka Mehta advised Government ought to examine the impacts or consequences following the injection or introduction of the modern system of transport in our traditional economy. I think our rural areas, our 5,70,000 villages require roads and when roads come road transport comes. I would submit, for reasons which are very ably stated by Shri Khadilkar himself—I will not repeat them—the commodities and the produce from the rural areas should also be transported cheaply, economically and quickly to the market, and that is a fact which has got to be taken into account.

Shri Mathur has once again repeated his observations he made earlier in another connection. His two charges are: firstly, the ISTC has done nothing. I have already referred to it. I do not think I need repeat it here. The other charge is that there is some sort of "squeeze" or "corruption" prevailing all around. The other day also he made the same point in another context. I would respectfully submit that we expected the Committee in its report or recommendations to give some method or some measures by which we could curb these corrupt practice, mal-practices or irregularities. After all, even if the regional transport authority consists of only one man, what will happen? If there are two claimants and if these claims are alike, how will the Regional Transport Authority or the magistrate presiding over that body determine the rights of the parties concerned? There should be some criteria. Unfortunately, the Committee in its recommendation has not pointed out any criteria on the basis of which one could decide in cases where everything else is equal and a choice has to be made in favour of one claimant out of so many. If there are no criteria, should it be decided by drawing lots or should it be done by some other method? There the rub comes. So, we shall have to devise some

steps to ensure that this particular need is also met.

Shri Harihar Chandra Mathur: There should not be any artificial scarcity as has been created at the present moment. If there is free licensing these things will disappear.

Shri Raj Bahadur: That is arguing in a circle. We would not have scarcity and we would be self-sufficient only if we increase the production of our automobile industry. If the production of the automobile industry is adequately increased, obviously there will be no scarcity or shortage and premium on the sale of vehicles or on permits. The Committee itself has complained in its report, and rightly complained, that there is at present a premium on vehicles and permits. We know that there is premium on permits as well as a premium on the purchase and sale of automobiles. I hope, it may be possible now, with the new system that has been introduced recently for the sale of vehicles, to eliminate premium in the case of sale or purchase of motor vehicles. But so far premiums unfortunately prevail, and we are sorry for that. Perhaps, these could be eliminated by some other stringent measures. That is the whole point. Of course, if the scarcity was not there, the need for having some controls may not have been there, and the problem would not have arisen at all.

Then, Sardar Iqbal Singh said we in the Ministry of Transport have been rather weak-kneed in our attitudes or relation with the sister Ministry of Railways. He has called co-ordination subordination and said that we have to pull our weight. Shri Braj Raj Singh and Shri Khadilkar asked: why not let the Transport Department itself be merged with the Ministry of Railways? I would submit that in a democratic set-up we have got to work in some sort of co-ordination and harmony. After all, we cannot ignore the fact that there is huge investment in the railways. But I agree that we

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

have got to remember the huge investment in the road transport industry as well. That has to be done. Were it not for the fact that the road transport development needs were more keenly felt, perhaps the two Ministries would not have been separated. Now they have been separated, these problems have come to the fore. So far only two years have passed. But in due course we shall be able to give Transport its due place and provide for the development of road transport adequately. It should not, however, be supposed that we are not pulling our full weight with the State Governments, or with the Ministry of Railways; in so far as these particular inhibitory factors are concerned, which weigh heavily on the expansion of road transport. Hon. Members will not forget that only recently after much real difficulty and argument we relaxed the restrictions of 150 miles on permits and increased the limit to 300 miles. So far as goods trucks are concerned, these can be given intra-State routes freely. All that has been done. I think in this connection I should thank Dr. Krishnaswami for the very powerful support that he gave us for whatever little we have done.

16 hrs.

Then I will come to one more important point which was made by Shri Tariq. He said that the appointment of the Masani Committee had raised high hopes which are now getting frustrated. As I said, we have not even taken any decisions on the recommendations of this Committee. How then can our hopes be frustrated? How does he think that he is being kicked out of the parlour of his beloved a fact to which he alluded in his Urdu couplet when he had not even entered it. I can only say that his case is under consideration in the court and he should not feel frustrated or disappointed about his future at the present stage.

Shri Narasimhan said that inter-State transport is irksome and harass-

ment is caused to passengers when they travel from State to State. We are perfectly conscious of these difficulties. It is for these reasons that we want that some effective step should be taken to see that all the irksome factors that operate against the free and smooth flow of traffic from State to State are removed. That is why we place high hopes on the particular international highway to which Shri Mathur was referring. Of course, the international highway will take a long time to come. It is expected that it will connect Vietnam in the Far East with perhaps Iraq or Turkey in, what is known as, the Middle East. But it will take time. In this background very truly it is a tragic situation that when our vehicles move from State to State our passenger traffic, our goods traffic and all have got to undergo severe hardships and irksome experiences. I think it is high time that this House comes to the aid of road transport, as it has done hitherto and with its support we are sure we would be able to deliver the goods on behalf of Road Transport.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Could you get greater support from this House than has been given? Every single hon. Member has supported you so strongly.

Shri Raj Bahadur: Thank you. We are so grateful for it.

Shri M. R. Masani: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think today's debate has shown two outstanding features. The first is what the hon. Minister who has just concluded described as the unanimous support that the House has given to the recommendations of the Road Transport Re-organisation Committee, at least in so far as the main body of its recommendations in regard to the administrative set-up is concerned. I think it would also be right to say that even the rest of the Report has received near unanimous or widespread welcome from all sections of this House.

Sir, on behalf of my colleagues in the Committee, some of whom are here including you, who at the moment adorn the Chair, and many who are not here, I would like to express my gratitude to both the hon. Ministers and to the various other hon. speakers from all corners of the House who have been good enough to extend their welcome to our conclusions and their appreciation of what little we have been able to do during the ten months of our existence.

A feature of the debate has been the absence of Party controversy. There has been no party approach to this matter, not even, if I may say so, by and large an ideological approach. We have not . . .

An Hon. Member: Not even the new Party.

Shri M. R. Masani: Not even the new Party.

We have been functioning, all of us here as people who are concerned with the development of one of the most vital needs of our country, that is, transport, and in that cause we have forgotten our political controversies and have tried to understand and apply our minds to the needs of the country. That is why perhaps we can congratulate ourselves on the very high level of the debate that has now gone on for nearly five hours.

Perhaps there was one note of dissent only, on a limited aspect of our Report, and that was the caveat put in by my hon friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, right at the beginning of the debate. Just before I rose, the hon Minister of State was good enough to answer part of his criticism. I would like to assure Shri Mehta that even though the Chairman of the Committee had his own philosophy and still has it, it would be unfair to the remaining members of the Committee to think that they were likely to be

influenced or to swallow that philosophy without having a very good look at it. I do not mind revealing—and you, Sir, can confirm it—that this philosophical aspect also was a subject of considerable discussion lasting over numerous hours when various points of view ranging from that of the Chairman to those that were against it were placed before the Committee and argued on more than one occasion. It is as a result of these various points of view that the synthesis that is to be found in the Report, to which I shall refer later, has taken place. In fact, Shri Mehta himself went on, after making that remark, to say that there was a lack of theoretical clarity. That proves the point that when ten good men come together to pool their minds, leave their pre-conceptions behind and try and find out pragmatically what the answer to the problem is, you do get perhaps a lack of theoretical clarity. But I think the Report is all the better for that attempt to synthesise various points of view, and I would like at this stage to express my gratitude to the members of the Committee for the excellent job of teamwork and for the excellent co-operation with which they all worked together.

I think it was, if I may say so, a good example, along with this debate itself, of the functioning of parliamentary democracy at its best, where hon. Members of the Government Party and hon. Members of the Opposition Parties come together in the service of a common cause

The other aspect of the debate, which has not been such a pleasant one, has been what the hon. Minister has referred to just now, that is, the equally widespread impatience about the implementation of the Report and a widespread apprehension that the Transport Ministry is not doing enough in behalf of the Report and of the general cause of road transport. It is a pity, as my hon. friend, Shri Mathur,

[Shri M. K. Masani]

suggested that the hon. Railway Minister was not here to listen to the debate because it might have been for him a highly educative experience.

I may be permitted to summarise in one sentence the criticism that has been made from various parts of the House. Shri Mathur suggested that the hon. Transport Minister and the hon. Minister of State might provide more leadership on the subject. Sardar Iqbal Singh complained about the non-implementation of the Report and referred to the "subservience" of the Transport Ministry to the Railway Ministry. Shri Khadilkar went even further. He wondered whether this was not a waste of the taxpayer's money, that is, the money that was spent on the Committee's work. I thought he was a little unkind, because perhaps the waste of the members' time might also have been given due recognition since we had worked very hard on this report—all of us—for about ten months. He went as far as to describe the battle between the Railway Empire on the one side and "the paper tigers" of the Transport Ministry on the other. He went so far as to say that the time had come when the Transport Ministry might be remerged in the Railway Ministry for all the difference it would make. Then Giani Gurmukh Singh Musafir and Shri Tariq also pleaded for urgency and more haste. Shri Braj Raj Singh was the last speaker to echo this kind of criticism.

Knowing something of the difficulties of the Transport Ministry, I am inclined to think that some of this criticism was rather harsh. I do admit that some harsh criticism has taken place which probably does not take into account the complexities of the problem and the very difficult task of the hon. Ministers and the Ministry concerned. I would not like, therefore, to subscribe to the language which has been used. But I would, in view of the hon. Minister of State's repudiating that charge, wonder whether it would be so wise to dismiss this

criticism. I think that the hon. Minister of Transport would do well to consider why this feeling exists that the Transport Ministry is not asserting itself adequately vis-à-vis other interests. Simply with a view to correcting the impression that has been created and to put the matter in better perspective, I would like to invite the attention of the House to a few facts.

This Report can be broken down, in its recommendations, into certain categories. The first category is that of the State administrative apparatus—Chapter V of the Report. Now, the hon. Minister mentioned to us what was being done in that regard. When he introduced the subject to the Transport Development Council, he said:

"It is difficult for the Council to go through each recommendation in the short time that is at its disposal. We would accordingly only place before the Council the main recommendations of the Masani Committee regarding re-organisation of the administrative set up."

"The other recommendations will have to be gone into in detail by a small committee which the Council may appoint"—but the Council did not appoint it—"or by a selected group of Transport Commissioners. After an examination has been made by such a small group, the recommendations can be again considered by the Council, if it so desires. Otherwise, action can be taken straightway by the Central Government on the advice of the Committee of Transport Commissioners."

The hon. Minister has explained that by mid-September the Government of India hope to ascertain the reactions and the readiness of the various State Governments to carry out the recommendations in Chapter V, and that by November or December, when the next meeting of the Council takes place, decisions could be taken.

Now, Sir, if by December, by the end of this year, Chapter V of this Report will be carried out, I for one, would feel that the labours of my colleagues and myself have been well rewarded. I do not think we need grudge six months' delay. But I would like to put before the hon. Minister another way in which this might have been handled, which perhaps would have drawn greater appreciation from the House. Suppose the Transport Ministry had, by a simple resolution of the Government of India, said that with such reservations as they might have had the Ministry of Transport accepts Chapter V of the Report and requests the State Ministries to put it into effect and to let them know what they were doing, I do not think that would have been a bad way of going about it either. I think that with the influence that the hon. Ministers could have brought to bear upon the State Ministries, perhaps faster progress could have been made. Of course, I know that the hon. Minister may say, "If we had done that, it would have put up the backs of the State Ministers, we want to pursue the more persuasive way of taking them into confidence, listening to what they have to say, and then publishing our own mind". I do admit there are two ways of going about it and that while one might please the House better

Shri Raj Bahadur: I think the hon. Member would pardon me for interrupting him. He knows what his recommendations are. It means creation of a separate Ministry of Transport. It also means separation of the Transport and the Road Wings, and putting Transport under two sections, one for dealing with transport undertakings and the other dealing with administration under a Transport Commissioner. The Transport Commissioner under the scheme proposed will have to deal with enforcement, inspection, planning and development. All this has got to be done and accepted by the State Governments

with the resultant increase in their budget expenditure and all that. Can we force it just by an order from the Central Government on them, I would like to understand from the hon. Member.

Shri M. E. Masani: I am sorry if I did not make my point clear. I was not suggesting for a moment that the Central Government can force the State Governments to do anything. What I said was that, if the Ministry of Transport had said, "We find Chapter V to be sound" except for certain things—which they might have drawn attention to—"and we would recommend to State Governments that they might accept as much of it as possible and let us know what they propose to do", that would not have been forcing them. I even concede that they might have perhaps not got the same response from the States Ministers, who are jealous of their rights, as the policy pursued by the hon. Minister. Therefore, I have a very open mind on this question. I shall be quite satisfied if by the end of this year, through private and public persuasion, the Ministries of the State Governments could be made to accept Chapter V of the Report, I think we can then all have cause to congratulate ourselves

But there is another series of recommendations which are not of that category, where the Union Government can move without reference to the State Ministries. Just to give some examples of what they are, I would mention the reorganisation within the Transport Ministry in the Union Government itself; the single-point taxation scheme, which is now universally accepted by all concerned and which has also been recommended by the Conference of Transport Commissioners; the third idea about finding funds and high tensile steel from the United States or elsewhere for the building of bridges and culverts; the allocation of foreign exchange for vehicles spare parts and diesel oil;

[Shri M. R. Masani]

credit facilities for operators through the State and the Reserve Bank; and the extension by ten years of the moratorium on the nationalisation of goods transport. I have given a few examples. For these recommendations, there is no need to wait for the State Governments to be convinced. I was glad this morning when the hon. Minister said that some of the recommendations—and I hope he had recommendations of this order in his mind—could be carried out immediately by the Government of India if they make up their mind to do so. I hope at least these recommendations will not be referred either to a group of Transport Controllers or any others for further examination, because I do suggest that, if that is done, it would not be very complimentary to a Committee with which, as the hon. Minister of State pointed out, six Members of the Legislature were concerned. I think, on these recommendations of policy within the competence of the Union Government, the hon. Minister should make up his mind along with his colleagues and announce which of these recommendations the Government of India propose to implement without further delay. Therefore, I was glad when the Transport Minister said this morning that there are some recommendations which could be immediately carried out. I would suggest to him that all recommendations that do not need the co-operation of State Governments should fall into that category.

But, Sir, a third category does remain, and that is Chapter IV on Licensing Policy, because that chapter impinges on the vested interests of the Railways. Now, Sir, on page 61 of the Report we had drawn attention to a circular of September 1958 put out by the Transport Ministry to which the Committee had taken exception even while it was functioning. And that circular, it would be recalled, says (page 61 of the Report) that the Railways should have a seat on State Transport Authorities. We had then

pointed out that not only was this recommendation probably illegal, but that it was inequitable because if other transport interests were debarred from membership of the State Transport Authority, the Railways certainly could have no place in it. I am very glad that the Transport Ministry did not press that point. But unfortunately, a second circular was later issued, I think probably after the Committee became *functus officio*, and I understand that it suggests that in the matter of applications for permits over a distance of three hundred miles, even within a State—intra-State traffic—the S.T.As., if the Railways object should not take a decision but should refer it to the Inter State Transport Commission. It seems to me that there is not much of an improvement in this shift, and if Members in this House are a little suspicious of what would be called a policy of appeasement of the Railways, it is administrative actions of this nature that give support to these suspicions. The I.S.T.C. is not even functioning on the inter State level. Why should a body, which has no concern with intra-State traffic but on which the Railway Board is effectively represented, be given a veto over intra-State traffic, primarily within the competence of the S.T.As., just because the Railways object? It is this kind of veto given to the Railways which makes public opinion suspicious and which makes it impatient with the inadequate defence of road interests by the Transport Ministry. Here again, it seems to me that this circular is not valid and the State Governments would not be bound to carry it out, because they have quite rightly pointed out that the Inter State Commission has no right to interfere in the matter of intra-State transport.

Then we come to the appointment of the Neogy Committee. May I say, at the outset, that there are very few Members of this House or previous Members of this House for whom I have a higher esteem and regard than

my friend Mr. K. C. Neogy? I have had the privilege of working with him in the old Indian Legislative Assembly, as a Member of the Congress Party in opposition to the then government of the day. I hold Mr. K. C. Neogy in the highest esteem as a student of these problems and as a man of independence, integrity and character. Therefore, I congratulate the Government of India and my hon. friend the Minister on securing the services of an outstandingly able and independent man like Mr. Neogy. We could not have had a better Chairman, assuming the Committee had to be appointed. But the House has already commented on what it thinks of the composition of the rest of the Committee. It has been said by more than one speaker that it is loaded with officials and bureaucrats and we cannot really expect much from the Secretaries of the Ministries who are not really concerned with the development of road transport but who go there to watch the respective interests of their own Ministries or zamindaris. Therefore, the country will depend on Mr. Neogy for a fair analysis of the problem and a fair award which he will have to give as the only independent man on that Committee

What bothers me is not so much the composition of the Committee as its terms of reference. The terms of reference, I must confess, are distressing. Let me just read them, because the hon. Minister read one sentence, but when the whole of it is read, it is quite clear that the terms of reference of the Neogy Committee do go against the wishes of this House expressed on numerous occasions.

This is what they say:

"Taking into account the existing stage of development of the various means of transport and the economic, political, social and strategic purposes which the transport machinery is designed to serve, the Committee should recommend—

- (a) what exactly should be the long term transport policy of the country so that the development of the transport machinery may be effected in consonance with our growing needs with economy and efficiency avoiding duplication to the maximum extent practicable;

The House will remember that when the Railway Minister, in the course of his Railway Budget speech made this suggestion that duplication should be avoided, not only this House but also the other House unanimously turned down that specious plea by saying that to avoid duplication means maintenance of a monopoly

Shri S. K. Patil: As far as practicable; see the whole thing

Shri M. E. Masani: Yes; as far as practicable. I do think that it is an unfortunate concession to the Railways' point of view that this need to avoid duplication should be referred to the Neogy Committee at all

It goes on to say

- (b) in keeping with the policy defined under item (a), what should be the respective role of the various means of transport in the country during the next 5 to 10 years; and
- (c) what is the best mechanism for the regulation and co-ordination of the various means of transport so that the transport needs of the country are met in an efficient and economic manner consistent with the larger interests of the country "

The words 'co-ordination' is a good word just as the word 'regulation' is not. But, even the word 'co-ordination', as the House has today unanimously shown, has been used in a

[Shri M. E. Masani]

very one-sided way. Right from 1939 when the word co-ordination has been used, the House knows that it has only meant one thing: attempts to put limits on the number of miles that road transport can serve the country in the interests of the Railway monopoly. Linear restriction; that is what the meaning of the word co-ordination has been. Indeed, it will be recalled, as has been mentioned in the Report, that when the spokesman of the Railway Board came before our Committee, he still harped on the limit of 75 miles as being a reasonable limit for road transport beyond which the Railways should have a say whether they can ply or not. This shows that the Railways like the Bourbons, have not learnt anything or forgotten anything during the last twenty years. This attempt at setting a linear limit on the operation of road transport was successively rejected by this House as well as the other on more than one occasion. The Joint Committee of Parliament, when it considered clause 50 of the Motor Vehicles Amendment Bill in 1956, had in its minute on 24th October, 1956 the following: "The Committee felt that there should be no limit put on the distance that a vehicle should be allowed to ply". The relevant clause which sought to limit to 150 miles—not 75 but 150 miles—was rejected by the Joint Committee and by Parliament and the Ministers concerned made the statement that Parliament had gone against the attempt to set a limit on the distance that road transport can ply. Then, again, from 23rd to 25th February, 1959, in the Rajya Sabha and from 25th to 27th February in the Lok Sabha, both the Houses, by the speeches made, unanimously rejected the plea of the Railway Minister that such limits should be kept and duplication should be avoided. If any further proof is wanted, today's debate shows that the House of the People does not agree to the policy of co-ordination or avoiding of duplication if it means curbing and throttling road transport development in the interests of the Railway monopoly.

Shri Asoka Mehta mentioned that there does not seem to have been "a creative dialogue between the Railway Member on our Committee and the rest of the Committee or between the minute of dissent and the majority report. There may not have been a creative dialogue. But I can assure him that there was a long dialogue which was repeated from meeting to meeting. The dialogue took place in Calcutta, then it moved on to Bombay, and then it travelled to Delhi and Madras. Wherever the Committee went, the dialogue proceeded. It was not as if there was no exchange of thoughts. Both sides put their points with the utmost frankness and in a most friendly way. It is true that the dialogue was not creative, because one side came to the Committee with its mind made up. That has been illustrated by Dr. Krishnaswami in the way in which he has characterised rather harshly the minute of dissent of the Railway member on our Committee. That was a rigid mind, a mind made up, a mind that tried to hold back the progress of the country in the cause of vested interests.

What is the issue? The issue is, do we move with the rest of the world? Do we allow the people of India to travel in the way and to send their goods in the way they want to send? Or do we, in the interests of something that is already there, try to put a strait-jacket on economic and technological progress? Do we try to turn the wheels of progress back? That is the real issue. Co-ordination is a good word. I do not reject the word. I think it is a good word. But the way it has been practised during the last twenty years, up to this moment, does make people suspicious about the word co-ordination, because as somebody said, it is not co-ordination, but "subordination": that was the phrase used in the debate this morning.

So far as the Committee is concerned, its basic philosophy and conclusions on this matter which, I admit

may not be theoretically logical or clear, have been embodied in two or three paragraphs commencing on page 44. I hope, Sir, you will indulge me to the extent of allowing me to read a few sentences, because the Committee's fundamental philosophy should be placed before the House. The Committee says:

"Against this background"—of switching over from railways to roads that has been going on in other parts of the world, in all progressive countries of the world—Against this background, says the report—

"It will be generally agreed that any attempt to turn back the wheels of progress and to cling to a mode of transport that is no longer the most efficient or speedy would be to do grave injury to the basic interests of the country. At the same time, it will also be agreed that the shift from one form of transport to another has to be phased and to be so effected as to make it as painless as possible."

The pain which we are thinking of avoiding is on the part of the Railways

"In such a context, the task of the planner in a democratic society is to balance the free choice of the consumer with the needs of maximum utilisation of resources invested in the various forms of transport"

"The Committee is against favouring any one form of transport against another. In so far as the principle of maximum utilisation of investment is concerned, it is suggested that the best application would be to utilise to the same extent the country's investment in the tracks in both cases, i.e., in the railway lines in the one case and the roadways in the other, and to furnish both the

tracks with the requisite rolling stock or vehicles to utilise the tracks to the fullest extent. . . .

"Equally important is the principle of the free choice of the consumer in a free society. Any attempt to dictate to the consumer, the means of transport he should utilise, is undemocratic and will in the long run retard economic progress. In this connection, we would like to point out that since 1950, the principle of consumers' free choice as one of the fundamentals of a National Transport Policy has been reiterated by successive Committees, e.g., the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee (1950), the Taxation Enquiry Commission (1953-54), the Study Group (Transport Planning 1955), and the Estimates Committee of the Lok Sabha (1956-57). The same principles were recently formulated by the International Chamber of Commerce as explained in a statement presented to the Third World Meeting of the International Road Federation in October, 1958, by the Commission of Transport Users of the International Chamber of Commerce. This policy has the support of the International Union of Railways, the International Roads Transport Union, the International Union of River Navigation and the European Conference of Ministers of Transport."

This is the basic philosophy of the Report and I do suggest to the Transport Minister that the terms of reference of the Neogy Committee do unfortunately beg the question, in so far as this principle is concerned, by going against the wishes of the House as have been expressed on numerous occasions and by going against the fundamental philosophy of the Report also. It seems to me that the principle of the Railway Board is conceded and Shri Neogy's hands are unnecessarily tied and fettered by inflicting

[Shri M. R. Masani]

on him a principle that should not have been inflicted, namely, the need to avoid duplication and the need for co-ordination and regulation. He should have been asked: "is co-ordination or regulation good, and if so, what should it be? He has been told, "co-ordination and regulation are the limiting principles, now tell us how they should be applied." I do feel that the Railways have won the battle in so far as the drafting of the terms of reference of the Neogy Committee are concerned

To conclude, I have taken the time of the House and I have taken the liberty of drawing the attention of the Minister and the House to these facts because I feel that the criticism that has been indulged in today should not be dismissed simply as over-enthusiasm or as lack of awareness of the difficulties of the Transport Ministry. I am very well aware of the difficulties of the Ministry. I yield to none in my esteem for the hon. Minister and in my belief that both the Minister and the Minister of State hold very enlightened views in respect of the development of transport. If we find that the actions of the Government of India do not reflect those enlightened views, then, I think it is our duty, our friendly duty, our constructive duty to tell them, "This House is with you. This Parliament is with you, but we expect you to give greater effect to the wishes of Parliament than you have been able to do so far."

I recall that, about a year or so ago, my young son came back from school and told me of a conversation between himself and his master. He had evidently submitted a paper on an essay which had not come up to the master's expectations, and the master said that was not good enough, to which my boy said: "But, Sir, I have done my best, and I cannot do better than my best, can I?" which was quite a clever question. But the master said: "If this is the best you can do, I do think you can do a little better than even your best." I would

therefore suggest to the hon. Minister that we have a very high expectation of him and his colleague. We know they are enlightened people who understand transport problems as well as anyone in this House. I do not think any Member of this House needs to teach the hon. Minister or the Minister of State the facts of life about the development of transport in any form. We want to strengthen their hands, we want to tell them that Parliament is behind them and, if the criticism that was made today was harsh, it was made in the spirit of telling them to have, as some hon. Member said, more confidence in themselves. When the hon. Minister was absent, some hon. Member, I think Sardar Iqbal Singh, said: let the Transport Ministry develop more self-confidence—in other words, let them realise that they have got more strength behind them than they think they have. Let them not be over-awed by the show of superior force or strength by anyone else. I realise they are up against a strong vested interest, but that is no reason why they should not pull their weight when the whole House is behind them and unanimously support them. In other words, I think the House would like to find its views more adequately reflected in the policies of Government from day to day, and I am sure with this vote of confidence that the House has given not only the Committee's Report but to the point of view of the Transport Ministry which, as the hon. Minister said this morning, is broadly the same, we wish the Minister godspeed in the task of converting the Committee's Report into sound Government policy.

Shri S. K. Patil: I must really begin with expressing my thanks to the hon. Members for the almost unanimous support that they have given to the Masani Committee's Report. I hardly came across a dissentient voice so far as the basic recommendations of the Committee are concerned. If the Members were anxious to pump in a little more self-confidence into me I am indeed grateful to them. I hope

I would be able to digest that confidence and do something according to the expectations of those hon. Members.

Shri M. C. Jain (Kaithal): We want you to reflect that confidence.

Shri S. K. Patil: I do.

I shall not refer to the individual Members and their criticism. That might sidetrack the discussion and possibly it might take a little more time which I do not wish to take. I would come to some points which are very important from my point of view and from the point of view of those who have made those points.

The gravamen of the charge was that in appointing the Neogy Committee after the report of the Masani Committee we have done something wrong, that this Committee is something which really conflicts with the purposes or the objectives for which the Masani Committee was appointed. I want to disabuse the minds of Members on that particular point.

As my hon colleague, Shri Raj Bahadur, has pointed out, the purposes of the two committees are quite distinct. Even while the Masani Committee was functioning, I had, on the floor of the House, more than once assured that a committee—call it a coordinating committee or a committee to fix the national transport policy of the Government or of this country, would be appointed. What was in my mind was not something to supervise or to comment on the Masani Committee's recommendations. It had nothing to do with that.

This Committee is quite distinct and different, and it was understood from the very start, and therefore, if there was any delay in appointing the Neogy Committee, the delay was not wholly on the part of the Transport and Communications Ministry, because, in order to appoint the committee, its terms of reference had to

be agreed upon by the two Ministries. It is not the Transport Minister alone that rules the roost, there is somebody else that comes into that roost. Therefore, they have got to put their heads together and devise the terms of reference which would be acceptable to both the Ministries. It is exactly that has taken a little time, and it is exactly that that has made those terms of reference as my hon. friend Shri Masani has quoted.

But he must give credit to the Transport Ministry for one thing. For twenty years and more you have allowed transport to be a part of Railway Ministry. I am not finding fault with it, but there it was for 20 years or perhaps more, I do not know the exact time. The whole concept was that transport was perhaps one subject, and road transport was dominated, and surely dominated, by the Railway Ministry because that was a huge leviathan under which road transport functioned. For the first time Government or this Parliament had the courage only two years back 1957, to separate transport from the Railway Ministry, and may I ask my hon friend Shri Masani what miracles he expects us to do in these two years?

Shri M. E. Masani: We expect that from you.

Shri S. K. Patil: That the Transport Ministry could even induce the Railway Ministry during these two years to agree to the appointment of this co-ordination committee and to agree to these principles to which they never agreed before and in which they never before believed for such a long time, is itself something for which the Ministry deserves credit, not that we want credit for it, but surely the House must bear in mind that the separation is not yet complete, still the old connections sometimes persist; and if they have persisted for a little while and may persist for a little longer, it is not because there is anything like shyness

[Shri S. K. Patil]

on the part of the Transport Ministry or want of confidence, but because of the real process by which we have got to work so that we can secure the maximum co-operation of both the Ministries put together and so devise a national transport policy.

Therefore, the Neogy Committee was conceived in that way, and surely not because it is any check-up of the Masani Committee. Please disabuse your minds of that.

Perhaps Members wonder why this Committee is so very officialised because five out of the six Members are the Secretaries of different Ministries. The House will remember that this is not like the other committees. Really speaking, it was a committee which the Planning Commission for their purposes could have appointed even without reference to anything in order to telescope the "activities of the various transport branches, in order to have some kind of picture as to how the allotment of money has got to be made. We enlarged the scope a little bit. I would have myself preferred quite an independent committee, just as Shri Neogy who is the Chairman of this Committee is an independent Member. In the sense that he is not attached now to the Government as he used to be before. If there had been two or three members like that, it would have been a different committee indeed, but the idea was not to appoint a committee like the Masani Committee which goes to all the parts of the country or wherever it is necessary, gathers evidence and does things of that description and then make a report which again Parliament considers for several months or years and ultimately comes to some decision. That is not the purpose of this Committee at all. It was going to be merely a committee, an official committee, taking all these things together and trying to find out from them what should be the policy for the next eight or ten years so far as the allotment of the funds is concerned.

Therefore, it was really a very good thing that we could induce Shri

Neogy to be the Chairman of this Committee so that it is not merely the official mind that works on it, but there is somebody, a Chairman, and a very powerful Chairman who has given the best part of his life to the consideration of the transport questions of this country. Then also, I could tell you that you should not go only by officials and officials. I shall merely give an illustration, not that I want to say anything against the officials. Please remember that the Secretary to the Transport Ministry is also one of the members. Do you think that that officer would ever be deflected from what his Ministry wants or he wants? So also, the Secretaries to the Commerce and Industry Ministry, the Finance Ministry, the Cabinet, the Planning Commission are there. Therefore, the House need not go away with the impression that because they happen to be Secretaries to the different Ministries, therefore, their views would be different. I think they would stoutly support, perhaps more than what the hon. Members have done, the cause of road transport. I have no doubt about it. But they have got to see that within the whole national transport scheme, they do something by which they can stop avoidable duplication. The word 'duplication' need not frighten my hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani. He sometimes believes, because the experience of the past twenty years when this was a part of the Railway Ministry, has been in that direction, that possibly duplication or co-ordination is subordination, and, therefore, something will happen. But he also forgets that it is not a question of the past or the present, but it is the future that has got to be taken into consideration.

Now, let me give an illustration of duplication, as I conceive of it. It is in that conception that I have agreed to this word 'duplication' being put in there. For instance, there is a railway track today, and there is a road today. That is what is present, that is what was there in the past; nobody is going

to remove either that railway or that road. But we have got to build up railways, and we have got to build up road systems in the future, in the Third Five Year Plan. Since we have got limited funds, we have to see that within that limited fund, we so apportion the fund that there might be no duplication. Had we had enough funds, then we could have given to the railways as much money as the railways wanted and as much money to road transport as road transport wanted. But that is unfortunately not possible for us. Therefore, within the money or within the resources at our disposal, we have got to find out whether in a particular tract we should have railways or, in particular, what is better, the development of road transport. Therefore, avoidance of duplication does not mean that what has already taken place or what is at the present time there would be disturbed, it only relates to the future, and that too, the near future, because we are face to face with the Third Five Year Plan, and we have got to allot money

Therefore, within the money available for development of transport all branches of transport, somebody has to find out, ultimately to advise the Planning Commission, as to how much should go to the railways and how much to road transport in order that we shall get the maximum advantage out of the transport system. Therefore, one need not be afraid that because the word 'duplication' has been used there, therefore something would go wrong. Surely, the Transport Ministry, and I, as the Transport Minister, and my hon. colleague would do their best to see that the interests of road transport do not suffer, and they will not suffer. Therefore, my hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani need not go with the impression that because the word 'duplication' has been used here, therefore, something wrong is going to happen. If he wants more money to be given for road transport,

here is the Finance Minister, and he can ask him to give me more money. But ultimately, even the Finance Minister has got to make the allotment within the limited resources available at his disposal. It is a very hard and a very delicate task indeed. One need not be afraid that because something has not been done today, it will not be done tomorrow also, that because a little more money has been given to the railways, therefore, we shall necessarily favour the railways. That is not the way that we should judge all these things.

16.44 hrs

[MR SPEAKER in the Chair]

I think what I have stated so far will serve to disabuse the minds of people as to why the Neogy Committee has been appointed. And I am quite sure that they will come to some conclusions as to what is to be done in the near future, that means, the two years of this Plan or even less than that, and the five years of the Third Five Year Plan, so that the available resources can be very scientifically apportioned, not that they have got to enunciate a new theory in this regard.

Then, somebody referred to the controversy, and it was asked why it should not be called a controversy. Should I begin by doing the work of a wrestler with the Railway Minister and call it a controversy and call it something bad? I must avoid this kind of expression; there is no controversy in it. Sometimes, I put it this way. I shall give you an illustration. A very big officer of mine was talking in very hot words; naturally, he believed in it, and he was very earnest about it as to what he should do, and how he would write his note. I quietly told him, not that he was wrong, but 'Look here, supposing you had been an officer of the Railway Ministry, what kind of a note

would you have written?'. Immediately, he understood. The mere accident that I happen to be the Transport Minister and somebody else who is my colleague happens to be the Railway Minister does not mean that he should take purely the railway view and I should take a purely road transport view; we must both take a national view as to what is in the best interests of transport, whether it be railways or road transport etc. We must have some kind of a synthesis which we are attempting. Therefore, our attempt should be, at least, that is my attempt, that I should not call it a controversy and fly at it and simply say that he had done some wrong. He has done no wrong. After all, that was the system that prevailed in this country. He is there by sheer coincidence a Minister of Railways, just as by sheer coincidence I am the Minister in charge of Transport and Communications. Therefore, both of us must take a national view, and we are doing that, not that there is no controversy in these things or there is no problem between me and him, but when we sit together and consider these problems, we at all times and under all circumstances come to a unanimous decision that this has got to be done, and we are prepared to accept the advice of those who know something more about it. When this committee decides or recommends something, then surely, it is both for me and for him.

The very fact that a committee has been appointed will restrict to a certain extent the rights and the privileges of the railways. That is a great concession which my colleague has made. Therefore, how can you say that the Railway Minister is not relenting or that the Railway Ministry is not relenting at all?

Then again, it is not a question of the Railway Ministry or the Transport Ministry or merely the Members of this House. We have got 570,000 odd villages to be taken into considera-

tion. We have got an area of 1½ million square miles in this country. Just now, our road development is not very significant; it is somewhere about, if I mistake not, 0.28 mile in one square mile, that is 26 miles in 100 square miles; we want to double it, and make it 0.55, after spending Rs 5,200 crores in twenty years. So, you can quite understand how gigantic the whole scheme is. Again, all our villages are not approached by roads; the railways do not serve them. If you take the percentage of railways, it comes to about 0.028 mile per square mile; that means one-tenth of the roads, that is, our railways today run only to about one-tenth of what our surface roads do in this country. In a situation like this, when we are so undeveloped in both the departments, railways and roads, surely, this is not the time when we can come to grips with controversies about it. Sometimes, a situation may arise which appears to be like some kind of a competition. I may give an illustration. This competition is not between road and railways alone but it is between all kinds of transport. Hitherto, in some ports, salt and coal used to be carried by our coastal ships. When they began to be carried by the railways, could I then come and say there is competition between the coastal ships, that is, our water transport and the railway transport? Similarly, the roads take away something from the railways, and, therefore, it becomes like a kind of competition. Sometimes, it may happen like that; the consumers' choice sometimes comes in, as I shall presently illustrate. But there should not be any misunderstanding on that score, that some kind of a great controversy has developed. That time will not come for a long time in our country. I repeat what I said on the floor of the House before, that for another twenty-five years, there will be so much growth of traffic in this country, natural growth, which will simply flow from the development plans that we have got in hand, that

[Shri S K Patil]

neither the railways nor road transport nor any other mode of transport need be afraid that they will not have enough traffic to carry. Therefore, what has arisen in the USA or in many of the countries in Europe has not arisen in this country, that will take at least twenty-five years. I would call that the point of saturation beyond which the railways cannot go. So, the roads are always having a place in our country, and there will not be the picture that we see in America. But I may say here that the railroads that are there in America are there after one hundred and seventy-five years of growth, because their growth is not of one day—in fact, there has been a very intensive growth of both the systems during the last fifty years. Even then, five years back, when the road programme for ten years was made in the USA, President Eisenhower presented a budget for ten years to the tune of \$ 110 billion for road development, which comes to about \$ 11 billion every year for development of road transport, which in terms of rupees would come to Rs 5500 crores every year. What I am telling you is not that enormous sums have been budgeted by them but that even after fifty or hundred years of development, even today, road development is a continuing development, and it will never stop, it is unlike the development of railways. Therefore, a point has been reached there where the railroads are nearly going out of circulation, and the roads are spending as much as Rs 5500 crores every year for their development. Such a thing has not happened in this country, as I said both the systems have got to develop. Therefore, that question will not arise for a very long time to come in our country.

There is a programme which the road engineers have made. That is—after the Nagpur Plan—another Plan, the Bombay Plan, costing Rs 5200 crores. It comes to about Rs 250

crores annually. Has the Finance Minister Rs 250 crores to give me annually? If so, I would be very glad indeed. I want it. But where could he give it? I must also understand that it is not merely the road department that he has got to be taken into consideration. He has got hundreds of different things to take into account. According to that, for the Third Plan, we did not budget for Rs 1200 crores, we budgeted only for Rs 1095 crores. But we are very much afraid that neither the Planning Commission nor the Finance Minister is going to have a look at it. Where could they give Rs 1095 crores during those five years?

I am not making a suggestion. You may think that instead of fighting and quarrelling over it, I have become so docile and submissive, in the words of my hon friend, Shri Khadilkar, a paper tiger, not a real tiger, a very non-violent docile tiger whose claws have been clipped and who, therefore, becomes a most innocent animal, a good animal whom one need not be afraid of. It is not that. But I have got also, when I sit in the Cabinet, when I sit in the National Development Council, to take into consideration a relative picture of everything and ultimately find out as to what is the best that Government could do for the promotion of road transport. That does not mean that there is no fight or self confidence in me. It is not that a mis-conceived or mis-placed confidence and fight will yield results. Possibly a docile tiger might do the job better than many others can.

My hon friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, referred to the Consumers' choice and said that it should not be unrestricted. Now the point is not that. Suppose I want to send something very quickly to another place. I do not even use road transport. I use air transport. It is the choice of the consumer. You can restrict it to a certain point. But surely by creating facilities or by not creating facilities, you cannot put a ban on him saying

that he shall not do that While better and quicker transport is available to him, surely he can utilise it May I say that even today goods are transported by truck all the way from Bombay to Delhi, Bombay to Calcutta and Delhi to Calcutta, because there are various advantages into which I need not go because the Masani Committee's Report has gone into the details of that problem and pointed out how beneficial in the interest of the consumer it is that he spends even more safely, quickly and so on? All those obvious advantages are there

Therefore, I cannot come and say that for some social good that I imagine it must be restricted This itself is a social good If you really separate the man from that social good and impose on him conditions, then he has no right to move his goods swifter to places Surely, that is not necessary and that is not what we are attempting Therefore, you cannot stop this natural course by any law that this Parliament or anybody can make Hence the primacy of road transport from that standpoint will persist and will always persist and remain, and this House need not be afraid that anything that the Ministry would do would really stop the progress of the development of road transport

He also talked of cross subsidisation and asked whether inter-State cross subsidisation also could not take place Now it is only easy in the public sector because you sometimes have the coal or the salt These are not commodities that you can sell dearer in the market because all the manufactures and other things have to depend on coal Therefore, you have got to regulate the price of coal Sometimes Government subsidise and take it from the high-rated cargo Therefore, both put together make a kind of thing which is really a co-ordinated picture of that But you cannot apply that to the road transport, which is perhaps bearing all the taxation which the railways do

not I sometimes cannot understand when Members come and say that because we have put so many crores—so many hundreds of crores—on the railways, they become our special responsibility, and if the private people have invested thousands of crores in a particular thing, that is not our consideration I cannot understand it, if one is a national wealth, the other is equally a national wealth which has got to be safeguarded in the same manner in which you safeguard the other national wealth in the public sector But the advantage of the public sector is that because we control the prices of it, we have got the monopoly of it We can give a little concession where it is needed and possibly make it up by high-freighted cargo Therefore, it is done But that cannot be done in the case of road transport My hon friend, Shri C R Narasimhan, called it correlative It is so For twenty years you have kept it so, and for two years now its chains have been taken away Now you want it to be as strong as a wrestler and fight—in two years' time That takes a little longer I could say one thing Between these two, I could always promise that so far as their connections are concerned, you will increasingly find that road transport will assert itself as it has been asserting itself

I was talking of cross subsidisation While it is possible in the public sector to do that, you cannot link it up with the private sector and say that the roads also must give something for it, for different purposes—for the simple reason that all those who operate road transport pay all manner of taxes The trouble today in this country is that so far as road transport is concerned, we are the most heavily taxed country If you take the Madras scale, I do not think you will find any place anywhere in the world where taxation on motor vehicles is as heavy as in Madras So when we took the decision in the Transport Ministry, it was to the effect that the incidence of taxation

[Shri S K Patil]

in other States should be somewhere about three-fourths of the Madras rate. Therefore, the Madras scale of taxation was a ceiling to which everybody was looking, nobody could go higher than that ceiling, anywhere in other parts it should not exceed three-fourths of the Madras rate.

Therefore, the trouble is not anything else, it is the high cost of it that really comes in the way of quicker development. But even then, we must not forget that this high taxation that we get is a kind of thing like a high-freighted charge which we receive like taxation in the coffers of Government and use it for other purposes. That is cross subsidisation of one type. We need not actually call it so, but ultimately it works in that direction, because you take the tax and use it for hundred other schemes. Otherwise, had you not used it, you would surely have had to tax the common man in order to get more-money. Therefore, over and above this, you cannot have something by way of cross subsidisation so that the low-rated traffic could be supported by the high rated traffic from the private sector on to the public sector. That is not possible and that is not necessary.

Then he also referred to 'creative dialogue' between the members of the Committee. It is a new expression, a charming expression. My hon friend, Shri M. R. Masani, has already replied to it. I am quite sure there was a lot of creation there—in the long Report of the Committee and the 'longer' dissentient note that the other member has written. Anyway, there was that feeling. I do not find fault with that member because, naturally, he has been trained in that way. He represented the interest of the railways there. For twenty years it has been dinned into his ears that the other transport was merely a sort of addendum or some kind of thing that helped railway transport. Therefore, I do not find fault with him. He has pointed out—very critically pointed out—where exactly the

limitations must lie. You need not take it that way. It does not mean that it is, as someone called it, a fantastic nonsense or things of that description. I can quite understand it. That cheers me up because my case is really supported. But surely that kind of support is not the one that will help to induce the Ministry to come to my way of thinking. Innocent as I may look and shy as I may appear, I think that is a better way to induce the other Ministry to come round to our point of view.

Incidentally, I compliment my hon friend, Dr Krishnaswami, for the very eloquent support that he really gave to the recommendations of the Masani Committee.

Then some hon Members have said that the Inter-State Commission has not been really effectively functioning. They forget that the Inter-State Commission is a new thing. We have created it. It does require a personality. That personality has got to be developed. I plead guilty to the charge that it has not yet done that type of work that you expected from it. That is not done merely by laying down the law. The proper type of persons must be there. Conventions have got to be established. Do you know that when you created the autonomous States—almost sovereign States, as they called themselves—they were so jealous for the preservation of those rights. At a time like that, to induce them to do a particular kind of thing takes a long, long time indeed. And who are the 'defaulting' States? That word is bad. They are not defaulting, they are non-co operating for the time being. But they will co-operate. Those States are Bombay and UP. They are big, powerful States, and when they yield, everybody will yield. Small States have yielded.

And what is happening today is this. These poor States which have yielded and come to our way now become hesitant looking at the big States not having yet cooperated with us. Therefore,

it shall be our duty to see, not merely at the level of the officer of the Council but even at the ministerial level, that for a proper national transport policy we get on with the cooperation of the States including the Bombay and UP States. Therefore, if the work has not really gone according to the expectations, it is not for the fault of any particular thing but for the fault of the machine. It is a new machine which has got to be lubricated. When it once starts working nobody can stop it. Therefore we are not doing it on a mere legal basis, we are doing it with all persuasive ways and if we fail in that we shall come to Parliament to take the other weapons that are necessary in order that all the States could be brought in the same scheme that we are discussing here today.

17 00 hrs.

There is the Transport Development Council. What can be better than this Transport Development Council that we have created, the Council in which there is representation.

An Hon. Member. We can continue tomorrow.

Shri S. K. Patil: No, no, I will finish it. It is a Council in which there are the Chief Ministers of the various States. There are the Ministries, they are sitting together in that august body. If they cannot deliver the goods then, surely, I cannot say that there is any other machinery that we can produce that can be able to deliver the goods.

When I went to the Transport Council I had all the recommendations of the Masani Committee, and what exactly we wanted to do. If I saw them in a good mood and saw that they are good people who would accept anything, I would say here are the recommendations of my Ministry and get them accepted. If somebody got

up and said that they want time to read the report, that it is a big report, then I say, though they are small, yet they are sovereign States with all powers which they have got and which they guard jealously, the report should be distributed and we may consider it at the next meeting. Therefore, all these things are not done not because there is no desire on our part to implement the recommendations but because we have got to take all the States. Therefore, we say let us do it at the next meeting. If we lose 3 or 4 months' time, but if we get the goodwill of the States and they unanimously come and say here is the Transport Council you want and we support all the recommendations, then we have really won the battle. That is exactly the case.

I have got to tell you and I can assure my hon friend Shri Masani and his colleagues of that committee that in my prefatory remarks today I have said that I go with him and my Ministry is working on the same lines as the recommendations of the Masani Committee. What more proof and what greater proof do you want of the *bona fides* of the Government and how they intend to proceed on this very vital and delicate question?

With these words I would say there should be no misunderstanding on the point that the Ministry is not earnest or anxious to implement those recommendations. I will be a happy man when I can say to this House that all these recommendations have been implemented.

Mr Speaker. The question is

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Road Transport Re-organisation Committee laid on the Table of the House on the 16th April 1959."

The motion was adopted.