

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

Commission Act, 1951, explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents referred to at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid within the prescribed period. [Placed in the Library. See No. S-110/54.]

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

INDIAN CENTRAL SUGARCANE COMMITTEE

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri M. V. Krishnappa): I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of Para 3-29 to 31 of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture Resolution No. F. 7-32/53-Com. I, dated the 24th December, 1953, constituting the Indian Central Sugarcane Committee, the Members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two Members from amongst themselves, to be Members of the Indian Central Sugarcane Committee."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That in pursuance of Para 3-29 to 31 of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture Resolution No. F.7-32/53-Com. I, dated the 25th December 1953, constituting the Indian Central Sugarcane Committee, the Members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two Members from amongst themselves, to be Members of the Indian Central Sugarcane Committee."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform Members that the following dates have been fixed for receiving nominations and withdrawal of candidatures, and for holding an election, if necessary, in connection with the Indian

Central Sugarcane Committee, namely:—

Date for nomination.	Date for withdrawal.	Date for election.
12-4-1954	14-4-1954	17-4-1954

The nominations for the Committee and the withdrawal of candidatures will be received in the Parliamentary Notice Office upto 4 p.m. on the dates mentioned for the purpose.

The election, which will be conducted by means of the single transferable vote, will be held in Committee Room No. 62, First Floor, Parliament House between the hours 3 and 5-30 p.m.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further discussion of the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The cut motions also will be simultaneously taken into consideration.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma (Kanpur Distt. South cum Etawah Distt. —East.): Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I proceed with my speech, I would like to invite your attention to certain references which one of the Members last evening made in this House. These references were made in connection with gentlemen who are not Members of this House and as such, I would crave your indulgence, even though you have been good enough to rule that no personal references are to be made in discussions on the floor of this House, to refer to these matters and to say a word or two in regard to those points. Have I your permission, Sir, in doing that?

Some Hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Last evening, there was, made in this House, a speech which, I believe, surpassed every other speech in the

House because it touched such a low level.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He cannot criticise or give adjectives to the character of the speech. What is the point, I should like to know. What objection he has and any point of order that he wants to raise, he can mention.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: I am not raising any point of order. I only want to bring to your notice the character of the speech as it struck me and many other Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker: I thought the hon. Member was referring to the fact of some names being mentioned by the speaker.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Yes. I did mention that even though there was a ruling of the Chair that names are not to be mentioned, especially of persons who are not Members of this House, yet, yesterday some names were mentioned and therefore, I crave your indulgence to refer to those very facts and names in this House. You were kind enough to give me permission to do that.

Some Hon. Members: Do that.

Mr. Speaker: There seems to be some misapprehension, perhaps on my part. I have said many times that it is wrong and it is not fair that any Member of this House should refer to names of individuals who are not present in the House and who have no opportunity, therefore, of either explaining the facts to the House or replying to the charge made. I do not know what names were referred to. But, whatever defects were found or were believed to exist by the speaker who spoke, he could criticise the Minister without mentioning the names. It is the Minister who is responsible to this House and the officers who are acting under him must not come into the purview of the discussions in the House. If that has been done, I wish it was stopped there and then. If it

was not stopped and it has gone out, I do not see how to avoid again something to be said in defence of those people.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: That is the difficulty which I am feeling. I hope hon. Members in future will take care to see that such a situation does not arise.

There is a rule also on this question. But, it appears Members are forgetful of the rules and sometimes in the heat of the debate, some allegations in speeches are made. All that I would like to do again is to appeal to Members not to refer to any names and—I do not mean it is a threat; I give it as a notice to Members—in case this is violated, the hon. Member who does that will not be able to catch the Speaker's eye so long as I am in the Chair.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): Should not that hon. Member be asked to withdraw those remarks and allegations which he made against those persons who are not Members of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Only I am making a distinction between allegations made which refer to the administration and persons who were responsible for such a kind of thing in respect of which the allegations were made. I think a Member while criticising the policy of the Government is entitled to give out his views and make the allegations which he thinks are well-founded. The mistake lay in mentioning names of particular officers and associating them with these allegations. That should not be done.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): On a point of clarification, are we to take it that in criticising the Minister—I am only giving an illustration—a person may say that the Minister has appointed so and so because he is related to him—will he be precluded from saying

[Shri Frank Anthony]

that? We are not making any charge against the person. We are making the charge against the Minister. I am only asking for a clarification.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member does not know that I have overruled such questions. He must first come to the Speaker if he wants to make a charge like that. He must be satisfied about the facts and then the allegation can be made. I am not going to permit mere relationship as a charge or a matter of insinuation that mere relationship gives a ground for believing that there has been nepotism. But, it should be the unanimous effort of the Members of this House to see that the prestige of the administration by giving names like that is not lowered and the level of the debate does not go down. That is the whole point.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: The hon. Member yesterday made serious allegations against the Director-General, All India Radio and made insinuations against that person. He has lowered the prestige of the person. That person has no right to defend himself here. What shall we do now?

Mr. Speaker: I have said that the hon. Minister will do the needful.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): Why not those remarks be expunged from the record?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): It is too late now.

Mr. Speaker: Nothing is too late. Now that the hon. Member has suggested expunging, I shall go through the speech and unless the speech contains any words or expressions which are unparliamentary *per se* I do not think I should expunge it. Merely because it contained allegations or statements, it does not become unparliamentary.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I have got the text here....

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow that here.

3 P.M.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: As I read the speech of my hon. friend Shri Chattopadhyaya, I was struck with his tremendous capacity to import vitriol and venom and vain verbosity into his performances in this House. If you go through the speech you will find not a single sentence in it which can be considered germane to the fair criticism or helpful criticism of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. From the beginning to the very end, he has indulged in a theatrical and in a sort of Punch and Judy showmanship which is his own profession as it were.

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

I feel, as I have always felt, that Shri Chattopadhyaya is a genius of a sort, but sometimes it appears that the geni in the bottle take possession of him and then he, I think, becomes quite a different man, he just becomes beside himself, his real self.

Shri P. R. Rao (Warangal): Is the debate on Chattopadhyaya?

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: It is on Chattopadhyaya and on many things that Chattopadhyaya said.

When he is beside himself, I think he forgets as to what he is saying. One of the hon. Members here, Shri-mati Uma Nehru, wondered whether the gentleman who was making that speech was really in his senses, and I also wondered whether his ears had not been too much poisoned by hearsays and whether he had not been led astray.

At the outset he referred in his speech to the Jack of Spades. The only thing I can say about this is that in referring to the Jack of Spades he perhaps forgot that he was referring to himself inasmuch as he is always considered by many

as a jack of all trades but master of none. As I said, his Punch and Judy showmanship and his vulgar mimicry have given him, or rather have taken away from him, that reputation which he should have enjoyed as a man of letters. Of course, he is classed as one of the passable poets of the English language who have been born in India.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakha-patnam): Possible or passable?

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Passable.

But, when I hear the sort of performance that he makes in this House, I am led to believe that there is something wrong with him. The irresponsibility and the sheer cussedness with which he said that the Minister for Information and Broadcasting was a thoroughly incompetent man will show that he is suffering really from a sort of spiritual gangrene, and the sooner he gets himself operated upon the better for him.

Some Hon. Members: Spiritual?

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Spiritual or spirituous it may be.

Shri Namblar: It requires a doctor please for operation. (*Interruptions*).

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: He has indulged in frivolities of which, of course, he is the undisputed master.

Now, let us calmly and coolly examine the charges that he has laid at the door of the Minister for Information and Broadcasting. He has charged Dr. Keskar with failure to re-orientate the policy of the A.I.R. I would really request the House to examine this question in a cool and calm manner. If after examination it is found that Dr. Keskar has not been able to discharge the duties which were entrusted to him, by all means criticise him, but before knowing as to what his fault is and before actually taking the trouble to see what the condition of the programme was before Dr. Keskar took over, to charge him that he has not discharg-

ed his duties, or that he has failed to re-orientate the programme of the A.I.R. is to talk in an irresponsible manner.

Now, with your permission, I want to examine this question of the programme policy of the A.I.R. I happen to be associated with the Information and Broadcasting Ministry in a non-official capacity. I am a member of the Central Advisory Committee for Programmes which was constituted at the initiative of the Minister and in this Central Advisory Committee for Programmes you will find that nearly all the elements in the public life of this country in the various States have been represented. For the information of the House, with your permission, I would like to read a few names which will show the care with which the Minister constituted this Central Advisory Committee. One is Shri B. Shiva Rao, a Member of this House. Then there is Shri S. N. Agarwal, another Member of this House. Then there is Prof. Humayun Kabir, then Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan and Shri Saadat Ali Khan; then there is the great Marathi dramatist and playwright Mama Warerkar; then there is Shri Mujeeb, Shri Sarangadhar Das, Shri Subba Rao. There is Ratindranath Tagore, there is Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, Shrimati Kamala Devi Chattopadhyaya. In this list there are others also. There may be in this list a name or two which my friend Shri Chattopadhyaya does not like.

Some Hon. Members: What is that name?

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: You can imagine yourself. But this very list will show that Dr. Keskar constituted this Committee with a view to make it a representative committee. No party considerations, no linguistic considerations have been permitted to influence the decision of the Minister to make this committee a representative committee. Now, it is this committee which advises the All-India Radio to make the programmes.

[Pandit Balkrishna Sharma]

For a minute I would like the House to bear with me, and I shall show what the nature of the programme really is. As the House will remember, there are two bases on which the A.I.R. programmes are made. One is the base called the base of expression; another is the base called the base of audience. The programmes which are based on the base of audience and the base of expression are again divided into two each. The programme which is made, which is considered, which is thought of on the base of audience is divided into two categories. There is one general programme and there is again what they call the programme for minorities. Minorities do not include necessarily the religious minorities or communal minorities, but minorities are women, children, troops etc. (*An Hon. Member*: Who said women are a minority?) These are the minorities which are clearly understood when the programme is made on what is called the base of audience.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): They are a real minority.

Shri Namblar: They are in a majority. So, there is the general programme, and the programme for minorities. If any hon. Members of this House have the patience to go through the various programmes that have been arranged by the All India Radio, in 1953 and in 1952, since Dr. Keskar has been in charge of this Ministry, they will find that here has been real and tremendous development in the outlook, in the execution of the programme, and in the framing of it also.

As I said earlier, the programmes that are based on the base of expression are divided again into two, namely, the music programme and the talk programme. Again, I would ask the hon. Members to go through the programmes of any of these two years, in order to convince themselves

that the programmes compare very favourably indeed with the programmes that were given to us before the present Minister took charge of this Ministry. The spoken word programme can be divided into talks, features, dramas, discussions, *kavi sammelans*, *mushairas*, and other items. As you know very well, this view of the music programme as well as the spoken word programme inextricably run through the general programme as well as the programme for the minorities. The minority programme includes programme for children, programme for women, programme for the rural population, programme for educational institutions, and programme for troops. If the critics have the patience to study the various programmes, they will definitely see that under the regime of the present hon. Minister, very definite and welcome improvements have been made in the programmes of All India Radio.

I have very little time to go into the details of the whole thing. But in order to let the House know a little as to what exactly is being done by the All India Radio, I will try to place before it, some of the details of the new programmes. It was in the year 1952, that Dr. Keskar took charge of All India Radio. Since then, he has given us a series of programmes which have been very greatly appreciated by the people as a whole.

My hon. friend Shri Chattopadhyaya spoke in his usual sneering and cynical vein about the national programmes, and said, well, Sir, the national programme is exhausted, I am exhausted, the All India Radio is exhausted, and everybody is exhausted, because his time was up. If you would only see what actually the national programme has meant in the cultural life of our country, you will have nothing but praise for the great imagination which was displayed by the hon. Minister, to think of this programme.

The national programme of talks was started on a weekly basis in 1953, and it included such talks as 'The Challenge to Democracy', in which all the great men in public life as well as in our educational life participated. Then, there was the programme called 'The Law for the Layman', in which even our illustrious colleague here, Shri N. C. Chatterjee took part, along with many other great lawyers. Then, we had the programme entitled 'The Future of Education', in which all the educationists, philosophers, and thinkers who have worked in the field of education participated. In the face of all this, to say, oh, the national programme of talks means nothing, shows that Shri Chattopadhyaya has not taken anything with the seriousness that it deserves. Otherwise, why should he have fallen foul of the national programme?

Then again, look at the national programme for music, which was brought on the air, at the initiative of the hon. Minister. All the great musicians of India participated in it. It was not confined to the North Indian musicians only, but it also invited musicians from the south, in order that the whole of the country might hear what the music of South India was like. Therefore, to come out with the criticism, oh, this national programme is of no value, is just to show one's own ignorance. Either Shri Chattopadhyaya did not take care to listen to any one of these programmes, or if he listened to it, he had no ear for it, or even if he had any ear, he was too much prejudiced to be influenced by it.

I shall not be betraying any confidences, when I say that another national programme is being arranged for Hindi talks, and I believe, from July onwards, that programme will be put on the air. I am giving you this piece of information, because I have received these pieces of information in my capacity as a member of the Central Programme Advisory Committee. At the initiative of the hon. Minister himself,

the Central Programme Advisory Committee has decided that there should be a Patel series of lectures, on the lines of the Reith lectures which are arranged by the BBC; necessary arrangements in this regard are being made. These lectures will be by eminent personalities, on various specified subjects. To say, that Dr. Keskar did not reorientate the policy of the All India Radio is, to say the least, to say something which does not hold water.

If, while condemning the hon. Minister, you just go on taking recourse to puns and play upon words, you may be exhibiting your wonderful mastery over the language, because you happen to be the child of a hybrid culture, but beyond that, it does not mean anything.

If I were to go into the details of the various other items which have been decided upon in the programme series of All India Radio, I would be taking an unconscionably long time of the House. I do not wish to do so but I would like to proceed to the other arguments which were advanced by Shri Chattopadhyaya. He flies at a tangent, and continues to condemn the policy of All India Radio, in regard to light music. In condemning that policy, it appears to me that he seems to have been briefed by those people who have not taken very kindly to the firm determination of the hon. Minister to ban this wretched film music from All India Radio.

Some people must have come to him, some people must have talked to him, some people must have poisoned his ears and, therefore, he has taken umbrage against this policy of the Minister. What, after all, is the crime that has been committed by the Minister? Sir, let me tell you about the position which film music had in the programme of the AIR before he took over. Before his taking over, till the early months of 1952, film music in the AIR occupied 31.5 per cent. in the musical programme. As you all know, film

[Shri Nambiar]

music has been responsible for the degradation of our tastes in music. I was the man who, long before Dr. Keskar took over charge of the Ministry, was in some way connected with AIR's programme policies, and I was the man who used to raise his voice against the continuation of this film music in the AIR. But at that time, the gods that were there would not listen to me. Perhaps mine was the lone voice. I objected to the film music on many grounds: firstly, on the ground that our sense of music was outraged by the film music, secondly that it lowered our tastes, thirdly that it created a mentality which did not go to make a good citizen, that among the children it created a vicious taste. For all these reasons, I was not in favour of film music. I wanted the AIR to take a firm stand upon it. They would not. And why would they not? Not because they liked the film music, but because they were at a loss to find out a substitute for film music. They said: 'Well, Sharmaji, all the time they cannot go on giving classical music and, therefore, it is very difficult for us to ban the film music all at once.' Well, I said: 'Do something in the direction. Have your own light music, if you like'. Then they said: 'How can we have our light music, because on enquiry by our special officers, we find that the film people who make this light music spend as much as Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 10,000 per song. And we naturally with our small budget cannot do this. Therefore, we cannot produce our own light music'. After this, as good luck would have it, Dr. Keskar took over this department, and without my saying anything in the matter, he himself took up the responsibility of seeing that the AIR came forward to produce its own light music. What does the production of the light music mean? It means only this: that you give good lilting songs with good words, with literary merit and ask your composers there to set it to music. That is all that it means. Of

course, it requires money. But then, he was able to find some money and he took this up. He put a ban on film music, with the result that today—I have got the figures—the film music in the AIR is only 6·8 per cent. From 31·22 per cent it has come down to 6·8 per cent.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: May I interrupt the hon. Member? What about the transference of the tuning system to Radio Ceylon, Radio Goa and Radio Pakistan as a result of this? Have you estimated it?

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: I will come to it.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Does he want to vulgarise national sentiment by tuning to Goa?

Pandit K. C. Sarma (Meerut Distt.—South): He wants 'lara lappa'.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Let me tell Dr. Lanka Sundaram that so far as our tuning to Lanka is concerned...

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): Tell him about Lanka.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma:....I myself have got the programmes of Radio Ceylon analysed and find as a result that Radio Ceylon gives to India nearly 3 hours a day. Out of these 8 hours, it gives 3 hours only for film music—you will be surprised to know that. Another 3 hours it gives for light music, which is not film music, but its own creation—light music. Then it gives 1 hour for North Indian classical music and another 1 hour for South Indian classical music. That is how the 8 hours are completed by Radio Ceylon. What we do here is that instead of giving 3 hours for our film music, we give less. But we, at the same time, have taken care to produce our own light music and I tell you, with not very great expenditure on it. We

have been able to produce till today, in nine months, only, about 270 songs, and out of these 270 songs, we have been able to process many of them. Any of the Members can go to AIR and the Director-General will, I believe, be very happy to give him specimens of the songs that we have produced, and you will really find that the songs are of a very high order. Who are the men who produce these songs? Men whose names are to be conjured with in the literary field, men like Pandit Sumitranandan Pant, men like Babu Bhagwati Sharan Varma, men like Pandit Narendra Sharma, to whom very few people can hold candle in regard to poetry and prose writing. My friend, Mr. Chattopadhyaya, was rather unfair to his own friend, Bhagwati Sharan Varma, whom he dubbed as only a prose writer. Well, long before Bhagwati Sharan Varma became a prose writer, he was a poet—and a poet of recognised merit in the Hindi language. Of course, all of you must be knowing that Pandit Sumitranandan Pant....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All our friends must be knowing. The hon. Member is addressing me.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Yes, Sir. 'You' means 'you', and no one else. Here I am reminded of one saying of Mira. When Mira went to Vrindavan....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is Information and Broadcasting.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma:....to see the Swami, they said 'He does not want to see any woman'. Mira said: 'Well, I thought there was no man in Vrindavan except Lord Krishna'. Similarly, I can say there is no man except yourself here.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): On a point of information, Sir. Does he mean that all of us are Gopis? (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that he means is that I represent all the hon. Members here.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: You represent the women also, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How long will the hon. Member take? He has already taken 25 minutes.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Therefore, Sir, what I wanted to place before the House was that this criticism in regard to these producers of light music was not at all fair. It was not fair to the Minister. It was not fair to those who were producing light music, and it was not fair to Harin himself, who is a poet, because he, of all people, should know that the men whom the Minister has put in charge are no relations of his, do not come from his province, and to say that AIR is 'AMR'—All Mahratta Radio—is to betray a very low taste. Nothing of the kind. Certain appointments as staff artists have been made, and Harindra was very unfair to the lady who has been appointed as Director of Music here in the AIR. Dr. Sumati Mutatkar. I tell you, is a Doctor of Music—a Doctor not from any half-penny-two-penny University but from the Academy of Hindustani Music of Lucknow.

Shri Syamanandan Sahaya: There are no half-penny-two-penny Universities, after all.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: The Vice-Chancellor of the Patna, Bihar, University need not think that I can be so silly as to cast aspersion upon the University over which he presides.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Not at all. We do not produce musicians at all.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: That may be your misfortune.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Yes.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: The hon. Member said that she was not taken even as a Programme Assistant and yet she was put in charge of music. What is wrong there? If I appear before the Public Service

[Pandit Balkrishna Sharma]

Commission, I will not be taken even as a Programme Executive, and if I cease to be a Member of Parliament and if Dr. Keskar makes me a Hindi Adviser and gives me a pay of Rs. 1,000 per month, do you think I will not deserve it, with my name in literature, with my work in this cause for so many years and with my contribution to the Hindi literature? Similarly, with Dr. Mutatkar, she was not found capable of doing a third-rate job of Programme Assistant, and yet she is a great musician and and there is no doubt about that. She is a musician who takes to music in a spirit of dedication. I know, and those of my friends who live in the Constitution House know, that daily from 7 to 10 in the morning, for three hours, she does her *sadhana*. About such a lady, to say anything in the House in such a cheap way, is very unfair and I cannot understand the mentality behind it, except that the hon. Member must have been briefed by somebody who has poisoned him; otherwise, he is not a man to talk in such a way.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If an hon. Member takes more time and it is the general desire from his particular group that he may be allowed to speak, then I cut off the extra time from the time available for that group. Even then, there are certain limits. I have already given the hon. Member half an hour.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Beyond this, I do not want to say anything more. It is due to this Minister, who has been maligned by my friend Shri Chattopadhyaya, that we today have a rationalised programme. The hon. Member was very much upset and was very angry because Dr. Keskar appointed two committees, one a Central Board for Music and another, a Screening Committee. Let me again put before you the names of those friends who find a place in the Central Board of Music and in the Screening Committee, and the

House itself will know whether Dr. Keskar has been inspired by any feelings of provincialism or any superiority complex in himself or whether he has been inspired by just the desire to bring our music programme in the A.I.R. on a rationalised basis. What happened up to this time was this. Various stations engaged musicians in their own way and so many complaints used to come to the A.I.R. Even people used to come to me and say "Well, Sharmaji, here are musicians of first-rate qualifications and they have never been called by the A.I.R. and third-rate musicians are being called by them." There was no other way to stop this sort of complaint except through a central organisation which has been brought into existence. Let me tell you that Dr. Keskar keeps that central organisation absolutely free from any official influence whatsoever and he has left everything to that organisation and the music programmes are fixed according to their advice. Dr. Keskar has charged the Screening Committee as he calls it, to grade the musicians so that in future complaints may not come, and with that end in view, he appointed the Central Board. Here is the constitution of the Central Board, and the members are: Pandit Ratanjankar, who is the Principal of the Academy for Hindustani Music, Lucknow; Shri Padmanabha Shastri, who is a Member of the Public Service Commission of Madhya Bharat and who is a great authority on North Indian and South Indian music; Shri Bhattacharya; Shrimati Kamala Devi Chattopadhyaya; Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale; Justice Venkatarama Iyer; Shri Krishna Kripalani; Shri Rai Umanath Bali, who is himself a great musician and connoisseur of music, well known in U.P. for his music talents; Shri V. Raghavan; Shri Shiv Raj Bahadur; Professor Sambamoorthy, Reader in Indian Music, Madras University; Professor Srinivasan; Shri Rabindralal Roy; Shri Periaswamy Theoran...

Shri S. S. More: Anybody from Maharashtra?

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Dr. Devdhar is there. Here is a representation of music connoisseurs from all over the country. How can you hold the Minister responsible for anything that some of the disgruntled artists may say? Of course, some of the artists raised a hue and cry, but ultimately what happened? Not that anybody wanted, but they themselves realised that they had made a mistake and they said so in writing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry I cannot allow any more time.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: About the Screening Committee, against which my friend screened so much, it consists of the following members; Pandit Ratanjankar. Pandit Haksar, Shri Padmanabha Shastri, Shri Roy Chowdhury, Shri Patwardhan, Shri R. L. Roy and Shri G. S. Tambe—this is the panel for Northern India. A similar panel is also there for South India. What these committees do is to go to various places, hear the artists and in their wisdom they grade the artists, so that the graduation helps the artists to get their dues properly from the A.I.R. The charge against the Screening Committee, the charge against the programmes that are put up on the A.I.R., the charge against light music etc., are all undiluted, unadulterated, pure bunkum.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Since yesterday, Shri Velayudhan has been rising in his seat. Let him have his say now.

Shri S. S. More: He is one of our artists in the Opposition.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may give his own experience.

Shri Velayudhan: I am very thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Demand for Information and Broadcasting. I was not expecting to speak on this subject, but yesterday, having heard

the trend of the debate here, I thought I must also take part in it as it has taken an important turn, and I have got my own reason and justification for it. Before I entered this Parliament, I was an officer in that Department itself, an officer in the Information Bureau, from which I resigned a few months before I entered Parliament. It is, therefore, a privilege for me to speak on this particular Ministry, especially after hearing the criticisms and counter-criticisms from my friends on both sides of the House. I was very unhappy when I heard my hon. friend Shri Harindranath Chattopadhyaya speaking yesterday with all kinds of venom, malice, and also I would add, with a sense of frustration. I may tell the House that I have great admiration for his talent not only as an actor, but as a poet too. But he symbolises a culture, or as he himself took credit, he represents a culture. When I compared that culture with the speech he made yesterday, I myself was convinced that his is not a culture which is suited to India; his is not a culture which is suited for decent society even. But I must humbly submit it is a culture perhaps meant for the forests and wild animals. Mr. Chattopadhyaya brought in the name of a distinguished lady. Of course, I do not know that particular lady. But I must at the same time point out that it is quite unparliamentary and undemocratic to bring in the name of a lady who is an officer in the Broadcasting Section of the Ministry and to connect her with the name of Dr. Keskar is a most heinous thing that any decent Member of Parliament can do.

I may tell my hon. friends that this is not a matter to be laughed at. It is a matter which should be taken serious notice of. Suppose my hon. friend Mr. Harindranath Chattopadhyaya were a Minister in Dr. Keskar's place: what would he have been feeling? He would have made a fool of himself. What would have been the fate of artists all over India if he were a Minister? I think they

[Shri Velayudhan]

would all have taken shelter into the Himalayas if he were a Minister in Dr. Keskar's place.

I know something personally about the working of this Department. That is why I am courageous enough to speak like this. When Dr. Keskar became the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, I was not in his group party. I was in the opposition, as I am today. But I have to expose the truth as it is: that is why I am speaking today. I went to Dr. Keskar and told him that I knew something about his Ministry and about the personnel in the Ministry. I told him that a thorough operation, a great purge was required in the Ministry if it was to serve the culture of India, to educate the public of India. That was what I advised him. On several other occasions also I spoke to him about the working of his Ministry.

I know that in putting matters aright in his Ministry Dr. Keskar had to face great opposition. He had to face opposition not only from small fries, but also great elements, like the film stars, who during the days of the war were in the National War Front staging musical programmes. They are his enemies today, because he did not give them any encouragement.

As soon as Dr. Keskar assumed office, Dr. Keskar realised that he was a Minister in free India. He wanted a thorough reorganisation of his Ministry, with a view to serving the people of India. Of course, there may be differences of opinion about it. But he had a definite view as to how the Film Section, the Information section and the Press Information Bureau and the All India Radio should be reorganised to promote Indian culture and serve the people.

What has Dr. Keskar done, for which my hon. friends criticise him like this? Mr. Chattopadhyaya referred to the case of some Programme Assistants. I know how these

Programme Assistants and information officers came into this organisation, very often with a chit from some very high persons saying that so and so has been a reporter of the Press, or he has got this certificate or that certificate from somebody. They used to get in by this means between the years 1939-45. Dr. Keskar took keen interest in reorganising the whole service. He may have taken a few persons who had nationalist views, who had suffered in the national movement and who were interested in reorientating India in their own way. He perhaps did it somewhat quickly; that is why there is so much opposition. The House at the same time should appreciate the difficulties which he had to face in reorganising or purging some of the officials and subordinates in the Department.

I want to say a few words about the reorganisation of the Information Ministry as a whole. It is a vital part of our national life. In fact, it should have been attached to the Education Ministry, because it will have to evolve a new culture, a new education for the people of the country. But, even the Education Ministry has not been able to fulfil its task completely.

Some months back I had an opportunity to visit the South-East Asian countries. In the course of my tour I had occasion to see some of our ancient dramas like *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* staged there. I was told that even films on our ancient epics like *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* have been produced in the South-East Asian countries. When I saw some of them I shed tears of joy to see the cultural heritage of India being preserved in those countries. I felt why our own friends in India could not be advised to take up ventures like this. We have got very brilliant artists and stars, both men and women, who can be compared with the stars of any other country. Why should we not encourage them

to produce cultural dramas? If they want State subsidy to produce such cultural dramas, the State should be ready to give them the necessary help. I would not say we must go back to the ancient Indian stage. We should, however, try to bring about a synthesis between the old and the new. If we want to build up a new India we cannot do away with our ancient culture, the culture of Hindu civilisation. We will have to take what is good in it.

I have always been feeling that we are spending a lot of money on different types of propoganda, and on sending delegations to countries like the Middle-East. I feel it is time that we directed our attention to the South-East Asian countries, where a good portion of our ancient culture still survives.

I would now like to say a few words regarding the integrated publicity scheme launched by the Information and Broadcasting Machinery. It is a publicity for the Five Year Plan. Of course, the Five Year Plan requires a lot of publicity. But, at the same time, I was not convinced of the necessity of the new Section now being opened when we have branches of the Press Information Bureau in all the regions. We have so many officers there. Why can't they take up this publicity? We have Deputy Principal Information Officers in Madras, Lucknow, Calcutta, Bombay and other places. Why add another staff when they themselves are not having much work in those offices? I say this because I was also in charge of one such offices and I can speak from my own experience. This is double expenditure, and double effort too. This work should be co-ordinated and co-related together so that we may avoid a lot of overlapping of publicity also.

I do not want to say anything more. I feel that the drastic and courageous policy which Dr. Keskar has followed should be continued.

At the same time, I hope he will reorganise the Films Section, the Press Information section and all the other Sections before he lays down his charge of this Ministry.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज (शोलापुर-रीचित-अनुसूचित जातियां): डिप्टी स्पीकर महोदय इन-फरमेशन एन्ड ब्राडकार्स्टिंग मिनिस्ट्री ने सन् १९४२ में जिन प्रोग्राम असिसर्टेड्स को एग्रायंट किया था, उनके बारे में अपर हाउस में भी सवाल उठाया गया था और मैं इस अवसर पर आपसे अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे लोग जो इतने वर्षों से लगातार काम करते रहे हैं उनको पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के पास भेजने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। सन् १९४२ में जिस वक़्त यह लोग डिपार्टमेंटली इम्प्लायड किये गये थे उस वक़्त इस तरह की उनके लिये कोई शर्त नहीं थी, अब इतने वर्षों तक काम कर लेने के बाद उन पर यह पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के पास जाने की शर्त लगाना अनुचित है और जिन पर यह शर्त लगी है चाहे वे कोई लोग हों, मेरी राय में उन पर यह अन्याय हुआ है।

दूसरी बात जिस ओर मैं अपने माननीय मिनिस्टर का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि रीचिडो एक ऐसा यंत्र है जिसके द्वारा आप देश को शिक्षित कर सकते हैं, और अपनी संकति आपनी भाषा और अपने त्वाज को बढ़ा सकते हैं और देश के स्तर को ऊपर उठा सकते हैं, लेकिन यह काम ऐसा है जिसमें आप को देश के हर क्षेत्र हर भाषा भाषी और प्राणी के कोऑपरेशन की आवश्यकता है। अभी यह कहा गया कि ब्राडकार्स्टिंग के मुद्दकमें मैं काफी मराठ लोग जमा हैं, तो मराठी कोई एक जाति विशेष तो है नहीं, मराठी भाषा बोलने वाले मराठ कहलाते हैं, अब हमारे मारे साहब भी तो इस नाते मराठा हुए, लेकिन हम लोग तो मराठा नहीं हैं, हम तो अनटचेबुल्स हैं, शैड्युल्ड कास्ट के हैं, मराठा अगर इस मिनिस्ट्री में ज्यादा हो जाते हैं तो उससे हमारा तो कुछ बनता नहीं है, मेरे ख्याल से तो इस मिनिस्ट्री में यह दोष है कि इसमें ज्यादातर उच्च जाति के लोग हैं, हमारे अड्डे भाई बहुत ही कम

[श्री पी० एम० राजभोज]

नहीं के बराबर हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह चीज खत्म हो जाय और हमारे भाइयों को भी उसमें स्थान मिले। यह छुआछूत और जातिपात का जो भेदभाव हमारे देश में चला आ रहा है, यह एक बड़ी नीतिक बुराई है और इसे देश और अपने समाज से शीघ्र से शीघ्र दूर करना चाहिये। हम देखते हैं कि कमिटी में मिनिस्ट्री की तारीफ करने वाले और हाँ में हाँ मिलाने वाले लोग ही लिये जाते हैं और वह कह दते हैं कि यह प्रोग्राम अच्छा है, बड़े अच्छे तरीके से काम हो रहा है, तो इस तरह की खानापूरी सब जगह होती है और वही यहाँ भी हो रही है। आज आप किसी भी मिनिस्ट्री को ले लें आप देखेंगे कि वहाँ पर उच्च वर्ण के लोग ज्यादा से ज्यादा हैं। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम इस भेदभाव की नीति का परित्याग करें और अपने पिछड़े हुए भाइयों को आगे आने का अवसर दें। आज हम इस सरकार और पीड़ित नेहरू के इस कारण खिलाफ हैं कि वह यह जातिपात का झगड़ा मिटाने की सक्रिय कोशिश नहीं करती हैं। इसी इनफार्मेशन एन्ड ब्राडकार्स्टिंग मिनिस्ट्री में आप देखेंगे मानो उच्च जाति के लोगों ने इसमें सर्व करने का कंट्रैक्ट ले लिया हो। दूसरे जाति में काबिल लोग नहीं हैं? हमारे शर्मा जी बड़े होशियार आदमी हैं और मरे दोस्त भी हैं, लेकिन वे मुझे माफ करे अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि उन्होंने जो नाम पढ़े हैं, उनमें एक ही जाति के ज्यादातर नाम मालूम होते हैं.....

एक माननीय सदस्य : बाह्यण ।

श्री पी० एम० राजभोज : ठीक है, बाह्यण मैं बोलूंगा तो डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब कहेंगे कि बाह्यण के खिलाफ मत बोलो। उसी जाति के लोग ज्यादा हैं। मैं सिर्फ इतना ही कहूंगा कि इस देश में उनके अलावा और किसनी ही जातियों के लोग रहते हैं और मेरी मिनिस्टर साहब से प्रार्थना है कि दूसरे लोगों को दूसरी जाति वालों को भी उसमें आने का अवसर देना चाहिये। यह बड़े ही अफसोस और दुःख की बात है कि हमारे शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट का एक भी

आदमी उस संस्था में जिम्मेदार पद पर नहीं है, एक आध जगह टर्मिनरी तौर पर अगर आपने रख लिया तो उससे क्या बनता है। यह कह देना भर काफी नहीं है कि आप में कलचर्व लोग नहीं हैं, पढ़े लिखे लोग नहीं हैं, या अच्छे आर्टिस्ट नहीं हैं या स्पीच देने वाले नहीं हैं। आप उनको आगे बढ़ाने और इस योग्य बनाने की क्या कोशिश कर रहे हैं? मैं डाक्टर काटजू साहब का शुक्रगुजार जरूर हूँ कि कम से कम वह एक इस सम्बन्ध में छुआछूत खत्म करने का बिल लाये हैं। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि रीढ़ियों से जहाँ और दुनिया भर का प्रोपेगेंडा होता है वहाँ इस जातिपात की विषमता को नष्ट करने के लिये और खत्म करने के लिये रीढ़ियों में प्रोग्राम रखना चाहिये और इस देश में छुआछूत को जल्द से जल्द खत्म होना चाहिये। आज देहातों में यह जो छुआछूत की बीमारी फैली हुई है यह धर्म नहीं है अधर्म है और इसको खत्म करने के लिये इस मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से बहुत कुछ हो सकता है और उस विभाग के जो आज यहाँ अफसर बैठे हैं वह अगर इस मामले में सहानुभूति दिखलायें तो यह काम सम्पन्न कर सकते हैं। यह जो आज कल पद्मपात चलता है कि या तो कोई किसी का दोस्त है इस कारण उसको रख लिया जाता है या रिश्तेदारी की बिना पर अन्दर आ जाता है और मामला खत्म हो जाता है, इस तरह का पद्मपात आए दिन होता है। मैं नाम तो यहाँ पर नहीं लेना चाहता लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाऊँ कि नागपुर से एक शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के आदमी को ट्रान्सफर किया, मैं नाम नहीं लेना चाहता, उनके ट्रान्सफर को कौंसिल किया और बम्बई के आदमी को पूना भेज दिया और जो नागपुर का था उसको नागपुर में रखा। इस तरह गोलमाल होता है कि चार घंटे में उसका ट्रान्सफर बम्बई से पूना हो गया, क्योंकि पूना में उसका मकान है। और जो पूना में ७ महीने से आया था उनको बम्बई भेजा। मैं यहाँ पर इस चीज को खत्म चाहता हूँ कि ट्रान्सफर आदि मामलों में हम गरीबों के साथ बहुत अन्याय होता है।

मैं यहाँ पर इस चीज को साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि यह चीज कहना गलत है कि हमारे में टैलेंट नहीं हैं। हमारे लोगों में अच्छे अच्छे गाने वाले लोग हैं, और झुमा बनाने वाले हैं, अच्छी स्पीच देने वाले हैं, हमारे बीच में डाक्टर अम्बेडकर सरीखे लोग विद्यमान हैं लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उनको आल हूँडिया रीडियो पर टाक देने के लिये क्यों नहीं बुलाया जाता। घंटी बज गई, हमारे भाई को तो आपने चालीस मिनट दिया, मुझे भी और समय दिया जाय

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member comes to me and tells me that he wants only five minutes. I have given him ten minutes. But on the uoor of the House he appeals to all the Members to give him more time I will give him one more minute.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : यह सवाल जिसके लिये मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ बहुत अहम सवाल है। यह नेशन और राष्ट्र का सवाल है। दूसरी सर्विसेज के अन्दर जो हमारे लिये सोलह परसेंट का अनुपात रखा गया है वह अभी तक अमल में नहीं आ रहा है और उसकी अमल में लाने के लिये हमारे मिनिस्टर महोदय को जल्द से जल्द कोशिश करनी चाहिये क्योंकि वह अवीध जल्द खत्म होने को है और यह बहुत जरूरी है कि हमारा जो रिजर्वेशन का कोटा है वह फिल हो जाय और आज जो यह उच्च वर्ण को लेने में पक्षपात किया जाता है जैसे कोई शर्मा है और कोई वर्मा है यह बन्द होना चाहिये

श्री जोकीम आल्वा : आप तो इतनी बड़ी एन० सी० सी० कमेटी के मेम्बर हैं।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : एडवाइजरी कमेटी में भी हमारे मेंबर, मन्नास, हैदराबाद और बम्बई के लोग हैं, लेकिन सिद्दयूल्ड कास्ट रूलर कमेटी के कौन हैं ?

लेकिन इतना ही पर्याप्त नहीं है हमको रीडियो द्वारा इस तरह का प्रोग्राम ब्राडकास्ट करना चाहिये सहज भाषा में जिसे हमारे गाँवों में बसने वाले भाई समझ सकें और वह यह जान सकें कि देश में क्या हो रहा है। देशात के लिये अधिक कार्यक्रम होना चाहिये। बस अधिक न कह कर मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया।

4 P.M.

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): Sir, you will permit me first of all not to reply to specific and personal criticisms that have been made on the floor of this House and which—I do not know whether they are in consonance with the dignity of the House; you are the best judge of it—only show the level to which the persons who made them belong.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta—North-West): A very good convention.

Dr. Keskar: I consider that it is only when people have not got valid arguments that they begin to descend to the level of fishmongering.

I will, first of all, instead of replying to specific criticisms about faults of omission and commission, like to place before the House certain facts which are inter-related, and which will probably be an answer to most of the Members about the majority of points that have been raised. Later, I will reply to specific criticisms that have been been raised by hon. Members.

The most important point about which so much of venom, spite and malice has been showered on this House, has been regarding the retrenchment of a number of the staff of All India Radio. I would like to trace the history of this question

[Dr. Keskar]

All India Radio had inherited in 1947 a kind of broken service. A very large part went to Pakistan with some of the highest officers, and the radio officials and the Minister in charge—who was Sardar Patel—were faced with a very difficult situation in that they had to recruit on the spot and quickly, a large number of officers; not only recruit officers but to instal a sufficient number of Stations so that the country was served from the very beginning of independence with Radio Stations which would be a good beginning. For that reason they were forced to recruit quite a large number of persons on an *ad hoc* basis and on a temporary basis. Sir, you yourself are aware of the very difficult and abnormal times that we faced in 1947, 1948 and even 1949, and it was natural that normal rules of recruitment were not observed. People were recruited quickly and work was carried on. This was the beginning of the present structure of All India Radio that now we are trying to reorganise.

It is natural that in such confused times, appointments were made in various ways. I do not want to go into details but there is no doubt that a number of very irregular appointments were made. I do not blame anybody for that, because at that time initiative had to be left to a very large number of officers to take on people and do work on a temporary basis. This was the condition after two or three years of freedom. I remember, the hon. Member Dr. Lanka Sundaram, year before last put a very searching question in this House as to the number of people who were on the permanent administrative roll of A.I.R. who were approved by the U.P.S.C., and how and why they had been recruited. He also criticised that we had a very large number of staff who were irregularly recruited. There was justification in what he said because it was so, and I think nobody is to be blamed for that. Large numbers of

people had to be recruited and work had to be carried on; but a time arrived when this had to be regularised. It has to be remembered that this particular cadre of All India Radio is a permanent cadre of the Government of India and we had to see as to the number of persons that should be in this cadre, what pay they should get and who will be incumbents of that cadre. This was not something which the Minister or even the Government as a whole could do. This was within the province of the Union Public Service Commission. This work was referred to the Union Public Service Commission, in the initial stage for the higher officers and in the latter stage for all the other officers of the All India Radio, whether they are called programme executives, programme Assistants or lower grade staff. These cases were referred to them for regularisation and for their opinion. Unfortunately for us the Union Public Service Commission was not able to give its opinion in this matter very soon. They could not be blamed for it because they had to cope with such a large rush of work, they were so much over-burdened and the number of members was so small that it was physically impossible for them to do this work; more especially with a cadre which consists of hundreds of people of whom the great majority had been recruited in various ways other than the ordinary prescribed way. The problem before the Government and also the Union Public Service Commission was whether they should follow the ordinary procedure. The ordinary procedure is that the Union Public Service Commission advertises the posts and when applications have come in answer to the advertisement, they call people for interview and select. This was the normal course. The other course, which is an abnormal one, is that they should call for the records go through them carefully as to how these people have been recruited and what are their qualifications, screen

them thoroughly and see who can be considered fit and who should be considered unfit. The Public Service Commission, naturally, always prefers to go through the normal way. There is no doubt that if all these hundreds of posts had been advertised, thousands of people would have answered and in the selections more than fifty per cent. or even greater number, of the persons who are at present occupying the posts would have been rejected and new people would have come in. We, therefore, represented to the Commission that it would be a great hardship on people who had been working there for a long time; who, no doubt, though they had been recruited in abnormal circumstances, had been there for some time. that such a large number being thrown out at this juncture would not be advisable, and that the Commission should take a more human view of things. I am glad to say that the Commission in this affair throughout behaved in a very understanding and reasonable manner and they agreed that instead of going through the regular procedure they would go through the records of these people, select those whom they considered fit and inform the Ministry. Well, Sir, that is what was done.

Unfortunately, though the work was referred to the Commission two or three years back, as I said, they took a very long time and we got their advice only about six months back. Now, the Commission has given us certain advice and I am obliged to follow that advice unless I can show in every individual case the reason to the contrary and I go down through a regular procedure which is laid down by the Constitution regarding the matter. Unless it is a very important case of an individual.....

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes): May I ask.....

Dr. Keskar: Order, order.

72PSD

Shri Nambiar: The hon. Minister himself has pronounced the words of the Chair.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has unwittingly expressed what I should have said.

Dr. Keskar: I apologise. If the hon. Member wants to put questions he can do so afterwards. I will try to answer all his questions, but he need not interrupt me.

A very untrue allegation was made yesterday during the course of discussion that only a certain number of cases was referred to the Union Public Service Commission and other cases were not referred. Sir, all the cases have not only been referred, but people know that it is not this Ministry which is to judge whether particular cases should be referred to the Union Public Service Commission or should not be referred. The Home Ministry which is in charge of all the services of the Government of India has to keep a watch over every Ministry to see whether every Ministry is working according to the regulations or not and all action has been referred to the Home Ministry, not only in this case when particular persons had to be discharged because the Public Service Commission recommended that they should be discharged. They appealed to the Government. Their appeals were also referred to the Home Ministry and also to the Union Public Service Commission. The Home Ministry has looked into all these cases and has been satisfied that all these cases have been referred to. But hon. Members here continue to make untrue allegations not because these cases have not been referred to, but because they want to bolster up a case which is not true. Personally I do not know any one of those persons. I have nothing against them. I shall be very glad if they can continue in service and if I can allow them to continue according to the rules. When a cadre is formed in

[Dr. Keskar]

Government service, and an important cadre like that, it is absolutely obligatory on the Government to fix the number of persons who will form that cadre. If I do not fix the number, I will not be able to make anybody permanent in that cadre. By not being made permanent, or quasi-permanent, they will not be able to get pension or other benefits of Government service. By the cadre not being regularised and by the number not being fixed for so many years, hundreds of persons have been suspended in the air, not knowing whether they are going to continue in service in the All India Radio, or what their future is going to be. I consider, in the interests of the majority of these people, it was necessary to finalise it and the final touch had to be given in consultation with the Home Ministry and the Union Public Service Commission. Otherwise, a vast majority of these people who were suffering, would have suffered, for some time more. It was obligatory on us to do that and we did it. If we had not done it, hon. Members would come down upon us in the other way that Government was trying to keep a large number of persons suspended in the air not knowing what their future is going to be. I consider that it was not only necessary but it was in the interests of the service as a whole and the vast majority who constituted that service that this question should be referred to the Union Public Service Commission. I would have contravened the Constitution if the cases had not gone up.

Still further, I am not guilty of this crime of referring it to the Union Public Service Commission. Probably it is a crime, as it appeared to me from the hon. Member's speech. This had already been done six or eight months before I took charge of the Ministry. That is the ordinary procedure of the Government and the Minister who was then in charge had

already taken steps to refer the whole matter to the Union Public Service Commission. I am reaping the consequences of the rules. It is no use Members popping here and abusing me for dismissing somebody. I take the responsibility because the Government's responsibility is undivided. Whether it is the Union Public Service Commission that decides or the Home Ministry that decides, the responsibility is there and that responsibility devolves on me according to the rules. I am not able to shirk it or even to circumvent it. I will not be able to put back the people because according to the rules, they cannot be there.

Hon. Members in this House cannot speak with two voices, and contradictory voices at that. Time and again, Members have got up in this House and attacked us for appointing people by the back door, for not consulting the Union Public Service Commission. Every other day I see everybody standing up and saying, why is the Union Public Service Commission not consulted in a particular appointment. Again they attack us for consulting the Union Public Service Commission in a case that they like. They want the Union Public Service Commission to be ignored in a certain number of cases because they want to be the champions of those who are retrenched. It is no pleasure to me to retrench somebody. I put it to the House that when Government have formulated some rules of service—I am talking of permanent service and the permanent cadres—it is not possible to overrule those rules. I remember year before last hon. Members attacked this Ministry saying that the rules are not observed and the Union Public Service Commission is not consulted. We made the decision that we will refer the case to the Commission and abide by the advice of the Commission though at that time I was quite sure that the hon. Members would turn round against us when the

Commission gives the advice and we follow that because they want to attack the Government whether we decide this way or that. I am not prepared to accept such a criticism when I am quite sure that we have conscientiously followed the rules. Not only have we followed the rules; we have tried to look to the ultimate benefit of a vast majority of the officers concerned.

I would like to say a few words on the question of the temporary staff. Before that, let us take all these cases. There are 24 people whose cases were involved. Because the strength of the cadre was fixed, these 24 people could not continue. Out of these 24, three persons were reverted to the lower posts on which they were holding a lien. Six people have already been given alternative jobs. Now, there are 15 persons involved. As you know, the policy of the Government is, when for reasons of rules regarding permanent service, we are not able to keep certain temporary persons in service, we try to provide them as soon as possible and as quickly as possible, with alternative jobs. We are pursuing that policy. As I said, already we have given jobs to nine people. We will try to give suitable jobs to these persons who have been retrenched as soon as we can, provided they are suitable for the jobs and they show an aptitude for that. I have been attacked personally because I retrenched that staff. As I said, the wheels of this had already been in movement when I took charge.

The question of temporary staff has been raised. The House has to decide this way or that. Does the House want—I am ready to take a hint from this House—that if a person is wrongly and irregularly appointed in contravention of the rules and if he is by some hook or crook able to continue in service for three or four years, he gets a claim or occupancy tenancy right on that basis?

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): Whatever you did, you did right.

Dr. Keskar: I may tell you, nobody will be happier than me, I will certainly appoint 50 more men and let them somehow or other continue in service for some time. After three or four years, they will claim permanent or occupancy rights.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): Thank you; I have a claim now.

Dr. Keskar: I might inform hon. Members that there is a certain wrong impression prevailing in the House regarding the question of quasi-permanency. I remember in the other House this question was raised by my hon. friend Shri C. G. K. Reddy and we had questions and answers for 15 minutes.

Shri S. S. More: Can the hon. Minister refer to the proceedings in the other House?

Dr. Keskar: I am not quoting the proceedings.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We do not quote particular proceedings except in the case of Ministers who have made statements there. Speeches of other Members in the other House are not allowed to be quoted here.

Shri S. S. More: He is referring to a speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: To what happened there; not to any speech.

Dr. Keskar: I might say that this question was raised even on the floor of this House and we have given a detailed reply to it. But, the impression that I gathered is this. There is a very wrong impression prevailing in the minds of the Members regarding the question of quasi-permanency. The Members appear to think that if a person somehow or other is able to stick on to government service for three or four years, he becomes entitled to quasi-permanency. That is not the case. If a

[Dr. Keskar]

person in government service for more than three or four years satisfies all the rules regarding qualifications, regarding his confidential record of work, and when the case is referred to the Home Ministry and the Union Public Service Commission, they are satisfied regarding his work and *bona fides*, then only he becomes entitled to quasi-permanency, because, if persons who simply continue somehow were to get that right, well, I will say that it will be opening the door to corruption in the best possible way. Not only will you leave the door open to the Ministers, but to other people also to put in people as they like and make them continue. I think the House would be badly advised in trying to insist that because a certain number of people have continued in service for a longer time, they should be given a place. I have no grouse against those people. They have been there. I quite realise it is difficult for a number of people to find out different jobs. Certainly we will try to see they are given jobs as much as we can, and we are exerting ourselves to the utmost, but that cannot be done by coming here and threatening me or by abusing me or by other methods of intimidation. That is probably the worst way of trying to get an alternative job. This process of trying to get alternative jobs is already in motion, and we have sympathy for the cases of those persons who have been in service for a number of years—however they might have come in—because we have some human feelings after all, and we would like to see that they are not left on the streets. This is regarding the question of retrenchment.

Now, I would like to come to broadcasting as a whole. I am grateful to those hon. Members who have spoken appreciatively of what we have been trying about broadcasting programmes, but may I point out that it is not possible to judge programmes by saying that programmes are bad or programmes are

good? After all, a judgement regarding programmes is a relative judgement. If a person hears a programme and does not like it and then generalises and says that programmes are no good, I do not like it. I remember an hon. friend who used to speak. I asked him to listen to the programmes. He said: "One day I listened and it is no good." That is not the way to judge programmes. If there is any hon. Member who wants to judge programmes, I would first of all ask him to look at the programmes in a balanced way. He should listen to programmes for some time before he offers any constructive criticism. It is quite possible that a number of Members do not want the programmes, the programmes are no good for them, because "X" is the Minister and they do not like the Minister. For that I have no answer. But I will say this, it is not possible for me to answer general and vague criticisms. The standards of Members might differ. The standard of the Member who spoke and who abused me is certainly different from the standard of my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani or the standard of my friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya. Everyone has his own likes and dislikes. Everyone has his own angles and it is natural for different persons to appreciate programmes of different standards. That is human and that is natural. Further, improvement of programmes is a continuous process. A programme is not a static thing. Every day there are programmes. They are not simply repetitions of the last day's programmes. Programmes go on. There are changes tried. If the changes are not sufficiently good, you drop them. You have got new programmes. That is happening not only in this broadcasting organisation. It happens in other broadcasting organisations also. So, the improvement of programmes is not an absolute thing. It is a continuous process, and it takes place from day to day. Keeping this in view, I would like to put a few points before the House.

The first is, many of the gentlemen who come forward and attack us regarding the programmes—not in a mood of venom and spite with which my hon. friend was inspired—sincerely feel that the programme is no good. A large number amongst them are unconsciously trying to compare our programmes with the programmes of foreign broadcasting organisations. I remember a very good critic and broadcaster in a foreign country who came back to India, listened to our programmes and said: "Your programmes do not appeal to me." When I cross-examined him and asked which programmes he listened to, he said: "I listened to the English programmes". Now, 90 per cent. of our programmes are in Indian regional languages. We do not give any emphasis or preference to the English language, because the radio is meant for the largest number of listeners. I would say that this is the only medium of cultural and educational expression which tries to give the first position to Indian languages, and it has done very great work in furthering the cause of our languages, literature and our culture. Now, when we see we have got regional stations and these stations are trying to broadcast 90 per cent. or even more of the programmes, in regional languages, you will have to judge the programmes by the wealth of talents that is available in that particular language, and also the forms of cultural expression which are appreciated in that language. You cannot try to judge a Malayalam or Telugu programme, or a Bengali programme or Marathi programme by what is being broadcast by the Columbia Broadcasting Company or by the B.B.C. because they are quite different worlds. They cater to particular people and we are trying to cater to our own people, and our programmes must be judged by the standards of our own likes and dislikes, our own culture and our own literature. We cannot judge them by what I call foreign standards and foreign-imported ideas and prejudices. So,

I will ask those friends who are interested in the future of broadcasting not to judge by saying: "Look at the B.B.C. It has got certain programmes".

I will take, for example, the case of drama or dramatic features as they are called in the B.B.C. which are extremely popular that side. Now, drama is a form of literature which has had very great development in certain languages. In Western countries it has had even a greater development. The type of dramas that you will find broadcast there will certainly not be of the type you will find here, because even here you will find enormous differences. Certain Indian languages have developed drama to such a great extent that they can give programmes which are as good as any in foreign languages. Take the example of Bengali, Gujerati or Marathi. Certain languages, which have not developed will not be able to give good programmes. Shall we for that reason condemn the drama programmes in Hindi or in other languages? I am not able to accept the argument that because a gentleman who has been bred up on the B.B.C., N.B.C. or any other foreign system does not like features in Indian languages, therefore they should be condemned.

Now, habits of listening also differ. For example, take the United States. People there have peculiar habits. For example, I find in American homes that the radio is on from the morning till midnight, and whether a person is listening to it or not, that serves as background music. It is going on quite loudly. Children study, people work at home, and they go and they do not find it a disturbance at all. Certain people and homes in India might have to that extent imitated the U.S.A., but I do not think generally Indians would like something blaring at home from six in the morning to midnight, because they will not be able to work in peace. I am not blaming or criticising the American people. They have got a habit. They feel the

[Dr. Keskar]

radio programme should go on throughout the day, and a programme cannot be intelligent or very fine for 24 hours of the day. Naturally therefore some kind of rhythmic noise is on the air continuously. They like it. They consider it necessary in order to carry on their work at home. They can do it. They are quite welcome to do it. Nobody wants me to do that sort of thing in India simply because it is done in the U.S.A. or in some other country. I feel I am not able to accept that suggestion because I do not think our habits and our mind and our psychology will accept that sort of continuous noise on the ears.

Listening habits in other countries are also different. People here are always fond of quoting Russia. I will say this, that their listening habits are quite good, and what we are trying to do is certainly appreciated by them much more than by friends here who always rise up and say they admire Russia.

Shri Nambiar: The question of Russia never arose throughout the discussion.

Dr. Keskar: Not here, not in the course of this discussion, but generally you hold it up as a model always. Most critics are *habitues* unfortunately not of Russia but of America and they try to put forward to us suggestions, and compare us with the B.B.C. or the N.B.C. You must compare us with Marathi, Gujerati, Bengali, Hindi and other languages and literatures and their standards. We are trying to make them radio-conscious, put them on the air, give new forms of expression in these languages, and that is not something which can be done in a day. It will take time, and as I said, the developments in different languages are different. So far as a particular language programme is concerned, you will have to consult the listener in that particular language, as to what he feels about the programmes. In the end, I would only

say this, that the standard of radio programmes can only be on level with or slightly in advance of the general cultural standards prevailing in any particular language in the country.

Lot of praise has been showered here on Radio Ceylon, Radio Pakistan and other radios. Since I was told by so many people, naturally, I was also very curious to see whether Radio Ceylon could give us some guidance as to what sort of programmes should go on the air. So, I tuned on Radio Ceylon, Radio Pakistan etc. I have got here a number of programmes broadcast by these stations. But I would just read out a typical programme, as a sample. It is as follows:

“Recitation from the Holy Quoran, News in English, News in Urdu, Lessons from the Holy Quoran, Religious Poems, Classical Music, Urdu Songs, Lyrics, Sports, Poems, Classical Music, Kashmiri Songs, Instrumental Music, Programme for Children, Programme for Amateurs, Punjabi and Gujerati Songs, Listeners' Requests, News in English, News in Urdu, Music, Close Down.”

I have tried to cull these things, and I have taken a typical programme here, and I find there is nothing so extraordinary in the programme.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: One thing I could not follow. Was it ‘Closing Down’ or ‘Closed Down’? (Interruption)

Dr. Keskar: I am not passing any reflections on these programmes. But I maintain that I have listened to these programmes, their talks, their poems etc. are quite good, and very interesting, but there is nothing in the programmes which can make one say that their programmes are very much superior and that they have greater variety. In fact, I must say, that we provide a greater variety of programmes than other radios do.

As far as Radio Ceylon is concerned, I might say, that there is plenty of advertisement interspersed with film songs, classical songs, folk songs, etc.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon). Industrial publicity also.

Dr. Keskar: There is no doubt that to some people the attraction is that there are advertisements on that, such as the ones on...

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal Distt. cum Almora Distt.—South West cum Bareilly Distt.—North): On Macleans.

Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Distt.—East): Maclean's Powder.

Dr. Keskar:... or D.D.T. or something like that. But I cannot find in the programme itself, anything which can make one say that their programmes are in any way comparable with ours in variety, or superior to ours in any particular respect.

Pandit Balkrishan Sharma: Not at all comparable.

Dr. Keskar: It is quite possible that a number of people might like advertising on the radio. There has been an agitation by a certain section of the commercial community and advertising interests, that there should be commercial broadcasting in the country. I would like to say only two words in regard to this. Leaving aside the question that commercial broadcasting will not only bring down the standard of broadcasting, but make it a kind of *tamasha*, because it must attract the largest number of people to listen to the advertisements, my hon. friends forget that nearly eighty per cent. of the advertisement revenue which is paid at this time in our country by the advertising resources to the advertising media and various newspapers is coming from American and English and other foreign sources. If tomorrow the radio makes a major part of its revenue come from such foreign sources, I

have no doubt whatsoever that within a year or two, it will have to accept their dictum as to what the programme should be, how they should come, and at what time they should be put on the air, etc., because the person who pays will call the tune, and you cannot blame him for that, because, after all, he is paying.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: We do not want this.

Dr. Keskar: I make bold to say that this kind of criticism is not only meaningless, but some of it is interested and selfish. I will not say anything further on commercial broadcasting.

I now come to a question which interests so many of my friends here, and on which everyone has spoken from the very beginning, namely the question of film songs. First of all, I would like to make it clear, in spite of propaganda backed by very rich vested interests...

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: Powerful purse.

Dr. Keskar:...we have never claimed that we are banning any particular sort of music. We have never banned film music. We have always said that we shall try to give as great a variety to the public as we can. The history of this controversy regarding film songs is interesting, and I will take only one or two minutes about it. It is interesting, and the House should know it. When I took charge, we tried to reduce the quantum of film music on the radio, as it was occupying in certain stations, nearly fifty per cent. of the music time, and when going through all the songs that were broadcast, we found that some of the songs were of such low quality, that it was not right for us to allow the broadcasts of such songs. A very large number of producers objected to this reduction on two grounds. Firstly, they said, you say you are reducing, because our songs are of low quality, we protest against it, you must withdraw your remarks, you must say that our songs are of good quality, and at the same time, we object that you

[Dr. Keskar]

do not give sufficient advertisement to our films and our producers, unless you do these things, we are not ready to enter into any agreement with you regarding film songs. I said, it is not possible for us to try to consider all film songs as sacrosanct, beautiful and above reproach, we will have our opinions, we will make our own selections, and we will put on the radio only those things which we consider proper. It is not possible, at the same time, for the radio to serve as a medium of advertisement for the film industry. We have nothing against the films, we have nothing against film songs, if listeners want to listen to them, they are quite welcome to listen to them, and we are ready to put on the air, film songs in a particular proportion, in order to give variety to people; but we will select those songs, and broadcast them only according to a certain proportion, and we will not allow radio stations to broadcast simply film music from morning till evening. This did not please them, and they said, we will terminate our agreement. I said, you can please yourself, I am unable to accept your presumption and also your thesis. So, the majority of producers terminated their agreements with All India Radio. There are still a number of small producers, who have got an agreement with us, and whose selected songs are still broadcast on the radio. Even now, our attitude is the same. We have nothing against film music. The film producers might say anything, but I am not affected by abuse, whether it is from film producers or from my hon. friend who was trying to represent their cause here. We take a very objective attitude in regard to this matter, and we are not against film songs as such. We have nothing against them. If there are good film songs, we will broadcast them, and we have no objection to that. But you cannot impose on us the condition, you broadcast a very large number of film songs, you give a particular and due publicity to the films.

I do not think we can accept that proposition. So, very regretfully, in this quarrel, we had to terminate, or rather they terminated, the agreements.

From the time these agreements were terminated, a very vehement campaign was carried on by interested sources, backed by bags of money, throughout the Press and outside, that the radio

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea): Including some Congressmen.

Dr. Keskar: Yes, you are right, including some Congressmen—...has become worthless. They said so many things, but ultimately it boiled down to one main point, namely, that there are no film songs on the radio. I have tried in a very objective way to carry out an analysis as to the demand for film songs. Film-goers naturally want to listen to film songs, if they like the film. But generally speaking, our analysis and our listener research is that it is a favourite with, or is liked by the children and the adolescents, that is, those who do not understand things and those who can be attracted in the most primitive way. They are there, and in every family we found that the elders detested it, but the children said: 'Let us have that noise, let us have that rhythmic song, we would like to listen to it'. A number of people can bear witness to what I am saying. We found in hundreds of families the same thing, that it is the children and the adolescents who want them. These are the type of people who, we have been told, are demanding film songs. There might be likers of film songs, there might be a certain number. The world is made up of a variety of human beings and some people would like film songs, some people would like something else, *nautanki* and *tamasha*. Every one has his own likes and dislikes. We try to provide as varied a fare as possible. That should always be the attitude of a broadcasting organisation, but it is not possible for the radio to descend

below a certain level. At the same time, it is not possible for the radio always to consider that we should put only what amuses people. The radio, I consider, is not only a medium of entertainment; it is a medium of education and culture also, and especially in countries like India where people are backward, where we have got a great task to fulfil, this vital and important medium has to be utilised for the educational and cultural progress of the country. We cannot allow it to be prostituted for the purpose of this sort of entertainment.

Now, I would like to refer to certain points which have been raised by hon. Members. Sardar Hukam Singh has been rather annoyed with me about many things. But, first of all, he dislikes classical music. Now, of course, I do not say he has not the right to dislike it because he does not understand it.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): Do not be unfair, as you complained of others being unfair. I did not say that I disliked classical music.

Dr. Keskar: I said you do not understand it. You have not disliked it, but you do not understand it, and people do not appreciate it. I correct him.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Yes.

Dr. Keskar: I quite realise—we also realise—that a very large number of people, especially in the northern part of India, have lost touch with the classical tradition. I am quite aware of it and I might inform my friend...

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): Question. (*Interruptions*).

Sardar Hukam Singh: North Indians also are tax-payers. They have a right to hear what they also want.

Dr. Keskar: I was drawing his attention to the fact that in the particular station in the north, like

Jullundur and Delhi—specially Jullundur—we get a larger proportion of simple music, whether it is folk music or any other sort of music—simple music that the people might like. I do not want to impose. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members will kindly take their seats, wherever they may stand. Otherwise, it becomes a public meeting.

Dr. Keskar: I am not at all saying anything against what he says. We will see that where the classical tradition is not so well known and where our giving a large amount of classical—or what is called the traditional—music might not be understood by people, they are not dosed too much with it. I also submit to him that because classical music or music which comes from times immemorial—and it is one of the most magnificent traditions of this country—is not well understood, we should try to make it well understood by slowly giving it to the public so that they become accustomed to it. I think he has no objection to that.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Go slow then.

Dr. Keskar: I entirely agree with him.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: What is known as 'Punjabi theka on dholak' is very popular.

Dr. Keskar: I might say as far as the question of classical music is concerned, that we are not trying to increase the proportion of classical music, as an impression is being sought to be created that we are. For example, the proportion of classical and non-classical music has differed very slightly—may be 5 per cent. this side or that side. But because there was no film music, it happened that for six months we had to give a quantum of classical music, which has already come back to its normal proportion. We do not want to impose classical music on the public; we will try to give to the public folk music, folk songs and other fare—whether it is light music or other

[Dr. Keskar]

forms of music—which they will easily understand, and classical music, in proportion, will not be increased except in provinces where the public like it and demand it, as in the south, where the tradition is such that even their *bhajans*, their devotional songs and their other forms of musical expression are in classical tradition and classical tune. Now, it will not be right for me in those areas to say to people 'you will not follow the classical tradition; there should be other types of songs'. But we will take up the different cases of different regions separately and I assure him that no effort will be made to increase the proportion but rather we will try to decrease the proportion, of classical music, and give the public quality music. So he may rest assured that he will hear more and more better types of songs which he likes.

Now, we were discussing about Radio Ceylon and Radio Goa and other radios and a number of Members were saying that people were listening to Radio Ceylon. I have made a research into the listening of Radio Ceylon not only through our own sources but through sources which supply material to Radio Ceylon, and I am not at all sure, like some of the friends who are its protagonists here, that its listening popularity is increasing. It is on the decrease. And why do we find so much of noise that Radio Ceylon is popular? Sir, at the back of it are the advertising interests which want to be known that Radio Ceylon is popular, because otherwise advertisers will not come to advertise in Radio Ceylon. So an atmosphere must be there, that it is a very popular thing. I do not say people do not listen. I myself listen to Radio Ceylon sometimes, to see what they are doing. Now, people listen to Radio Moscow or the B.B.C. Does that mean that a man is banned from tuning on to Radio Ceylon or Radio Moscow or Radio New York or some other radio?

I would like people to tune on to different radios and compare them. We should even encourage this, and I would not be against it. (*Interruptions*) If it is a question of people liking to listen in to Radio Ceylon, I have no objection. They are completely at liberty to tune in to Radio Ceylon. But the 'vast influence' of Radio Ceylon, which is being advertised very cleverly is nothing but an advertisement meant to get more advertisement.

Sardar Hukam Singh: My point is that we should find out whether we have lost some proportion of our listeners to these radios.

Dr. Kaskar: I agree with you to this extent that when people who are accustomed to the type of songs like film songs do not get them, they try to tune on to other radios. Now, if my hon. friend had tried carefully to listen to Radio Pakistan or Radio Ceylon or other radios which are in the neighbouring countries he would find that they are trying to follow us, and they are trying to take a lesson from us. In fact, as regards Radio Pakistan—I read the Pakistan papers—there is a strong criticism about the songs saying, 'Why don't you get for us songs from India to be included?'—I mean letters like that always appear. So if you try to follow the trends, you will see that it is not we, but others also are trying to see what we are doing and appreciating what we are doing. Here I might say that when the Ceylon Broadcasting Commission recently visited this country, they expressed the greatest appreciation of our programmes and their variety, and I am sure that with co-operation between us, this will lead to a good exchange of programmes, not of film songs but of other things.

Shri Joachim Alva: May I ask the Minister why does not the Ministry move the Finance Minister to ban Indian businessmen from advertising in Radio Ceylon?

Dr. Keskar: That question has been referred to the Finance Ministry and and it is under consideration.

Now, regarding licences, I might say that with licences in force at present we have passed the 8-lakh mark. They were 7,80,000 but now we have passed the 8-lakh mark and they are increasing—gradually and slowly. But the question of having more licences in the country is related to the question of cheaper radio sets, which it is not possible for us to avoid. A reference to this was made by my hon. friend, Shri Domadara Menon, and I quite agree with him. But as long as we are not able to put up a medium-wave network all over the country, we will not be able to provide the public with, or rather even the manufacturers will not be able to provide to the public, cheaper radio sets. The question of cheaper radio sets has got many other factors and I will not be able to go into them in detail because the time at my disposal is short, but I might suggest that we are trying to leave no excuse for manufacturers to say that our stations or transmitters are such that we should like to have only very complicated sets in order to give the public good listening. Within the next two years, you will see that we shall have medium-wave channels which will cover more than two-thirds of the country.

Shri Meghnad Saha: We have got only one listener to every 500 in this country, while in the western countries, there is one listener to every five or six, and that shows the extent to which we have to improve our services (*Interruption*).

Dr. Keskar: If the hon. Member will listen to me, I say that there is no contradiction between him and myself. He wants to have more listeners, but I am saying that the standard of living and the standard of income in this country are such that nobody can be expected to buy a radio set of Rs. 300 or more. The middle-class

families, who are the biggest number among the licence-holders, are themselves unable to afford this high price, and unless the price goes below Rs. 150 or even below Rs. 100 per set, it will not be possible for us to increase listeners. I may inform the hon. Member that we are devoting attention to the question of the manufacture of cheaper sets, and a time might come also when, if the industry does not do anything in this direction, Government will have to step in and help in producing a cheaper set.

Shri Meghnad Saha: There has been a programme for the manufacture of cheap radio sets for the last ten years, but nothing has been done so far.

Dr. Keskar: I would like to say a few words regarding the points raised by Shri Damodara Menon, and others. One of the questions they raised was in connection with the Films Division. They wanted us to consider why we did not try, in the Films Division, to get the help of private industry on a greater and greater scale. I do not know whether Shri Menon has tried to fortify himself with facts before putting the question. At present our procedure is that upto one-third of our production is offered to private industry. We have asked them to come forward and produce certain documentaries. With very great difficulty we are able to get documentaries and sometimes we try to persuade certain producers to take up this work, which is probably a welcome change from the work which they are doing and which will give a certain type of experience. We have not been able to persuade the producers to give a larger amount of time towards documentaries, because it is not a paying concern. A documentary is something which is more prosaic and is not so remunerative as the others. After all, the producer comes in only if there is profit, and so we are not able to persuade the producers to take up this question. It is for this reason that we have not been able to persuade

[Dr. Keskar]

the producers to give us their co-operation in producing more documentaries. I will certainly welcome it if producers take it up. The other point about the production of a documentary is that it is a technical subject, which is very different from a feature film—it has a technique and an approach, which are very different from ordinary films, where real scenes occupy a greater part and not stage scenes or, what you call, a created story. Certain people, who might be eminent in one line, do not easily depart from that line to which they have been accustomed, and that is one reason why they have not been able to take up the production of documentaries. I might assure my hon. friend that I welcome the co-operation of the industry and I certainly say that we get more and more co-operation in this matter, and if they come forward, we will give them more and more films. The hon. Member raised the question of Calicut. I might tell him that as far as the Malayalam coverage is concerned, we are seriously considering the whole thing. The question is not only of strengthening the radio station at Calicut, but is one relating to the adequate coverage of radio programme for the whole of the Malayalam speaking area. I may inform him in this connection that our Five Year Plan which contains a large number of schemes for the erection of transmitters, has been further expanded, thanks to my friend, the hon. Finance Minister, and we have a further expansion. I might very briefly inform the House that as a result of this expansion, we are putting transmitters at Jullundur, Lucknow and Calcutta. We are having a very powerful short-wave transmitter at Calicut; we will have a high-power transmitter at Bangalore, a 20 k.w. transmitter at Madras and Hyderabad, and we will have, in addition, high-power transmitters at Jaipur, Patna and in the Malayalam region—they have been already passed. So, my friend may be assured that there will be ade-

quate coverage for that area very soon.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack): What about Cuttack?

Dr. Keskar: Cuttack has a 10 k.w. medium-wave station transmitter and we are also putting up a high-power short wave transmitter there. I would have liked to cover a much larger ground and a number of points which were made by hon. Members who were deflected by the very violent, personal somersault or assault which the hon. Member tried to commit on me. I am a weak man as he himself said, and I was a little upset and I had, therefore, to devote a large part of the time to dispose of the faulty impression that he has tried to create and also in order to see that such sort of personal or spiteful attacks do not take place here. I will, however, state the facts to the House and the House will have to consider them. After all, why should there be this bitterness? The hon. Member had devoted a very large part of his speech to music and musicians and I might tell Shri Velayudhan in this connection that there is a very large vested interest created in this organisation, not because of any particular fault or any such thing, but because for the last five years they were in a condition of flux and here money is involved—payment to artists involves a big sum, and people who have entrenched themselves and the cliques which have entrenched themselves will certainly have suffered, though on grounds of merit they have to be shifted. The hon. Member was trying to express all these vested and reactionary interests here. I might tell the House that I am not ready to tolerate or to accept any such kind of demand on behalf of any reactionary or vested interests, and if he thinks that by intimidation, by threats or by abuse, he is going to deflect us from our path, he is thoroughly mistaken.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I wish to put a question to the Minister...(*Interruptions*).

5 P.M.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No questions now. It is five o'clock and I am going to apply the guillotine (*Interruptions*).

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): We have to put some questions. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is not bound to answer questions. If hon. Members go on interrupting like this, let them decide among themselves: I shall retire to the Chamber. It is very wrong. If the hon. Member wants to make a representation I will answer him.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is not a representation. The Minister said he would answer questions when he had finished. (*Interruptions*) I waited politely, but I am interrupted like this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No hon. Member has got a right to interrupt another hon. Member. Liberty to put a question is not a right. Hon. members have no right to put questions or to interrupt any hon. Member when he is on his legs. If he gives in, it is all right.

If the hon. Minister has not found time, hon. Members should be satisfied with whatever explanation has been given by the Minister. For that purpose we cannot go on extending the time.

I shall now put the cut motions to the House.

The cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will now put the Demands to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands

59, 60 and 127 be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[*The Motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P.P.*]

DEMAND NO. 59—MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,27,34,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ministry of Information and Broadcasting'."

DEMAND NO. 60—BROADCASTING

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,12,82,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Broadcasting'."

DEMAND NO. 127—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON BROADCASTING

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,83,33,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Broadcasting'."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the consideration of the Demands for Grants Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 135; 136 and 137 relating to the Ministry of Transport.*

Members and Leaders of Groups may hand over the number of the cut motions which they select to the Secretary in 15 minutes. I will treat them as moved if those hon. Members in whose names those cut motions stand are present in the House and they are otherwise in order.

The usual time-limit on speeches will be observed.

DEMAND NO. 96—MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,71,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ministry of Transport'."

DEMAND NO. 97—PORTS AND PILOTAGE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 57,19,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

DEMAND NO. 98—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 73,23,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

DEMAND NO. 99—CENTRAL ROAD FUND

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,23,98,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Central Road Fund'."

DEMAND NO. 100—COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING NATIONAL HIGHWAYS)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,48,11,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of Communications (including National Highways)'."

DEMAND NO. 101—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,02,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Transport'."

DEMAND NO. 135—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON PORTS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,40,02,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Ports'."

*Moved with the previous sanction of the President.

DEMAND NO. 136—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON ROADS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,56,57,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Roads'."

DEMAND NO. 157—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 84,79,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Transport'."

I have received the members of the agreed cut motions which the hon. Members may now formally move :

Medical examination of seamen by Government doctors

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta-South-East): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Transport' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Lack of sufficient attention to construction of national highways

Shri Nambiar: I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Transport' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Pressing demands of the Delhi Transport Service employees

Shri Nambiar: I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Transport' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Urgent need to construct quarters for the Delhi Transport Service staff in Delhi

Shri Nambiar: I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Transport' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Seamen's welfare

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Transport' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to lay down a uniform policy for the management of transport services in the States

Sardar Hukam Singh: I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Transport' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Necessity for developing minor ports of Alleppey, Quilon and Trivandrum

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon cum Mavelikkara): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Transport' be reduced by Rs. 100."

National highways and bridges in general and particularly in Karnataka

Shri Sivamurthi Swami (Kushitagl): I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Transport' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Development of the Tuticorin Port in Madras State

Shri Nambiar: I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Ports and Pilotage' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to undertake work of proper development of Calcutta port

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ports and Pilotage' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Development of ports in North and South Canara

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ports and Pilotage' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Negligence to develop natural ports of Karwar and Bhatkal

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ports and Pilotage' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to provide adequate protection and help to country crafts in coastal areas

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Lighthouses and Lightships' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Failure to provide a bridge over Sabari River

Shri P. Subba Rao (Nowrangpur): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Communications (including National Highways)' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These cut motions are now before the House and discussion may now proceed.

Shri Nambiar: Sir, with the limited time at my disposal I may not be able to cover all the activities of the

Ministry of Transport, but I would like to focus attention on road transport. I have to submit that the situation of the road transport today is not so good as is pictured by the Ministry. The Ministry in its report gives only very scanty information about road transport in this country. Actually the State sector in road transport is only a very small portion when compared with the private sector. Even in the State sector, no uniform procedure is followed. **The fares charged for the conveyance of the travelling public are usually very high, both in the rural and in the urban areas.** Taking an instance at our very door, the rates charged by the Delhi Transport Service are very high. I do not see any reason why it should be so. The fare charged by the D.T.S. from the Central Secretariat to Connaught Place is as high as two and a half annas for a distance which is not even one mile.

The same is the case in Madras. Recently the tramways were closed down when the Government undertook to put more buses on the road. But unfortunately the plight of the travelling public has not in any way improved. People have to stand in the queues at bus stands for hours together. This is the position wherever the State has come in. In rural areas the fares are very high. The minimum fare for the first mile is four annas to five annas and operators are encouraged to charge these rates. Government has no uniform procedure to regulate rates. The private sector is allowed to go on in their own way. It is therefore high time that Government thought in terms of bringing legislation to regulate the whole road transport and fix fares and freights, whether by the private sector or by the public sector.

Coming to the condition of the transport workers I have to submit that Government has not devoted any attention to improve their lot. The Motor Vehicles Act of 1939 is still

in the Statute Book unamended. Government in their report say that they are thinking of an amendment, but that amendment has not come forth. I do not find any valid reason for that. According to the Motor Vehicles Act a worker, a driver is supposed to be at the wheel for nine hours a day and for another four hours spread over; thereby he is supposed to be on duty for thirteen hours. The International Labour Organisation recommended that this is wrong. They said that no worker should be asked to work for more than forty-eight hours a week. During Question Hour in this House when the hon. Minister of Labour was asked as to why he did not follow the procedure suggested by the I.L.O. he replied that it is not possible to follow the I.L.O. recommendations here in India. Even though the Motor Vehicles Act prescribes nine hours a day, the drivers very often is asked to do more hours than nine. I can give figures with regard to the Punjab. I am told that in the Punjab the driver is asked to be at the wheel for about ten hours a day and he is again asked to be on duty which is spread over another eight hours. In Uttar Pradesh it is slightly different. The worker whether he is in Uttar Pradesh, or in the Punjab, or Madras is asked to do more work, which is inhuman. It is now time that the Motor Vehicles Act is amended so that the workers may get some improved service conditions.

The Motor Vehicles Act of 1939 is outmoded and has to be scrapped. I suggest that new legislation may be brought with a view to improving the whole of the road transport. If Government feel that nationalisation will improve matters, I would suggest their taking over the lines now operated by the private sector.

Apart from working hours, there is the question of security of service of the transport workers. According to the report supplied to us there are 48,000 operators in India. The ma-

ajority of them are in the private sector. There are no regular working conditions for the workers employed in these services. The worker can be sacked any moment at the whims and fancies of the operator. He has no right of appeal. The Industrial Disputes Act is not applicable to him; not even the conciliation proceedings come to his aid. The State Labour apparatus is of no help to him.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BEARGAVA
in the Chair]

I know of cases in Tamil Nad as well as in U.P. and many other parts of the country. There must be certain minimum working conditions for a worker in the Transport service, whether in the private sector or in the public sector. We could also see about the pay and allowances. There was a suggestion that there should be a minimum pay scale. I know in Madras there was a tribunal which gave a certain minimum standard. In order to avoid implementing this minimum standard they have started large scale retrenchment on the transport side, and the position is very bad in Madras. Not only in madras but in other places I can say that about travelling allowance or the basic minimum pay there is no standard, and no worker can claim anything. The moment he claims he is sent out or victimised. There is no security of service for him.

I can also bring to your notice that the attitude of the Ministry towards labour is very bad. Even in the State sector, for instance in Agra in Uttar Pradesh I am told that the Government Roadways Workers' Union is denied even registration on the ground that it cannot be treated as a trade union because transport workers are not "labour" under the Trade Unions Act according to the Registrar of Trade Unions in U.P. I do not know what exactly is the reason. The Indian Trade Unions Act gives certain fundamental rights to the workers. Here every

[Shri Nambiar]

member of the U. P. Roadways Workers' Union should be entitled to the benefits of the Trade Unions Act, but he is denied those benefits under some interpretation of the Government. I say that this sort of thing is derogatory to the standards that Government profess. When once Government takes such a stand, what will happen to the private owner? He goes beyond that. In U.P. there is a punishment system. It is known as the 'joint responsibility' system. By that system if a conductor commits a mistake, the driver also should stand the punishment. If there is an allegation of pilferage on the part of the conductor, it will recoil on the driver also and he can also be dismissed. This is the position.

About the Delhi Transport Service I have represented many facts to the Government previously. There is a slight improvement, which I should admit. The improvement is due to the change of attitude on the part of the management there. The workers continue to co-operate and now there is an improvement. But all the promises given by the Manager are not followed up by the D.R.T.A. It is above the Board and has nobody to answer to, except Parliament. Therefore, it is going on in its own way. With regard to housing conditions, I am told there is practically no house constructed for the transport worker in Delhi. Much money is wasted to bring the driver and conductor for duty by sending special buses in the morning. They have to collect the workers from far away places and put them on the road. This is an additional expenditure on the transport. Therefore, I would suggest that efforts should be made to construct houses immediately for the D.T.S. employees in Delhi. I know the Government will come forward and say that there is a blueprint and that this colony will come up. But I would submit that this colony is not going to come up unless the D.R.T.A. is told to construct the quarters immediately.

There is a promise of something like medical facilities and some other amenities to the staff—one doctor at a dispensary for two thousand employees and their families. This is all show. It does not afford any convenience or comfort to the workers.

I may be given some more time.

Mr. Chairman: An hour and fifteen minutes is the time allotted for the speeches of Members. At 6-20 the hon. Minister wants to be called. Therefore, if we want to put in six or seven speakers, only ten minutes each can be allowed.

Shri K. K. Basu: The Minister should take less time.

Shri Nambiar: My concrete proposal about this matter, as I suggested originally, is that a fresh legislation is necessary which the Government should try to bring in.

Then I want to make some reference to the conditions of seamen. In regard to seamen, you know that there was a controversy about their medical examination, in Calcutta, which continues. The report says that the medical examination is going on smoothly and satisfactorily. But it is not so, it is not going on smoothly. The present system of medical examination introduced by the Government requires to be changed, and the original system must be brought forth. That is my suggestion to him.

I have to say something about the Cochin port. Here also they say that the labour had some troubles and that now things are improved. But I would submit to you that the position of the labour in Cochin port is still bad. There is a large scale retrenchment and the intermediaries or the contractors are exploiting the labour there. Not only that. There is no housing at all. In Cochin port the question of granting houses to

the port labour is not at all there. Apart from that, I would submit that in Mattancherry, the place where the labour live, there is not even the facility of drinking water. I do not know to what extent Government have tried to give them water to drink. I would request the hon. Minister of Transport to visit Mattancherry and see the condition of the labour there and whether they are at least getting drinking water. So also in Wellington Island which I visited recently I found that the sanitation is very poor and bad. With regard to Tuticorin port there was a suggestion that the port is going to be developed. This development is only in paper and not in operation. I request that something may be done to improve the conditions there.

Lastly, I have to make a reference to the Tourist Section of the Transport Ministry of the Government of India. I welcome tourists. But the tourists cannot be invited at random. As things stand today, there is a propaganda machinery set up in New York to attract as many American tourists as possible. There has been an increase in the number of tourists from America from three thousand to six thousand as compared from 1951 to 1954. And these people are given visas, travelling facilities and everything. We know the latest stand of the American with regard to the arms supply to Pakistan. We cannot encourage this sort of inflow of American tourists, and we cannot admit them as and when the Ministry requires. There is the political consideration also to be borne in mind, and these tourists are not behaving properly when they come here. Therefore, I have my own grievance against this sort of invitation being extended to Americans, and I request the Minister to consider the matter on political grounds also and not merely on the ground of dollar earnings. He might say that we are getting dollar exchange worth Rs. 2½ crores. But that pittance should not

weigh against our political consideration.

گیانی جی - ایس - مسافر
(امرتسر): سہا پتی جی - میں روتہ
ٹرانسپورٹ کے متعلق ہی چند باتیں
کہنا چاہتا ہوں - ٹرانسپورٹ منسٹر
صاحب اس بات سے اچھی طرح واقف
ہیں کہ اس سوال پر ہمارے دیس
میں ایک زبردست متبہد ہے -
پلاننگ کمیشن جس نے دیس کی
ٹیولہمنٹ میں نمایاں دہمائی کا بوجھ
اچھے اوپر لیا ہوا ہے انہوں نے جہاں
دیس کی ٹیولہمنٹ کے لئے ۲۲۶۹
کروڑ خرچ کرنا ہے وہاں روتہ ٹرانسپورٹ
کے لئے صرف آٹھ کروڑ ۹۷ لاکھ روپیہ رکھا
ہے یعنی تہیب ۹ کروڑ روپیہ رکھا ہے
جو زہرو پائنت چار (0.4) پرسہمنٹ
سے زیادہ نہیں بلتا - اس کے علاوہ جو
ہمارا نیشنل ٹیولہمنٹ ہوتی ہے جس
کی رائے بڑی اہمیت رکھتی ہے اس
نے بھی پلاننگ کمیشن کی اس سفارش
کو منظور کیا ہے اور جو ۱۱ پائنت
دیس کے ٹیولہمنٹ کے لئے رکھے گئے
ہیں اس میں جو روتہ ٹرانسپورٹ کا
سوال ہے اس میں انہوں نے اہلی بڑی
اہمیت رائے دی ہے کہ پوائنت
ٹرانسپورٹ کو ہی صوبہ سوکڑیں بڑھاوا
دیں - اس کے علاوہ تھوٹ کمیشن کی
بھی اس طرح کی رپورٹ ہے - تو اگر
ہمکو اس طرف پورا دھیان دینا ہے
تو چونکہ اس معاملے پر اتنا اختلاف
رائے ہے اس لئے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ

[گھائی جی - ایس - مسافر]

سرکار کو اس کی پہلے پوری پوری جانچ کر لینی چاہیے - اور میں تجویز کرتا ہوں کہ اس جانچ پڑتال کے لئے ایک اچھی کمیٹی بنائی جائے جو کہ پورے طور پر پتال کرے اپنی رپورٹ پیش کرے - اس کے بعد ہی روڈ ٹرانسپورٹ کے راشنریہ کرن کے سوال کو لیا جائے -

ویسے ظاہر طور پر تو راشنریہ کرن کا جو سوال ہے یہ جو لفظ ہے یہ ایک بڑا پاپولر لفظ ہے - بڑا ہر دل عزیز لفظ ہے - پرنسپل کے طور پر مہرا خہال ہے اسے سب مانگتے اور اس پرنسپل کو ماننے میں اتنا متبہد نہیں ہوگا - مگر جب فور کہا جائے اور درجہ بدرجہ سوچا جائے

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: On a point of order, Sir, there is no Quorum in the House.

Mr. Chairman: There is Quorum in the House now, the hon. Member may resume his speech.

گھائی جی - ایس - مسافر - پچھلے

دنوں مدھے پردیہیں میں رائے پور میں آل انڈیا موٹر آپریٹرس یونین کی ایک بڑی نمائندہ کانفرنس ہوئی جس کو کہ شری ایس - کے - پاتل نے پریسائنڈ کیا اور مدھے پردیہیں کے چھف منسٹر شکلا صاحب نے اس کو ان اگریٹ کیا - اس وقت انہوں نے اپنی ابتدائی تقریر میں کہا تھا کہ اگر پرائیویٹ آپریٹرس ایچ اندر اپنی شہنسی

کو قائم رکھیں اور بڑھائیں تو پھر ہمیں کوئی اعتراض نہیں ہوگا کہ ان کو موقع دیا جائے کہ وہ اس کام کو اچھی طرح سے چلائیں اور ہماری راشنریہ کرن کی طرف توجہ نہ ہوگی مہرا کہتا ہے کہ یہ ایک ایسا سوال ہے جس پر اختلاف رائیں موجود ہیں - چار باتوں کا خیال یہ روڈ ٹرانسپورٹ کا راشنریہ کرن کرنے میں ہمیں رکھنا پڑتا ہے - پہلی چیز یہ ہے اپنی شہنسی جس سے پبلک سولہیت کے لئے زیادہ سامان پیدا ہو - دوسری بات ہے ورکرس کی - جو اس میں کام کرنے والے ہیں ان کا فائدہ کس بات میں ہے - تیسری چیز ہے گورنمنٹ کا مالی فائدہ یعنی ایکونامک کنوشچن اور چوتھی بات ہے انڈسٹری کا سوال - ہم ایک ایک بات کو لیں تو پتہ لگتا کہ ہر ایک سوال پر اختلاف رائے موجود ہے - اپنی شہنسی کے متعلق تو ابھی تک یہ بات ہمارے دیہیں میں نمایاں طور پر کہی جاتی ہے کہ بھائی یہ تو سرکاری کام ہے ہماری ذمہدیت ایسی ہے کہ ہم فوراً کہہ دیتے ہیں کہ یہ تو سرکار کا کام ہے - اس میں کچھ زیادہ ضرورت سوچنے کی نہیں ہے - اس میں ویسے سرکار چلائگی ویسے یہ چلتا جائیگا - جب پہلے ہی میں نے یہ خیال موجود ہو تو اس وقت وہ اپنی شہنسی کی طرف بڑھ نہیں سکتا تو جب تک ہمارے دیہیں میں

پوری جاگرتی نہیں آجاتی اور ہم کو اس بات کا پورا احساس نہیں ہو جاتا کہ جو سرکاری کام ہوں وہ ہمارے اپنے ہی کام ہوں اور ان میں ہمیں اپنا پورا کوپریشن دینا چاہئے اس وقت تک ہمارے درمیان میں یہ شکایت موجود رہیگی۔ اس کے برعکس جو لوگ اپنی پرائیویٹ بسز چلاتے ہیں وہ ہر طرح سے پبلک کے آرام اور سہولیت کا خیال رکھتے ہیں اور اپنے اندر اپنی شہنسی پھد کرتے ہیں۔ پنجاب میں میں خاص طور پر دیکھتا ہوں کہ وہاں کئی جگہ ساتھ ساتھ کام چل رہا ہے۔ وہاں گورنمنٹ نے بھی کئی روڈ نہیلائز کئے ہیں اور پرائیویٹ آپریٹرس بھی اپنا کام چلا رہے ہیں۔ ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ جہاں جہاں پرائیویٹ کمپنیاں کام کر رہی ہیں وہاں اپنی شہنسی بھی زیادہ ہے اور مسافروں کے لئے سہولیتیں بھی زیادہ ہیں اور پبلک کا وہاں پر خیال بھی زیادہ رکھا جاتا ہے۔ لیکن دوسری طرف سرکاری بسوں میں پوری طور پر کامیابی نظر نہیں آتی۔ مہرا کہاں صرف یہ نہیں ہے کہ جہاں جہاں سرکار کی بسوں چل رہی ہیں وہاں پر انتظام بالکل ہی خراب ہے مگر جیسا میں نے پہلے کہا وہ چیز موجود ہے اور وہ یہ سمجھ کر ہتھ جاتے ہیں کہ یہ تو سرکار کا کام ہے اس میں کچھ زیادہ توجہ کی ضرورت نہیں اور کچھ خاص زیادہ متعلق کی ضرورت نہیں ہے اور یہی وجہ

ہے کہ جب سرکاری بسوں کوئی سامان لے جاتی ہیں تو وہ کافی اپنے کو اور لوڈ کر لیتی ہیں کیونکہ ان کو سرکاری بسوں کو اس کا تو نہیں دھتا کہ کوئی ان کو چھک کر لیتا یا چالان کر دے گا لیکن اس کے برعکس جو پرائیویٹ موٹر گاڑیاں ہیں ان کو ہر وقت فکڑ دھتی ہے کہ کہیں ہم چھک نہ کر لٹے جائیں اور ان کو ڈر بنا دھتا ہے کہ اگر ہم نے قاعدہ سے زیادہ بوجھ رکھا تو ہمارا چالان ہو جائیگا اور ہم پر اس کے لئے جرمانا ہو جائیگا۔ اس لئے وہ ڈرا دھیان اور فکر سے کام کرتے ہیں۔

دوسری بات ہے ووکس کا فائدہ۔ اس کے متعلق میں اتنا ہی کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ جو ٹرانسپورٹ منسٹری کی تازہ رپورٹ ہمارے سامنے ہے اس میں روڈ ٹرانسپورٹ کے چھتے چھپتر میں جہاں اس کو قبل کہا گیا ہے وہاں اس بات کو مانا گیا ہے۔

“There are at present approximately 48,000 operators of whom only 25 own a fleet exceeding 100, another 50 who own more than 50 vehicles but not exceeding 100 and less than 1,500 operators own a fleet exceeding 5 but not exceeding 50 vehicles. There are more than 48,000 small operators each owning 5 vehicles or less.”

ان فگرز سے صاف ظاہر ہوتا ہے کہ ۹۵ پرسینٹ کے قریب ایسے آپریٹرس ہیں جو بالکل نچلے درجہ کے یا درمیانی درجہ کے ہیں میں آپ کو

[گھانڑی جی - اےس - مسافر]

بتاؤں کہ پنجاب میں تو حالت یہ ہے کہ آپریٹرس خود اور جو شہر ہولڈرس کھلی کے ہیں وہ خود کہیں ڈرائیورز کا کام کرتے ہیں اور کہیں کہیں پر تو کلہنرس کا بھی کام کرتے ہیں - وہ کوئی بہت بڑے سرمایہ دار لوگ نہیں ہیں - تھوڑا روپیہ کسی طرح سے قرض لیکر یا زیور بیچ کر اکٹھا کر لیتے ہیں اور ایک آدھ بس خرید لیتے ہیں اور اپنی روزی کھاتے ہیں یا دو تین آدمی مل کر ایک کوئی چھوٹی سوسائٹی بنا لیتے ہیں اور اس طرح اپنا گزارہ کرتے ہیں - اس طرح میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ پنجاب کے جو آپریٹرس ہیں وہ ورکرس ہیں اور اس سے زیادہ ان کو چھٹیہ اور اہمیت نہیں دی جا سکتی - اس لئے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس معاملے پر پھر ہمارے دیش میں اختلاف موجود ہو کہ ورکرس کا فائدہ نس بات میں ہے اس کے لئے میں نے اس بات پر زور دیا ہے کہ روڈ ٹرانسپورٹ کے راشنریہ کریں کرتے وقت ہمیں اس بارے میں پوری طرح جانچ پڑتال کر لینی چاہئے -

تیسری بات جو مالی فائدہ یعنی ایکونامک کوشچن ہے اس کے بارے میں بھی میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ بعض جگہوں پر یہ خیال کیا گیا ہے کہ اس طرح یہاں موٹر بنیس سے کافی روپیہ آجاتا ہے اس سے گورنمنٹ کہیں نہ فائدہ اٹھائے -

آمدنی کے بارے میں یہ بات تھیک ہے کہ اس میں آپریٹرس کو بھی دھوکہ ہوا ہے اور گورنمنٹ کو بھی دھوکہ ہوا ہے - اس میں چونکہ روزانہ آمدنی ہو جاتی ہے اس سے یہ خیال پیدا ہو جاتا ہے کہ آپریٹرس کے پاس بڑا روپیہ آگیا اور گورنمنٹ بھی یہ خیال کرے لگی ہے کہ روزانہ اتنا روپیہ آجاتا ہے - تو نہ گورنمنٹ ہی اس کی طرف خیال کرتی ہے اور نہ ہی آپریٹرس نے کبھی خیال کیا تھا کہ ان کی طرف بہت کم دھیان دیا جاتا ہے - کسی نے بھی ایسی ہی کی روزانہ آمدنی کا ایورج نہیں نکالا - چونکہ روزانہ آمدنی آ جاتی ہے اس لئے آپریٹرس خوش ہوتے رہتے ہیں - اور اس خوشی کو دیکھکر شاید گورنمنٹ کے دل میں بھی یہ خیال آیا ہے کہ یہ کام کوئی بڑے فائدہ کا ہے - جیسا میں نے کہا ہے اس میں اختلاف رائے ہو سکتا ہے - سرکار کو اگر روپیہ کا فائدہ کسی طرح سے پہنچنا ہے تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ پبلک کا ہی فائدہ ہوا - اس پر کسی کو اعتراض نہیں ہو سکتا - مگر اندازہ کرتے وقت ضرور ہر ایک خیال کو سلنا چاہئے -

مثال کے طور پر دہلی ٹرانسپورٹ سروس - ۱۹۵۳ کی رپورٹ مدبرے ہانہ میں ہے - اس میں انہوں نے پچھلے سال یعنی ۱۹۵۳ میں ۳ لاکھ ۹۹ ہزار کا فائدہ دکھایا - اس میں ۱۵۸ تیریل دیہیکلس چلے اور ۱۰۶ پھٹرول

ویبھیکل - یعنی اس پروپوزیشن سے - اس نسبت سے اگر اندازہ لگایا جائے تو یہ جو مائیلج کے فیکرس ڈئے کئے گئے ہیں ان کے مطابق ۱۹۵۳ میں ۲۲۵۰۰۰ مہل کوڑ کئے گئے ہیں - اور اس نسبت سے حساب لگانے پر تو ان روٹس پر ۱۳۵۰۰۰ مہل ڈیزل ویبھیکلس نے کوڑ کئے ہیں اور باقی پر دوسری ویبھیکل چلائی گئی ہیں - اس خرچ سے سمجھ لہجئے کہ کوئی ۱۵۰۰۰ گھنٹن پٹرول کی بچت روزانہ کی گئی ہے - ڈیزل ویبھیکل چلا کر - جو بھی پٹرول بچایا گیا ہے اس میں یہ سمجھ لینا چاہئے کہ ۱۵ آنے فی گھنٹن کے حساب سے روٹ فلڈ جو ہے اس کو نقصان پہنچا ہے - پٹرول پر تہوتی ہے - اگر اس طرح سے اندازہ لگایا جائے تو ۱۳۰۰۰ روپیہ روز کا روٹ فلڈ کو نقصان پہنچتا ہے - ۱۳۰۰۰ روپیہ روز کا مطلب ہے ۴۲۰۰۰۰ روپیہ ساہوار اور ۵ لاکھ روپیہ سالانہ نقصان روٹ فلڈ کو ڈیزل ویبھیکل چلا کر پہنچایا گیا ہے - اگر اندازہ لگایا جائے تو ۳ لاکھ ۹۹ ہزار روپیہ کی بچت اگر دہلی ٹرانسپورٹ نے کی ہے تو ۵ لاکھ روپیہ کا نقصان روٹ فلڈ کو پہنچتا ہے ہمارے اس دیس کو جس کی روٹس کو ابھی تہولپ ہونا ہے - جس کے ایک ایک مہل کے تکرے کو ہلانے کی ضرورت ہے - اگر وہ روپیہ سرکار کے پاس آتا تو اس سے کتلی سوکھن بن سکتی تھیں -

اب آئندہ جو اسکیم ہے دہلی ٹرانسپورٹ کی - اس کے مطابق ۱۳۰ ڈیزل ویبھیکل اگلے سال میں خریدنی ہیں جس کے لئے ۷۰ لاکھ روپیہ مرکزی فنڈ کو دینا ہے - مہرا کہنا ہے کہ جتنی ڈیزل ویبھیکل یہاں چلائی جائیں گی اتنا ہی پٹرول تہوتی اور روٹ فلڈ کو نقصان پہنچے گا - میں نے آپ کے سامنے ایک یہ مثال پیش کی ہے - اگر ہماری سرکاروں اس طرح سے فائدہ کا اندازہ کر لیتی ہیں تو میں کہتا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ بڑی غلط فہمی ہے کہونکہ اس سے یہ نقصان پہنچ رہا ہے - بچت نہیں ہو رہی ہے - اس غلط فہمی کو نہیں رہنا چاہئے - اور یہی باتیں ہیں جن سے اندازہ لگایا جا سکتا ہے - میں تو یہ بھی کہتا ہوں کہ میں ایسے ماتدا ہوں کہ اگر سرکار کے پاس روپیہ آتا ہے تو اس سے وہ پبلک کو فائدہ پہنچا سکتی ہے - مگر اس طرح سے روٹ فلڈ کو تو نقصان ہوا -

اس طرح سے جو روپیہ روٹ ٹرانسپورٹ کے ڈیپارٹمنٹ کرن پر خرچ کیا جاتا ہے وہ کسی اور اچھے کام کے لئے فی الحال خرچ کیا جائے اس سے ایک تو جو ہمارے دو مہانہ درجہ کے لوگ ہیں بیکاری سے بچ سکتے ہیں اور سرکار کا بھی اس میں کوئی زیادہ نقصان نہیں ہے - میں آپ کو پنجاب کی ایک مثال دیتا ہوں - ہمارے پنجاب میں ۸۰ کمپنیاں ہیں - ان میں سے ۵۰

[گھانی جی - ایس - مسافر]

پروسیڈنٹ کھلیان (فہرچہون کی ہیں -
 سہا پتی جی - چونکہ یہ سوال بڑا
 اہم ہے اس لئے آپ کی اجازت سے دو
 تہن ملت میں ان کے بارے میں کہنا
 چاہتا ہوں - ان کھلیوں میں ۲۰۰۰
 شہر ہولڈرس ہیں - جو کہ آپریٹرس
 ہیں - نو ۲۰۰۰ افراد تو ان کے ہی
 بن جاتے ہیں جو کہ اس میں کوآپریٹر
 ہوسس پر کام کرتے ہیں - کسی ایک
 کی کھلی نہیں ہے - میں نے رائے پور
 میں شکلا جی کی اسپیش سلی تھی -
 انہوں نے کہا تھا کہ بڑے بڑے یونٹ
 بن جائیں یہاں پنڈجاب میں تو پہلے
 ہی اس قسم کے یونٹ بلے ہوئے ہیں
 راشٹریہ کرن سے پنڈجاب میں ۲۰۰۰
 آپریٹرس جو ہیں جن کو آپ ورکرس ،
 ہی کہہ سکتے ہیں ان سب کے لئے
 گورنمنٹ کام مہیا نہیں کر سکتی ہے -
 میں نے اندازہ لگایا ہے کہ اس طرح سے
 کوئی ۷۵۰۰۰ کے قریب لوگ پنڈجاب
 میں بھکار ہو جائیں گے اگر آج موٹر
 ٹرانسپورٹ نہ ہلائی کر دیا جائے - اس
 تعداد میں موٹر بزنس سے تعلق رکھنے
 والے سب لوگ شامل ہیں - میں
 کہتا ہوں کہ راشٹریہ کرن کا جو پرنسپل
 ہے اس کے کوئی خلاف نہیں ہے - مگر
 ہر ایک بات کا - ہر ایک کام کا کوئی
 نہ کوئی وقت ہوتا ہے جتنے لوگ درمیانہ
 درجے کے بھکار ہوں گے انہا ہی ہمارے
 دیس کا زیادہ نقصان ہے کیونکہ یہ
 ہمارے دیس کی ریورہ کی ہتی ہیں -

جو لوگ کام کرنے والے ہیں اگر ان کو
 کام نہ ملا تو اس سے بڑا نقصان ہوتا
 ہے -

جہاں تک انڈسٹریز کی بات ہے -
 آج ملک میں بڑے بڑے انڈسٹریلسٹس
 ہوں ان کی رائے دیکھنی چاہئے
 مسٹر بی - ایم - بولا کی تقریر کو جو
 انہوں نے پچھلے ہوس چیمبرس آف
 کامرس کے اجلاس میں دی تھی - اس
 میں انہوں نے کہا تھا کہ اگر سرکار اس
 انڈسٹری کا راشٹریہ کرن کرنے کی طرف
 قدم اٹھائے گی تو اس انڈسٹری کو بڑا
 نقصان پہنچے گا - میرے کہنے کا تاثر یہ
 صرف یہی ہے کہ اس معاملہ کی
 جانچ پڑتال کر کے لئے ایک کمیٹی
 بنائی جائے - جو کہ پوری جانچ کر کے
 ہر لحاظ سے - ہر نقطہ سے ان چاروں
 باتوں پر جو کہ میں نے وضاحت سے
 پیش کی ہیں ، خیال کر کے ، اپنی
 رپورٹ پیش کرے - اور سرکار اس کی
 جانچ کر کے اس کے بعد کوئی فیصلہ
 کرے - میں یہ عرض کروں گا کہ اگر راشٹریہ
 کرن ضرور کرنا ہے تو پھر یہ ایک ایسا
 بہویار ہے جس کے لئے فل کھلیسٹیشن
 دینا چاہئے - بلکہ فل کھلیسٹیشن
 کے ان کام چلنے والا نہیں ہے -

ان الفاظ کے سامنے میں آپ سے زیادہ
 وقت لینے کی معافی چاہتا ہوں -

(English translation of the above)

Giani G. S. Musafir (Amritsar):
 Mr. Chairman, I would like to give

a few suggestions about road transport system in this country. The hon. Minister for Transport is fully aware that there is a major difference of opinion on this subject. The Planning Commission which has assumed the role of guiding the development works of this country has earmarked only about nine crores of rupees for transport development out of the total sum of 2269 crores; meaning thereby that only 0.4 per cent. of the total has been earmarked for it. The National Development Board too is in agreement with this recommendation of the Commission. Out of the eleven points suggested for the development of the country one is about the road transport and in this connection it has been vaguely pointed out that it is for the State Governments to encourage private transport. The Tariff Commission, too, has submitted its report more or less on the similar lines. So, there being such a divergence of opinion, the Government should make a thorough inquiry into this matter. I submit that a committee should be appointed for this purpose and after receiving its report on this subject, the question of nationalisation of road transport should be taken up. The term nationalisation has become a popular one these days. I think all of us agree to it on principle. There is not much difference of opinion so far as the principle underlying nationalisation is concerned but when we consider it.....

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: On point of order, Sir, there is no quorum in the House.

Mr. Chairman: There is quorum in the House now, the hon. Member may resume his speech.

Giani G. S. Musafir: Only the other day a representative conference of All India Motor Operators Union was called in Raipur, Madhya Pradesh under the presidentship of Shri S. K. Patil. The conference was inaugurated by the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh, Shri Shukla, who

in his inaugural speech pointed out that there was no reason why private operators should not be given a chance to function if they run their services efficiently and cater to the needs of the public. By referring to his speech I only want to draw your attention to the fact that opinions differ so far as this issue is concerned. We have to keep four things in our mind while embarking on any scheme of nationalisation of road transport. The first thing is the efficiency which means that sufficient transport facilities should be made available to the public. The second thing is the welfare of workers. The third is the economic gain that may accrue to the Government, and the fourth thing is the requirements of the industry. If we take each one of these points separately, we would find that there also there is divergence of opinion.

So far as the question of efficiency is concerned, there is a feeling in the country that any Government work would go on in the manner in which the Government would like it to go. I submit that this feeling or this way of thinking is a major hurdle in the achievement of efficiency. Unless there is sufficient social consciousness in the country, things would not improve and the position would remain as it is. On the other hand, people who run private buses look to it that the public get sufficient comfort and in this way they try to improve their efficiency.

In Punjab I have seen at several places Government nationalising some routes and at the same time allowing private operators to run their services on the other routes. Wherever these operators have been allowed to function we see the efficiency is high and the facilities of travel etc. for passengers are better. On the other hand, we see that State bus service is not so complete a success. I do not mean to say that they have failed or that their management is poor. What I mean to say is that there is that feeling of 'Government's job' to

[Giani G. S. Musafir]

which I have referred to. They do not give much attention to it and think that it is unnecessary. That is the reason why Government buses are generally over-loaded. They have no fear of any checking or any other governmental action. The case is not so with the private buses. They always look to it that the rules etc. are adhered to lest they get involved some trouble or the other.

The second thing to be kept in mind is the welfare of the workers. In this connection, I would like to draw your attention to the latest report of the Transport Ministry which says :

“There are at present approximately 48,000 operators of whom only 25 own a fleet exceeding 100, another 50 who own more than 50 vehicles but not exceeding 100 and less than 1,500 operators own a fleet exceeding 5 but not exceeding 50 vehicles. There are more than 46,000 small operators each owning 5 vehicles or less.”

It is evident from these figures that 95 percent the operators are those who belong to the lower or the middle classes. About Punjab I may say that the operators themselves or in certain cases the share-holders of such companies themselves work as drivers and sometimes as cleaners. They are in no way capitalists. They take some money on loan or sell their jewellery for purchasing a bus or two and in this way make their living, or two or three such persons form themselves into a society and run the show on a cooperative basis. What I mean to say is that the private bus operators in Punjab are no more than workers themselves. There can be difference of opinion on the question as to how the welfare of the workers can be achieved. That is why I submitted that these things should be looked into at the time of nationalisation of road transport in the country.

Third thing is the economic or the financial question. I understand that there is a feeling in some quarters that people earn a lot of money from this motor business and ask why the Government too, should not step into this field.

It is true that the operators and the Government have been deceived in so far as the income is concerned. A source of daily income as it is, we are prone to think that operators get a lot of money and the Government, too, are thinking in these very terms. The consequences are that neither the Government nor the operators did ever think that the latter were not attended to. None thought of their average income. As it is a source of daily income, operators are happy and their happiness makes the Government also think that this line is an yielding one. As I have already said, there can be a divided opinion. I personally think that if the Government are benefited in any way, it means benefit to the public. None can object to this, but each opinion should be given ear to when an estimate is made.

I have, for example, the 1953 Report of the D.T.S. with me. They have shown a profit of Rs. 3,99,000 in the last year. The number of diesel oil vehicles was 158 while those of petrol vehicles was 106. The mileage covered in 1953 was 22,500 miles, and keeping this proportion in view the diesel vehicles covered 13,500 miles when the rest was covered by the petrol vehicles. This brings us to the conclusion that there has been a regular saving of 1,500 gallons of petrol every day. Putting to road the diesel vehicles means, no doubt, a saving of petrol, but it also means a loss of 15 annas per gallon to the Road Fund. Petrol is dutiable. It, therefore, means a daily loss of Rs. 1400 to the Road Fund, and in this way the loss to Road Fund on account of these diesel vehicles comes to Rs. 42,000 a month, and 5 lakhs

of rupees a year. The saving of 3 lakhs and 99 thousand rupees to the D.T.S. means an annual loss of 5 lakhs to the Road Fund. It can be very well imagined how many new roads and routes could be built in this country of under-developed roads if all this money were to go to the Government.

According to the future scheme of the D.T.S., 140 diesel vehicles are to be purchased with 70 lakhs of rupees to be given by the Centre. The operation of diesel vehicles means the loss to petrol duty and Road Fund. This was an instance. There are many other devices which apparently seem to be benefiting, but are ultimately sources of loss to the Government. I want the Government to remove the misunderstanding about saving. Instances can be multiplied. The operation of diesel vehicles may, no doubt, mean a profit to the Government who can benefit the public, but it means a loss to the Road Fund. If the money spent on the nationalisation of Road Transport is spent on some other reconstructive programme, it will mean saving the middle class people of our country from unemployment. I will give an example of Punjab to show how the Government have not to lose anything in this way. We have 80 companies in Punjab, out of which 50 per cent. belong to the refugees. Mr. Chairman, I may be allowed to speak on this important point for two or three minutes more. There are about 4,000 shareholders in these companies, and they are operators as well. There are 20,000 people from their side who work on cooperative basis and no company is monopolised by any one individual. I had an occasion to hear Mr. Shukla's speech at Raipur. He said that big units should be formed. There are already such units in Punjab. Government cannot provide work to 4,000 operators, or workers of Punjab, by this nationalisation. My estimate is that if motor transport in Punjab is nationalised it will throw out of job about 75,000 people. All people concerned with the motor

business are included in this strength. Nobody opposes nationalisation, on principle, but each thing should come up in its own time. People coming from the middle class form the backbone of our country, and the more they are without job the more the loss to our country. Competent men without work means a loss to our country.

About industries I may say that we should consult the big industrialists of our country. Mr. B. M. Birla while addressing the Chamber of Commerce last year said that the industry would be put to a major loss if the Government nationalised it. And what I mean to say is that a Committee be appointed for the investigation into this matter, and be asked to submit a report in the light of these four points which I have already elaborated. After a full investigation, Government can give its final decision. I would like to submit that a full compensation be given in case nationalisation is to be done necessarily, because those people shall have nothing to start with if full compensation is not given to them.

With these words I close my speech.

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): I said last year and I repeat this year also that the Delhi Transport Service is the most inefficient, most irregular and the most unpunctual of all the transport services that I have ever seen plying in the various parts of the country, especially in towns and cities. I say this with my personal experience of the bus service of three of the big cities of India, namely Bombay, Ahmedabad and Poona. During every session I write about two or three letters to the hon. Deputy Minister for Transport complaining against this inefficiency and these irregularities of this service. The hon. Minister sends them to the authorities concerned, and every time a reply is given that they are trying to improve the service, but to no purpose.

The hon. Deputy Minister has been kind enough to divert some of the

[Shri Dabhi]

buses to North and South Avenues where the hon. Members of the House reside, but this, instead of being a source of convenience, has become a source of inconvenience, and irritation also, because when the Members, some of us, go there and stand at the bus stand, many a time the buses do not come, and then we have to walk to the Secretariat and there also wait for some time and then only are we in a position to get some bus. I travel at least once or twice daily by some of these buses and I have heard bitter complaints from several members of the public standing at the bus stops including Government servants. They have practically lost all hope of any improvement in this service.

Even according to the information given to us daily there are 25 to 30 breakages on all the routes. Even if there are only 25 breakages and even if only hundred passengers wait for half an hour, then every day about 1,250 hours are being lost and wasted by the members of the public. This is the way in which this Delhi State Transport service is getting on.

On the 28th of last month, apart from the other difficulties that we had to experience while going to Tilpat range, in the two buses that were provided for North Avenue we had to travel about 87 people in each of the buses against the capacity of about 35. That was the position.

In the report of the Ministry for 1953-54 it is stated that by the end of February, 1954, 30 buses have been added to the fleet, while 88 old vehicles have been condemned. This means that there has been a decrease in the number of buses when there has been a great increase in the number of passengers to be carried by the buses of this service. Last year also there was a decrease in the number of buses, and this year also. So, inevitably there would be difficulty, and the complaints that we hear every

day from the passengers are quite true.

There are other difficulties also. Even in important bus stops there is no shed where passengers can stop. For example buses on several routes pass through the Secretariat bus stop and even in summer there is not one shed there where the passengers can stand. The passengers experience great difficulty. Even at such important bus stops there is not a single shed.

Then again, there are bus stands at various places where sometimes time tables are attached to the poles, but they are fixed in such a way that at night you cannot read them, because everywhere there is darkness.

This being the Capital of India, the transport service must be an ideal one in every way to be followed by the other cities. Instead of that, this is the condition in which the transport service is working at present. I hope the hon. Minister would do something effective so that all the complaints would disappear and the public will have nothing to complain of against this service.

This is the only criticism I wanted to make.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): I am speaking on the subject only because I have had some connection for 15 years with the problem of road transport.

You will remember that no other province in India had what we call a government road transport except the Road Transport Department of Hyderabad which was developed by the Nizam State Railway. That taught us many things as to the advantages and disadvantages of road transport being conducted by Government enterprise.

For 19 years—now nearing 21 years even—the road transport of Hyderabad was the only one of its kind in

India. Then came our national Government, and without having any previous experience of the problems, the advantages and disadvantages of converting the road transport industry, which was already there, into a monopoly of Government, they rushed, thinking this is a grand source of income, into so-called nationalisation. There were warnings, in fact. A Select Committee of the House of the People in 1950 warned against it. The Tariff Commission warned against it, but it was done in a hurry.

Now, we will see the economics of it. The area of India is 1.3 million sq. miles. We have 1.78 lakhs of road mileage. Out of that only 33 per cent. are pucca roads. Now, the trend in western countries and other countries is not to increase the track mileage of railways, but to develop roads. Therefore, the future will be development of road mileage and not track mileage. At present, our road mileage is hopelessly low for such a big country. What will be the inference? The inference will be that we shall have to increasingly use road vehicles in order to cope with the enormous demands. That is point No. 1.

Then, in India we have got 47,575 private operators. Out of them 46,000 are individual, small scale operators. These are men who, risking everything, borrowing money, built up an enormous traffic, an enormous industry which connected all the cities together. Let us now look at the question of investment. The Planning Commission itself has computed the investment by the private operators at Rs. 131 crores. We have not any very exact figures, but my impression is that it is more, but let us accept the Planning Commission's own figures. Take the Government investment. Government investment before transport was begun, including rail-road co-ordinated transport was Rs. 12 crores. By 1955-56, it may come to Rs. 21 crores. At present, my calculation is that it is about Rs. 17 crores. They can

buy at the most about two thousand new buses by 1955-56: at the most, they can have totally only ten thousand buses. At present, private enterprise has got about forty thousand. There is a statement here by the Tariff Commission which says that the private operators in May 1952, had 100,855 vehicles. We have got all these figures here. What are you going to do with all these vehicles? What are you going to do with the enormous industry that these people have built up, when you are unable to manage even what you have?

I shall give you some examples. In Bombay, the State Transport Service has got a capital of Rs. 9 crores, and the annual profit was Rs. 8 lakhs, which is less than one per cent. of the capital. They are borrowing money at the rate of four per cent. Even this Rs. 8 lakhs is not a proper calculation. It is calculated as a profit, because they have converted a large number of their vehicles from petrol engines to diesel engines. On this basis, they claim that they have saved about Rs. 50 lakhs annually. In other words, if they had run as the private operators do they would have lost Rs. 42 lakhs. Next, take the case of the Bengal Government. They have had a loss of Rs. 6,45,000. The revised estimate of the loss for the current year is Rs. 16,44,000. This has been so, even when depreciation is charged at the rate of 16½ per cent. as against the normal trade practice of twenty-five per cent.

So far as the Delhi Transport Service is concerned, last year or the year before last, I gave some statistics regarding breakdowns. Presenting the report of the working of the Delhi Transport Service, the hon. Minister said in Parliament, that although the authorities had been suffering heavy losses in the past some years, it has been possible during the present year to wipe off this deficit. In the case of the Delhi Transport

[Dr. Jaisoorya]

Service, no new trick has worked. They have converted more than sixty per cent. of the fleet into diesel ones, and this has resulted in some saving. But you take the saving from one pocket, while you deprive yourself of what you had in the other pocket.

As I said earlier, the investment of the private enterprise is computed at Rs. 150 crores, according to me. Apart from that, there are other investments, as for instance, in the form of workshops, spare parts, etc. All these things will come to another Rs. 150 crores. If you destroy this industry, you would also be destroying the ancillary industries which make a living from this industry.

Now, I want to ask a very plain question. I have more experience about this problem than all the gentlemen in the Government of India, because they are all junior to me in this respect. They never had this problem before, while we were facing this problem even before. The problem is this.

Sardar Hukam Singh: The Minister has faced it.

Dr. Jaisoorya: I have repeatedly advocated the solution for it, and I would advocate it even now. Under the Production Ministry, the Government of India are investing hundreds of crores of rupees in partnership with private capital, and even the management has been handed over to various private agencies. If that be so, what is the difficulty in forcing the private industry in transport into 'co-operativism'? Let Government also join them. Convert the whole industry into one of a co-operative nature. I have got a scheme in this regard, and I presented it to the Hyderabad Government. It was a complete scheme based on the principle of co-operatives, so that the entire road transport industry could be run, developed, and improved as a co-operative venture. That is the correct thing to do. Because they

have no experience, they are proceeding in the narrow sense of swallowing everything Government can never put in that amount of capital. You have already got all this machinery. All you have to do is to drag the private industry on your own terms, on your own conditions, and under your own management. Only then would you be able to develop transport in this country. I am very doubtful whether our finances in the next few years are going to be so wonderful as to enable us to expand our transport services. You know that as far as Bombay is concerned, it is only under the Colombo Plan that they are getting about five million dollars worth of trucks. This is how Bombay is expanding its transport services. All this has its own repercussions.

The Planning Commission had rated the capacity of manufacturers at thirty thousand vehicles of all description a year. But what is the actual position? It is not more than four thousand, as the Tariff Commission puts it. This is so, because the private sector is not prepared to invest anything more, because of the uncertainty. There is, however, a way out. I am prepared to discuss it with anybody, including the hon. Minister, for I have no enmity against him. For years, I have been working out these schemes, I gave them to the Hyderabad Government, but they did not accept it, but that does not worry me. If this Government also do not want it, it is their look-out, not mine.

सरदार अकरचूरी (गुरदासपुर) : चेंबरमैन महोदय, मैं समझता हूँ कि इसके मुताबिक हाउस में कोई दो राय नहीं हैं कि इस वक्त मोटर ट्रान्सपोर्ट को नेशनलाइज नहीं करना चाहिये। इसी हाउस में अभी बताया गया है कि सन् ५० में हाउस में इसी मामले पर बहस हुई और उस वक्त यह तय पाया गया कि मिनिस्टर साहब मोटर वाहिकल एक्ट में कोई

तरमिम लायें जिससे कि इन आपरेंटर्स को माकूल मुआबिजा दिया जाय और तब गवर्न-मेंट इस इन्डस्ट्री को नेशनलाइज कर सकती हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि किसी इदारत को नेशनलाइज करने के लिये कोई इल्तलाफ नहीं हो सकता, लेकिन यह बात देखनी होती है कि आया उससे पीब्लिक को क्या फायदा है और सरकार को क्या फायदा है और यह चीज जिन निज सूबों में ट्रान्सपोर्ट्स नेशनलाइज हुए हैं वहाँ की हालत पर गौर करने से पता चल सकता है। जहाँ तक पीब्लिक के फायदे का ताल्लुक है, उसके लिये देखली ही काफी है और इसी से अन्दाजा लगाया जा सकता है कि पीब्लिक को कितना फायदा है। एक २ बस स्टैंड पर दस दस, बीस बीस, और पचासों आदमी खड़े रह जाते हैं और उनके सामने बस स्टैंड से बस गुजर जाती है और वह बेचारे खूँही लाइन बनाये वहाँ बस के इन्तजार में खड़े रहते हैं। मैंने 'प्रताप' अखबार में आज ही पढ़ा कि बहुत से हमारे रिफ्यूजी भाई जो दूर कॉलोनीज में बसे हुए हैं वह इस वजह से कि उन्हें बस ठीक वक्त पर नहीं मिलती वह लोग नौकरी से हटा दिये गये हैं, उनको काम पर से हटा दिया गया है। इसीलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि नेशनलाइजेशन से जहाँ तक पीब्लिक के मफादे का ताल्लुक है उसका देखली की हालत से बखूबी अन्दाजा लगाया जा सकता है। इसके अलावा मैं ५० पी० के बार् में आप को अपना तजुर्बा बतला सकता हूँ कि वहाँ पर मोटर नेशनलाइजेशन के बाद क्या हालत हो रही है। आज वहाँ हालत यह है कि सरकारी बसों पर जो कंडक्टर्स और ड्राइवर्स हैं वह पुलिस वालों से भी ज्यादा डरम जताते हैं और पीब्लिक की दिक्कत को कम करने की तरफ उनका ध्यान नहीं जाता। अब वहाँ बस स्टैंड पर तो कतली मिल जाता है और उससे आप सामान उत्तरवा और चढ़वा सकते हैं लेकिन बीच रूट पर जो आदमी सवार होता है उसको बहुत दिक्कत पेश आती है, अकेले बिना मदद के उसको अपना सामान ऊपर चढ़ाना होता है या ऊपर से नीचे उतारना होता है, कोई आदमी उसका सामान चढ़ाने और उतारने

में मदद नहीं करता या उसे सहारा दे, मेरे साथ खुद ऐसा इतिफाक पेश आया है और मैं आप दिन रोज देखता हूँ कि वह लोग कुछ पर्वह नहीं करते, क्योंकि उनकी जिम्मेदारी कोई नहीं है, वह सर्विस पूरी सरकारी हो गई है, इस वास्ते वह जिम्मेदार नहीं हैं और पीब्लिक के आराम का कोई ख्याल नहीं करते हैं।

दूसरी बात मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इसको नेशनलाइज करना है तो उसके लिये माकूल मुआबिजा जरूर देना चाहिये और देना है तो उसमें सरकार को कितना खर्च आयेगा, मैं पंजाब की मिसाल देकर बयाम करना चाहता हूँ। पंजाब में इस वक्त १२६७ बसेज हैं और इन १२६७ बसेज के मुताल्लिक पंजाब का रवेँया इस वक्त यह है कि वहाँ की गवर्नमेंट कहती है कि जो अच्छी २ बसेज हैं वह हम ले लेंगे, खराब नहीं लेंगे और जो रवेँया उनका नजर आता है उसके आधार पर मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि वह १२६७ में से सिर्फ ६७ बस लेंगे और १२०० नहीं लेंगे। वह १२०० बसेज मुल्क की बल्ब हैं, मुल्क की जायदाद हैं और वह इस तरह खन्क में जा पड़ेंगी और जाया हो जायगी। और इन १२०० बसेज की जगह अगर गवर्नमेंट गौर करे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि दूसरी बस खरीदने से २० हजार खर्च आयेगा। अगर पेट्रोल वाली ली जायेंगी तो १२, २२ हजार खर्च एक बस पर आयेगा। इसीलिये मेरा अन्दाजा है कि अगर १२०० नई बसें खरीदनी हैं तो चार करोड़ रुपये से कम खर्च नहीं आयेगा। यह चार करोड़ रुपया कहाँ जायेंगा? यह अमरीका जायगा या इंग्लैंड जायेंगा, सब का सब रुपया बाहर जायेंगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर इसे नेशनलाइज करना है तो उनको वक्त दो, कम से कम दस साल तक इस काम को नहीं करना चाहिये। यह जो १२०० बसें आज जो कन्डम हो जायेंगी उनको पांच साल तक वह लोग चलायेंगे। अगर यह पांच साल तक इसी तरह चल जायेंगी तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस चार पांच साल के अर्से में हम अपने देश में यह बसें पैदा करने के लिये, इंजन पैदा करने के लिये अपना रुपया क्या

(सरदार अकरपुरी)

लेंगे और उन लोगों को भी जो लोग नेशनलाइजेशन से भूखों मर जायेंगे उनकी जान भी बचा लेंगे ।

एक और बात से मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को खबरदार करना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि यह सवाल पंजाब में बड़ी तेजी के साथ उठ रहा है, और बड़े खराब तरीके से उठ रहा है, कि एक लाइन ले ली जाती है, उसमें दो, तीन या चार बसें चला दते हैं, लेकिन उन लोगों को किसी किस्म का मुआवजा वगैरह नहीं दते और उन को बेकार कस्तें चले जाते हैं जिनमें कि ५० फी सदी रिफ्यूजी हैं । उन लोगों के साथ कोई अच्छा सलूक नहीं किया जा रहा है । पंजाब में अगर यह राष्ट्रीयकरण हो गया तो हिन्दुस्तान के हर सूबे में हो जायगा । हिन्दुस्तान के सूबों की जहां तक मुझे वाकफियत है, बंगाल में, बम्बई में और ५० फी० में जो बड़े बड़े शहर हैं जैसे कानपुर वगैरह, उनमें पंजाबी ही हैं जिनके पास बहुत काम है । अगर वहां पर भी ट्रान्सपोर्ट को नेशनलाइज कर दिया गया तो उनके पास कोई काम नहीं रह जायेगा, वह लोग पंजाब में आयेंगे । पंजाब की आज कल क्या हालत है । हर एक किसान के पास चार-चार पांच-पांच एकड़ जमीन होती है जिन पर दस दस आदमी पल रहे हैं । अगर और सूबों से पंजाबी आ गये तो वह लोग वहां जाकर क्या करेंगे । वह लोग गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ ही झंडा उठायेंगे । जो लोग कह रहे हैं इस काम को जल्दी करो, वह इस निगाह से नहीं कह रहे हैं कि मुल्क का भला हो । वह इसीलिये कह रहे हैं कि जो लोग बेकार होंगे, वह उन लोगों के पास जायेंगे और गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ बगावत करेंगे । इसीलिये मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस के लिये वक्त देना चाहिये, समय देना चाहिये । जो कुछ ज्ञानी जी ने इस सिलसिले में कहा है मैं उसको सपोर्ट करता हूँ कि इसके लिये हाउस में एक कमेटी मुकरर होनी चाहिये जो कि तमाम पहलुओं से सोच कर अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश करे ।

इस के साथ ज्ञानी जी जो नहीं कह सके हैं उसके लिये मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि बाकी जो स्टैंड्स हैं उनसे कहना चाहिये कि वह किसी एक लाइन को नेशनलाइज न करें । अगर आप ऐसा स्टैंड नहीं लेंगे तो लोगों को बहुत नुकसान होगा । मैं समझता हूँ कि इसी में देश की भलाई है और देश की बेहतरी है । इसी तरह से देश का सरमाया बर्चगा और जब कि हम और बहुत सी चीजों में सरमाया लगाना चाहते हैं, उस वक्त इस रूप्ये को इसमें लगा देने से हमारा बहुत फायदा हो सकता है ।

इतना कह कर मैं बगैर आप के घंटी बजाये हुए ही अपनी तकरीर खत्म करता हूँ ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (जिला बनारस—मध्य) : श्रीमान्, मैं एक विषय पर बोलना चाहता हूँ जिस का सम्बन्ध हिन्दुस्तान के जहाजों से है, या कि जहाजरानी से जो कि एक बहुत उपीक्षित विषय रहा है । मैं हाउस का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी समुद्री सीमा करीब दो हजार मील की है, लेकिन हमारा जो ओवरसीज ट्रेड होता है वह हिन्दुस्तान के जहाजों द्वारा सिर्फ ६ परसेंट होता है । ९४ परसेन्ट ओवरसीज ट्रेड जो होता है वह दूसरे देशों के जहाजों और दूसरे देशों की कम्पनियों द्वारा होता है । इस में २० परसेन्ट तो सिर्फ इंग्लैंड द्वारा ही होता है । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है इतना बड़ा देश, जिस देश में केवल ६ परसेन्ट व्यापार देशी जहाजों के द्वारा होता है, वह देश कैसे पनप सकता है ?

साथ ही साथ मैं आपका ध्यान इस ओर भी आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि जो स्कूप हमने जापान के हाथ बेचा, वही स्कूप आज जहाज बन कर हमारा गला घोट रहा है । जैसे कि लास्ट वार में कहा गया था कि अमरीका ने स्कूप बेचा और वही अमरीका का स्कूप बुलेट बन कर, गोली बन कर पिछली लड़ाई में अमरीका की छाती को छेदने लगा । वही अवस्था आज हमारी जहाजरानी की है । जो स्कूप, जो लोहा, हमने जापान के हाथ बेच दिया

उसी लोहा से जहाज बना कर आज वह हमसे कम्पीट कर रहे हैं। जापान ने दो एंग्रीमिन्ट किये, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान ने किसी विदेशी कम्पनी से या विदेशी देश से कोई एंग्रीमिन्ट नहीं किया। जापान ने एक परीशियन गल्फ एंग्रीमिन्ट किया और दूसरा जापान पाकिस्तान एंग्रीमिन्ट किया। इस का फल यह हुआ कि अरब सागर में हमारा जितना ट्रेंड था, इंडियन ओशन में जितना ट्रेंड था, धीरे धीरे जापान के हाथ में चला गया और हमारे हाथ से बराबर ट्रेंड बाहर होता चला जा रहा है।

इसके बाद मैं दूसरी बात की तरफ ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। "बंकरिंग आफ दी कोल एंड बंकरिंग आफ दी आइल"। दुनिया में जितने जहाज हैं, १९२६ में उन में से करीब ९८ परसेन्ट जहाज ऐसे थे जो तेल से चलते थे, आज ६० परसेन्ट जहाज तेल से चलते हैं। जो विदेशी जहाज हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के पोर्ट्स से आ कर कोल लेते थे, कोयला लेते थे, आज वह हमारे पोर्ट्स पर कोयला लेने नहीं आते। इस वास्ते नहीं आते कि हमारे पास तेल नहीं है, आयल की बंकरिंग हमारे पास नहीं है, हमारे पास आयल का स्टोर नहीं है। आज हालत यह है कि हमारा कोयले का ट्रेंड दिन पर दिन गिरता चला जा रहा है। आज बर्मा और सीलोन को छोड़ कर कोई कोयले का ट्रेंड हमारे पास नहीं है। आज से दस वर्ष पहले हम आस्ट्रेलिया को कोल एक्सपोर्ट करते थे जापान को करते थे, यहां तक कि इंग्लैंड को भी हम कोल एक्सपोर्ट करते थे। आज क्या हालत है? आज हम बर्मा और सीलोन को छोड़ कर कहीं को कोल एक्सपोर्ट नहीं करते। पाकिस्तान कोल इम्पोर्ट करता है इंग्लैंड से, पॉलैंड से, साउथ अफ्रीका से आज। आज हमारी प्रॉब्लम एंसी है कि जो हमारे साथ के देश हैं, जहां कि हम कोयला भेज सकते थे, वह मुल्क भी हमारे हाथ से आज निकलते जा रहे हैं। मैं आपका ध्यान इस तरफ आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि जर्मनी और जापान जो युद्ध में जर्जर हो गये थे, जिनकी शिपिंग खत्म हो

गई थी, नेवी खत्म हो गई थी, उसी जापान ने दो वर्ष के अन्दर १५ लाख टन के जहाज बनाए, जर्मनी ने ७ लाख टन के जहाज बनाये। लेकिन 'व्हेयर वी स्टैंड?' हमने कितने जहाज बनाये? हम फ्री थे, हम युद्ध के बाहर थे, हमारे पास लोहा है, हमारे पास कोयला है, लेकिन हमने जितना लोहा और जितना स्क्रैप जापान के हाथ चला था, दूसरे देशों के हाथ चला था, उस से हम अपने यहां जहाज तैयार नहीं कर सके।

मैं आपका ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करना चाहते हैं, तो आज यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि अगर आपके पास जहाज नहीं हैं, तो आप विदेशों से, किसी देश से, जैसे कि जापान पाकिस्तान का एंग्रीमिन्ट हुआ, जापान परीशियन गल्फ एंग्रीमिन्ट हुआ, एंग्रीमिन्ट कीजिये तथा दूसरे देशों से पुराने जहाज लीजिये। इस में कोई हर्ज नहीं है, जैसे आप इंग्लैंड इम्पोर्ट करते हैं, वैंगन्स इम्पोर्ट करते हैं, इस में आपको क्या शर्म है अगर आप जहाज दूसरे देशों से उधार लें, या पुराने जहाज खरीवें? इन जहाजों को ले कर के आप अपनी छोटी सी शिपिंग की उन्नति करें और विकास करें। शास्त्री जी ने अभी हाल में इंडियन शिपिंग ट्रेंडर्स से बातचीत की थी। उनकी डिमान्ड थी कि आप अगर उनको चीप रेंट पर, थोड़े इन्टरैस्ट पर रूपया दीजिये तो वह लोग इस व्यापार की तरक्की कर सकते हैं। मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि इन व्यापारियों को और इन व्यापारियों को आप जिन्दा कीजिये। उनसे आप एक पैसा भी इन्टरैस्ट मत चार्ज कीजिये, उनको रूपया दें कीजिये कि वह जहाज बनायें, जहाजों को हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा करें। आप शिपयार्ड बनाइये, डाक्स बनाइये और इसी तरह की दूसरी चीजें बनाइये तो आप के मुल्क की तरक्की हो सकेगी। हमारा दो हजार मील का समुद्र तट है। इतने बड़े देश में कोई जहाज हमारे पास नहीं है। एक टैंकर हमारे पास नहीं है। जैसा मैंने आप से कहा, आज करीब ६० प्रतिशत जहाज आइल से चलते हैं। अगर हमारे पास आइल बंकरिंग नहीं होगा तो हमारे पोर्ट्स में कॉनसे विदेशी जहाज आकर लगेंगे

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

और हमसे तेल लेंगे। लिहाजा यह जरूरी है, खासकर ऐसे समय में जब कि हम हिन्दुस्तान में आइल रिफाइनरी कायम करने जा रहे हैं, कि आप टैंकर लें, दूसरे देशों से उधार लें या मोल लें, लेकिन आपको लेने चाहिए। कारण यह है कि इस वक्त मार्केट आपके हाथ में है। आपको टैंकर के वास्तु मार्केट नहीं खोजना पड़ेगा। आप फारिस की खाड़ी से जो तेल बम्बई लावें वह अपने टैंकरों में लावें और आप यह नियम बनावें कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो रिफाइनरी कायम होगी वह उसी तेल को लेगी जो कि हिन्दुस्तानी टैंकरों द्वारा लाया जायगा। इसमें आपको लाभ है, यह बहुत अच्छी चीज है, इसको आप छोड़ने की कोशिश न करें।

Sardar Hukam Singh: I have heard with pleasure and satisfaction the observations that have been made by several hon. Members here so far as motor transport is concerned. There was almost an unanimity in their demand that we should exercise some caution in proceeding with the speed with which we are going just at present. The friend, who spoke from my right, said that the present policy that is being followed by different States is not uniform and, therefore, it is necessary that we should go into that question and see that there is a uniform policy laid down by the Centre which might be followed by them. Though that gives me satisfaction that the Members are in agreement, I feel there is one difficulty because I am diffident as to how I would be able to convince the Minister who is the hero of nationalisation, in U.P. I would only request him to keep his mind open, and consider the facts dispassionately and not be guided by those obsessions that he might have gathered when he was in the U.P. Leaving aside all those considerations that have been put before you, illustrations have been given about the D.T.S and about other instances, that wherever the Governments of the States have taken over the enterprise,

they have not been able to run it with that efficiency and economy which was required of them. Nationalisation of road transport is not an end in itself and it must be a means to give good transport at cheap rates and provide sufficient amenities to the passengers as well, which I will deal with afterwards. In the first instance, I want to impress upon the hon. Minister whether it is proper that the States should be allowed to sabotage the whole scheme underlying the Five Year Plan. This is most important. After we attained independence, certainly that idea came to us, namely, that we should proceed on with constructive programmes and schemes. We had very lofty projects before our eyes and we started haphazardly proceeding with them. We made mistakes, and then it was found that these things must be planned and there ought to be some definite priorities, under which we should proceed if we want to progress. I wish to submit whether when so much labour has been spent, so much money has been spent and such a big volume has been produced containing 2,000 pages or so, the States are justified in treating it as a scrap and throwing it out without giving any attention to it—at least they should know what it contains—and if the labours of such eminent experts and others are of any value, then certainly we shall have to see that the States do conduct themselves in a manner that is conducive to the proper implementation of the Plan. The whole structure of our Budget—we have provided for so much of deficit financing—is based on proper implementation of the Plan. The Finance Minister was asked for a solution of the unemployment problem and he said that there was no short remedy and it was only the orderly implementation of the Plan that would lead us to results which would throw out all unemployment and provide so many other good things for our country. If that be the

aim of the policy underlying our pursuits, then that policy must be guided by the priorities that we have got here. So far as this particular subject is concerned, the same priority has not been given to nationalisation of road transport by the Planning Commission as has been given to other projects. We will, therefore, have to see whether it is really good for the States to proceed on, leaving aside all other projects. It is curious that the Finance Minister complains that the States have not done their job, they have not contributed their share towards the Five Year Plan and, therefore it is not being implemented. Three years have already run out, but we are far behind the schedule and the achievement of our targets. For want of funds we have to resort even to deficit financing. But what do we find? When these projects are starving for want of contribution by the States, they are allowed to proceed with, and squander money over, schemes that we have by experience learned would not be productive at all. The Planning Commission has clearly laid down that these schemes should not be given high priority and caution should be exercised in proceeding with them.

Then again the question of the automobile industry was referred to the Tariff Commission, an expert body. They made a thorough enquiry; they took evidence throughout the country and had the benefit of the opinion of experts, industrialists and members of the public and came to certain conclusions. It is strange to find that their recommendations are being ignored. These are not cared for, and no attention is being paid to them. In fact, I would go a step further and say that the whole programme chalked out is being systematically sabotaged.

In fact every State Government was asked to put up its scheme, so far as this matter was concerned, by the Planning Commission. Some States did put up their schemes about

road transport. They are, of course, quite welcome to proceed ahead with them. But certain States did not envisage any nationalisation of road transport. They had no idea of proceeding with nationalisation during the Plan period, nor did they set apart any money for it. It is rather odd to note that it is those States which are proceeding at break-neck speed with the nationalisation of road transport, depriving those operators who have built up this industry and brought it up to a level that is today the pride of the country. The efficiency of private road operators can be compared with their counterparts in any other country. But they are being deprived of their means of livelihood in such a way that smacks of some vindictiveness. The operators are suffering on account of the indifference of the Central Government and vindictiveness of the State Governments. They are after all citizens of India and deserve every care.

Nobody is against nationalisation. But there should be a sense of priority in everything. Our main concern today should be to see how is the Five Year Plan going to be implemented if the States are going to proceed in this manner?

We are today faced with a serious situation on account of the Pak-American Military Aid Agreement. It is therefore imperative that our dependence on foreign countries should cease as soon as possible. We see portents of danger on the horizon. It is therefore necessary that we should become independent of any outside aid. When the Tariff Commission has recommended that the automobile industry must be helped in such a way that it can build up soon, we are sorry to notice that the States are proceeding in a way which is just the reverse of it. This is what the Tariff Commission said.

"There are, however, certain factors operating to prevent an increase in demand."

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

The demand is not there. Otherwise our industry can go ahead and produce good vehicles.

"It was brought to our notice during the course of the inquiry that private operators were putting off purchases....."

Figures have been given that the demand has decreased by a considerable number. While we require 25,000 vehicles a year, the last figure of production was 4,000 and they are not going in for others. Why? The Tariff Commission has explained the reason why no demand is there and the industry cannot develop. They say:

"It was brought to our notice during the course of the inquiry that private operators were putting off purchases of new commercial vehicles as long as possible owing to the fear that nationalization of road transport might put them out of business at any time. As the total number of vehicles belonging to private operators in May, 1952 was 100,855, it seems impossible for State Governments to find funds within the next five years to nationalise road transport by replacing all the private operators, especially as there are other projects "(I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to these facts)" more important and of higher priority, for which available funds would be required. We think that if State Governments decide upon a policy of suspending further nationalisation of road transport for the next few years, it will remove the fear from the minds of private operators and induce them to purchase new vehicles and extend their services."

Further on also they support this view that if it is required that schemes of higher priority should be

implemented, then it is necessary that no further nationalisation of transport should take place. If at all the Central Government is helpless, if it finds that it cannot interfere, then certainly it has to carry out the pledges that it has given already. When in 1950 we were discussing that Corporation Act the Members of the Select Committee laid great stress on the fact that we ought to have some compensation clause on the lines of the U.K. Act, and then the Minister of Transport assured the House that that was not the place but that he would look into it and would, as soon as possible, bring an Amending Bill amending the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act so that there is proper compensation paid. I want to enquire when it is coming. Though we have been told in every report that is placed in our hands since 1950 that that is under preparation, and at one time in one year's agenda I also saw that that was coming on, I am amazed to find that in this report we are again told that the Bill is under preparation. How long will that preparation take? When the Centre has been so silent and indifferent in this respect it has allowed the State Governments to proceed on. And thousands of operators have been thrown out of employment, thousands of buses have been made useless, and not a single pie has been given to any operator. The practice of the State Governments to refuse the renewal of licences by this method under the Motor Vehicles Act was an unfair use of the provisions of that Act and now we find that these State Governments have proceeded on with the unfair use of that Act and have deprived those faithful citizens who built up the industry with their well-earned money. I beg to submit, Sir, whose wealth is being wasted; is it not the country's wealth? Now we find that all the State Governments are resorting to acquiring and purchasing the vehicles which are run by diesel engines as against

Petrol engines because they are more economical. While in Bombay diesel oil sells at Rs. 1-5-0 a gallon, petrol sells at Rs. 2-11-0 a gallon. This is the only profit that they want to show to the public. Let them pay all those taxes. There is a fund for insurance. If there is an accident by a private operator, at once the victim goes to the court and gets his compensation, or if it is third party insurance, the company has to pay automatically to the third party. May I enquire of the hon. Minister whether in the accidents that have taken place so far as State buses are concerned, anything has been paid out of that insurance fund? Is that justice to the public; justice to the citizens? Only that part of the profit is being shown which they save by non-payment of these taxes and by the saving of 15 annas by which the Central Road Fund is depleted for every gallon. If the Government were to sit down—I would request the hon. Minister to think over it—and take stock of all the enterprises that have been taken so far, they would come to the irresistible conclusion that there is no use proceeding in this haste with this industry; let it develop. Of course, government management does not mean government ownership necessarily. Government can lay down any condition that it likes.

So far as economy is concerned, I can quote figures where the State Governments raised and fixed the minimum fare simply to get more from the public. When the Punjab Government was taking over the route of Jullundur-Amritsar, one day before that it raised the fare by one pie so that it may benefit out of it. The private operators can run these buses at 5 pies and they are prepared to do that. Though the Government has fixed a minimum fare, it is not economical. It gives no amenity to the passengers. My hon. friend just now described how the passengers have to take their luggage themselves. Excepting building of offices

there is absolutely no amenity provided by this State enterprise. So far as economy is concerned, so far as amenities are concerned, comforts to passengers are concerned, whatever might be the case, I can challenge anybody to prove that they are getting better service by nationalisation. When this is the case I appeal to the hon. Minister and the Government to look into this and not throw out so many operators who have shed their blood and built up this industry at so much cost.

Sbri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Sir, many speakers have referred, more than adequately, to the problems of road transport. I do not want to repeat what they have said, but before I pass on to some other subject, I would like to make one observation. Rudyard Kipling said that 'transport is civilisation', and today we realise the great importance of that historic statement. I believe that transport provides the basis for civilised existence. We say that travel is education; travel is experience and all such things. Our education and experience due to travel depends entirely on transport and the facilities of transport. So, if a country has to advance even culturally, politically and economically, transport is the lynchpin of the appercart of development. Therefore, we must bear in mind that transport especially to an undeveloped economy is most essential, much more essential than to a developed economy. Among transport services, road transport is the most important. The hon. Minister would agree with me when I say that the road transport system in the land is not developing on proper and rational lines. I am not here talking as a party man. I am only pointing out from an objective angle one or two important drawbacks in our transport industry, apart from agreeing with some of the suggestions and criticisms made by the other hon. Members.

There is no uniformity of taxation on transport. A variety of taxes are

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswami]

levied and they vary from State to State. The motor vehicle operators, have to pay not one or two taxes, but a number of taxes, half a dozen taxes. Due to this regressive taxation, many operators have suspended their lines and they are not operating them. A few Governments, in their enthusiasm to raise a lot of money, have indiscriminately levied these various types of taxes: road cess, seat tax, insurance etc. which are acting as a regressive factor on the development of road transport apart from the threat of nationalisation. I am not referring to nationalisation. Though I agree that there should be nationalisation of key industries, though I agree that nationalisation as an ideal is to be aimed at, I say the policy of nationalisation should have priorities. We cannot nationalise all the goods and services in the land, at a single moment. Nationalisation should have a plan and should proceed from stage to stage. When I find that some of the States have nationalised the transport service, I feel they have taken the wrong end for starting nationalisation. We must first and foremost start the nationalisation of basic industries. We must start nationalising banks and insurance companies which are the key points of our economy. By nationalising transport before nationalising the other concerns, I think we are putting the cart before the horse. That is why our national transport policy has become a huge joke. It has been a failure. I wish that the Minister of Transport is not indifferent to this matter. I hope he will intervene and guide the policy of the States on proper lines.

There is another important point which I want to refer, namely the sufferings of dock labourers. I have received a representation from the labourers in the Bombay dock. In December 1953, the Bombay Port Trust introduced certain drastic changes without consulting the labour union. One change was that instead

of giving a holiday on Sunday, which is the normal holiday for all the other people, they said that any day in the week could be declared a holiday without notice. Even on Sunday the workers could be called for work. Usually, Sundays are holidays for all the people. Why has this been done? I am referring here to the workers who are working in the Chief Engineer's Department. Those workers are called at any time and are given any day in the week as holiday without notice. This has been causing great inconvenience to them.

Secondly, there is the question of the working hours during night time. These have been increased from six hours to eight hours. This is rather against the long-established practice and this has been done without consulting the labour union. People are called at night time, at awkward hours, to work for eight hours. No rest is given to them. No interval is given to them for coffee or tea or middle rest. They have to work continuously for eight hours. And no extra allowance is allowed for that work. Formerly, whenever people worked during night time that used to be treated as an exceptional case. Today, in the Bombay Port Trust they want to make it a part and parcel of the normal work. Night work there has become part and parcel of the regular routine. It was never part and parcel of the normal work previously. And while introducing this they have not consulted the labour union. The labour union many a time has demanded that this matter may be settled amicably by negotiation or by conciliation, and I hear that Mr. S. C. Joshi, the Chief Labour Commissioner, actually intervened. He wanted to bring about some sort of compromise between the labour and the employers, but the employers would not listen to him, and I was told that he has sent up his report to the Minister concerned.

Then, there was a demand for adjudication. Though the demand was made about two months ago, this has not been granted till today, and no step has been taken by the Minister concerned to settle this matter amicably. This should not be left as it is. The situation is becoming more dangerous. There has been restiveness and there has been a lot of discontent created in the minds of the dock labourers on account of this policy. So, I want that the Minister should make a categorical statement here and take necessary steps to bring about a satisfactory solution of this problem.

My next point is development of certain ports. Some time back there was a committee appointed to go into the condition of various ports and make a report giving its recommendations. On the basis of those recommendations Government was to take action to develop certain ports. I come from an area which has no facilities of ports. The Minister is well aware that Bhatkal and Malpe are ports which could be developed. If the Minister could only give his sanction, they could be developed with little cost. And there has been agitation since very long that these ports should be developed. They would feed nearly four to five hundred miles of hinterland, and today there is lack of economic development in this area of Karnatak because there are no port facilities available. The Committee has submitted its report, but we do not know what has happened to the report. So, I urge upon the Minister to take steps to see that both Bhatkal and Malpe, and if possible Karwar, may be developed as good ports. I leave it to him. He can select one now and develop it, and give some sort of relief to this area.

In conclusion, I would like to say that there is no policy regarding the development of coastal shipping. Today, our coastal trade is being carried on by foreigners; I speak subject to correction...

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): You are wrong here.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I am very happy, if it is carried on by Indians.

I would again request Government to look into the grievances of the dock workers. I have got other cases with me, but I have no time to refer to all of them. But I would only say that the hon. Minister should look into their grievances and settle the cases satisfactorily.

Regarding road transport, I would suggest that Government should give a directive to the State Governments, that they should observe a common and uniform taxation policy, and they should not go on with nationalisation at this juncture, because it is inopportune and not timely. A time will come when we can nationalise transport. But let us wait till then. Let us concentrate now on other schemes. Let us nationalise other big industries, and leave this transport for the present, as it is employing thousands and thousands of labourers.

I support Sardar Hukam Singh's statement that compensation should be given to small operators. There are a few big operators, who would not mind, if no compensation is given. Their lines may be nationalised without payment of compensation. But the small operators who possess only one or two lines will be hit hard, if they are not paid any compensation when their buses and other vehicles are purchased.

With these few words, I say that Government should follow hereafter a bold, positive, and enlightened transport policy.

Mr. Chairman: Now, I would call upon the hon. Minister to reply.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamiluk): May I put one question to the hon. Minister, before he starts his reply?

Mr. Chairman: Let him begin first. The question may be put later on, if necessary.

The Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri L. B. Shastri): I have heard with attention the various suggestions made by hon. Members, which I shall most gladly consider. I am really thankful that the criticisms made were on the whole really constructive, and they will certainly have to be looked into. You will pardon me, if I say, that I have no hesitation in saying that the progress we have made in various branches of the Transport Ministry, such as shipping, ports, roads, tourism, etc. has been, on the whole, satisfactory, and we hope the progress will continue.

As Shri Raghunath Singh has spoken vehemently about adding to our tonnage, I may, in brief, give certain facts and figures which will indicate that there has been a consistent improvement, though this does not mean that we do not want to go ahead much further. Taking shipping, we had a tonnage of 3,90,707 G.R.T., before the Plan period started. Now, we have 4,33,524 G. R. T. In 1954-55, it is expected that the tonnage will increase by 72,100 G. R. T. Besides, we expect, to start with, to have a nucleus of two oil tankers before the end of the Plan period.

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

I have suggested to private ship-owners that they should consider having some tankers so that the country may be in possession of at least a small fleet of tankers. I am glad to say that this suggestion is being seriously considered by them. The Transport Ministry had provided Rs. 300 lakhs for loans in the year 1952-53, of which Rs. 200 lakhs were ear-marked for purchase of oversea ships. That was not utilised by the shipowners. In a meeting with their chief representatives a few months back, I drew their attention to this fact and stressed on them the urgent

need of adding as quickly as possible to our existing tonnage which is quite inadequate. I am glad the response from the shipowners has been quite satisfactory and the figures which I am placing before you will indicate the progress in the utilisation of loans advanced. The provision in 1952-53 Budget, as I said just now, for loans was Rs. 3 crores, of which only Rs. 81.16 lakhs were utilised. The provision in 1953-54 was Rs. 3,52 lakhs and Shri Raghunath Singh will be glad to know that out of this, they have utilised Rs. 250 lakhs, whereas in 1952-53 they had utilised only Rs. 81 lakhs or something more. In 1954-55, we have provided for Rs. 445 lakhs for advancing loans to the shipping companies. I hope that the number of ships to be purchased during 1954-55 will be 16 more, with a tonnage which will go up to 72,100. Some of these ships will be of the latest design and capable of high speed which will result in quicker turnaround. Out of these, 5 ships have been ordered from the Hindustan Shipyard, Vizag. The total number of ships in 1953-54 was 124, the tonnage being 4,33,000. The number of ships in 1954-55 has increased from 124 to 140, the tonnage being 5,56,024. We hope that the number of ships at the end of the Plan period will be increased from 140 to 153 (roughly) and the tonnage is expected to increase to 6,00,000, which has been provided as the target in the first Five Year Plan period.

I may say a few words about the ports. Our programme for the development of major ports is ready for each port and the estimates in each case have been sanctioned. Work on 34 out of 48 port development schemes included in the Plan has started and by the end of the Plan period, we expect to complete 80 per cent. of our programme. Some of the development schemes are of considerable magnitude and it will naturally take time to complete them. The total allotment of loans from the Centre is Rs. 22 crores and the rest will have to be found from the Port Trust authorities for completing the programme,

which is estimated to cost about Rs. 31 crores.

Mr. Gurupadaswamy raised the question of the Bhatkal and Karwar ports. He knows it very well that minor ports are the responsibility of the States. But we have made a departure from the past in this respect and are trying to help the States in developing these ports through loans. Rs. 26·3 lakhs has been allotted in the Budget for minor ports this year, and the State Governments are, I know, keen to make their own contribution and go ahead with their development schemes. I may also inform him that Government have assigned a high priority to a hydrographic survey of the ports of Karwar and Bhatkal, and the survey is to be taken up shortly. Presumably, the details of development can be decided only after the survey is completed and that is being done by the Government of Bombay. In fact, the Government of Bombay have set up a marine survey organisation under their P. W. D. which, in conjunction with the survey work, is expected to study the general aspect of port development or improvement necessary.

I may say a few words on the nationalisation of bus transport. I would like Sardar Hukam Singhji, who is a very accurate student of the Constitution, to realise our responsibility in the matter and the autonomy that the State Governments possess in this connection.

Sardar Hukam Singh: If this is the hon. Minister's helplessness, what is the need for producing this massive Plan of 2,000 pages?

Shri L. B. Shastri: The hon. Member may hear me for a couple of minutes. Mechanically propelled vessels or vehicles figure in the Concurrent List in the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution, and the executive authority in the matter of road transport is vested in the State Governments, and consequently, it is primarily the responsibility of the State Governments to initiate schemes for re-organisation of transport services. But

72 P.S.D.

nationalisation is so far confined to passenger services only, and that too, on a comparatively small number of routes, except perhaps for one or two States like Bombay. There are, I am told, only about 6,000 buses under the control of the nationalised undertakings. Goods services are left to private operators, and States Governments have generally stated, as their policy, not to enter this field during the Plan period. Governments, like Madras, have also made it clear that they have no intention of extending nationalisation to mofussil areas. Shri Jaisoorya said something about the efficiency of the nationalised transport services. I shall not give my own views in the matter because they might be considered to be prejudiced as Shri Hukam Singhji has said in his speech.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I will accept them.

Shri L. B. Shastri: I will not give the hon. Member my views, but I will give the views of the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee, as Shri Hukam Singhji expressed his appreciation for the recommendations of that Committee.

Sardar Hukam Singh: That I have even for your views.

Shri L. B. Shastri: I hope he will accept their views expressed in regard to the efficiency of the State bus services. They have said that the general impression gained by the Committee in respect of State transport undertakings was that they were on the whole being ably built up under difficult conditions and were run by very competent officers. It is true that in the course of the debate in Parliament on the Road transport Corporation Bill in 1950, the criticism levelled against the State Government, who were running State services, was that the compensation paid to dislodged operators was inadequate, and the then Minister of Transport, Shri Santhanam, gave the House an assurance that the point would be examined and necessary remedial

[Shri L. B. Shastri]

measures would be taken while amending the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939.

I can inform hon. Members that that Act is being revised by the Transport Ministry. I know that the question of licensing of vehicles and incidence of taxes on motor vehicles as pointed out by Shri Gurupadaswamy and other allied matters, as suggested by Shri Hukam Singhji, have often been discussed before by various organisations in the country and there is a strong opinion that the existing law should be revised and modified where necessary. I shall not go into details, although I know there are many important and vital matters involved. I would only like to inform the House that the draft of the new Motor Vehicles Bill is almost ready and I would like to introduce it early in the House. If other business permits, I shall take an opportunity to introduce that Bill in this very session. The Bill, I hope, will be found to be fairly comprehensive covering various important points raised in connection with the subject.

Shri Nambiar spoke about providing certain minimum facilities for workers, whether in private or public sector. Shri Gurupadaswamy also said something about the problem of workers of Bombay Port. I can inform Shri Gurupadaswamy that Mr. Mehta, a leading member of his party, wrote to me and one of the secretaries of that organisation, Mr. Patel, met me only three or four days before. I have discussed matters with him and I hope it will be possible to find a satisfactory solution.

As regards workers of private sector, I shall content myself by saying that I do not want to enter into that field, because it is better that I should concentrate on the welfare of workers of the nationalised transport first and then think of private sector. I may inform Mr. Nambiar that we have provided Rs. 30 lakhs for housing for D. T. S. workers in Delhi and I do not think he will consider this provision to be very small. About the

D. T. S. workers we have already accepted several of their demands—he knows them. Other reasonable demands are still under consideration and I hope the workers will find that their reasonable demands have been met without further delay.

7 P.M.

It is true that the service rendered by the D. T. S. is not quite satisfactory. I do not say that I am myself satisfied with it and I do realise that we have still to do much in order to give relief to the citizens of Delhi. I hope the House will allow me to say this at least that not only has there been no deterioration, but in fact there has been some definite improvement in certain respects. For example, we have built two depots for repairs and maintenance of buses, when formerly we had practically none. More buses are now on the road, more shelters have been provided, and financially too the D. T. S. is better off. Relations with the workers have improved, and this naturally has added to the efficiency of the D. T. S.

During this year we expect to have 140 more buses and shall be completing the central workshop also. We have obtained the services of an experienced transport officer of Bombay on loan for a few months for the purpose of advising us on effecting improvements in various branches of the D. T. S.

I have no doubt that the frequency of buses on several routes has to be increased and special timetables prepared for peak hours. Delhi is now one of our biggest cities, and I know that the D. T. S. will have to go much further to meet the needs and requirements of its people. May I assure the House, Sir, that hon. Members will find definite and substantial improvements in the future. Thank you.

Sardar Hukam Singh: May I put just one question? Is the Central Government...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A number of questions have been put. Let me not be misunderstood. It is past 7 o'clock. I do not want to extend the time.

I shall now put the cut motions to the vote of the House.

The cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the Demands to the vote of the House

The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amount shown in the third column of the Order Paper in respect of Demands 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 135, 136 and 137 be granted to the President to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof".

The motion was adopted.

[The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P. P.]

DEMAND NO. 96—MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,71,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ministry of Transport'."

DEMAND NO. 97—PORTS AND PILOTAGE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 57,19,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

DEMAND NO. 98—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 73,23,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

DEMAND NO. 99—CENTRAL ROAD FUND

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,23,98,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Central Road Fund'."

DEMAND NO. 100—COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING NATIONAL HIGHWAYS)

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,48,11,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Communications (including National Highways)'."

DEMAND NO. 101.—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,02,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Transport'."

DEMAND NO. 135—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON PORTS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,40,02,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Ports'."

**DEMAND NO. 136—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON
ROADS**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,56,57,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Roads'."

**DEMAND NO. 137—OTHER CAPITAL OUT-
LAY OF THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 84,79,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Transport'."

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Friday, the 9th April, 1954.
