

[Shri V. P. Nayar]
as you have said, the question of jurisdiction has to be taken into consideration, I submit that since the Central Cabinet has gone into the question as reported in the Press or is going into the matter shortly, it is a matter which gives us jurisdiction to consider what it is about.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): The point is this. The Central Cabinet is responsible to this House to give full information about the happenings in Travancore-Cochin in respect of the resignation of the previous Ministry and the subsequent developments. The Central Government has to come to a decision in this matter whether there should be President's rule or not. But, here, we are concerned with one aspect of the matter and that is, the Central Government should not issue instructions to the Rajpramukh to call only one particular leader and not any other leader to form the Ministry. It is a question of propriety.

Mr. Speaker: I am now concerned with the question of jurisdiction.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Because it is a point of propriety as well as.....

Mr. Speaker: Very well, the hon. Member has nothing more to say. I am anxious to know how this House is clothed with jurisdiction or how the Government is concerned.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): As you have been pleased to observe, the Rajpramukh has the primary jurisdiction in the matter. The complaint here is that something undemocratic is being done. I agree that something undemocratic is being attempted by means of this adjournment motion. We are asked to impose our will on the Rajpramukh who has complete jurisdiction to exercise his own discretion, whether the signatures are genuine and whether the number is 60, 70 or even 90. That is not my concern. The Rajpramukh is entitled to form his own opinion and it is for him to invite anybody to form the Government; or, in case, he is satisfied that no stable government can be formed, to take such other steps as may be open to him under the Constitution. So I do not see how the Parliament can ask me to direct the Rajpramukh to adopt undemocratic ways at this stage. If any proclamation is issued, then it will come

before the House and, under the law, it will have an opportunity of expressing its opinion.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): May I take it that the Central Cabinet is not discussing it at all?

Mr. Speaker: Many things will be discussed but the question is, so far as the adjournment motion is concerned, is it the responsibility of this Government or is it the responsibility of the Rajpramukh there. It will be certainly undemocratic to seize the jurisdiction of the Rajpramukh or allow this Government to have supervisory control over the Rajpramukh when the Constitution definitely empowers the Rajpramukh to decide who ought to be his Chief Minister. If perchance he does not allow any person to serve as Chief Minister and a proclamation is issued, then hon. Members have ample jurisdiction to discuss the matter. But, I do not think now it is in the competence of this House to discuss this matter. The adjournment motion is, therefore, disallowed.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion of the Demands for Grants Nos. 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 140, 141 and 142 relating to the Ministry of Transport. As the House is aware, 3 hours have been allotted for the Demands of this Ministry.

There are a number of cut motions to these various demands. Hon. Members may hand over the numbers of the selected cut motions which they propose to move at the Table, within 15 minutes. I shall treat them as moved, if the members in whose names those cut motions stand are present in the House and the motions are otherwise in order.

The time-limit for speeches will, as usual, be 15 minutes for the members including movers of cut motions, and 20 minutes if necessary, for Leaders of Groups.

DEMAND No. 95—MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 44,53,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Ministry of Transport'."

DEMAND No. 96—PORTS AND PILOTAGE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 62,64,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

DEMAND No. 97—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 98,73,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

DEMAND No. 98—CENTRAL ROAD FUND

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,99,30,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Central Road Fund'."

DEMAND No. 99—COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING NATIONAL HIGHWAYS)

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,09,67,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Communications (including National Highways)'."

DEMAND No. 100—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 40,24,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Transport'."

DEMAND No. 140—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON PORTS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,40,00,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Ports'."

DEMAND No. 141—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON ROADS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,97,08,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Roads'."

DEMAND No. 142—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,95,71,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Transport'."

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (जिला बनारस—मध्य):
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सब से पहले श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी को, श्री अलमगेशन जी को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने जहाजरानी के विकास

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

के सम्बन्ध में काफी कार्य किया है। लेकिन यदि आप विश्व की स्थिति को देखेंगे तो आपको मालूम होगा कि हमारी उन्नति उतनी अधिक नहीं हुई जितनी अधिक होनी चाहिए थी।

जहाज के व्यवसाय में तकरीबन ४० करोड़ रुपये लगे हैं। इसमें से सरकार ने १८ करोड़ रुपया ऋण के तौर पर दिया है और बाकी २२ करोड़ रुपया है वह कम्पनियों ने लगाया है। द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना बनाई है उसके पूरा हो जाने पर हमारे पास सिर्फ ६ लाख टन के जहाज हो सकेंगे। परन्तु सारे विश्व के पास इस वक्त १ करोड़ ५६ लाख टन के जहाज हैं अर्थात् इस वक्त हमारा अनुपात विश्व के जहाजी व्यवसाय में आधे सेकड़े का है, ५० पर सेंट का है और पांच बरस के बाद भी यह अनुपात शायद २५ परसेंट रह जायेगा। इसका कारण यह है कि हम ने अपनी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो टारगेट (लक्ष्य) रखा है वह केवल ६ लाख टन का ही रखा है। अब मैं यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कारण है कि हमारी प्रगति इतनी धीमी है और कैसे इस को तेज किया जा सकता है। इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह कहना है कि १५० करोड़ रुपया प्रतिवर्ष हम विदेशी कम्पनियों को जहाजों के भाड़े के रूप में देते हैं। आपको याद होगा कि सन् १९४७ से लेकर १९५२ तक हम लोगों ने करीब १५६ करोड़ रुपया साखान्तों के लाने में व्यय किया है। अगर इस रुपये को हम थोड़ा-थोड़ा करके जहाजी व्यवसाय में लगाते गये तो आज हमारे पास १३ लाख टन के जहाज हो जाते अर्थात् द्वितीय योजना के पूरा होने तक जो हम ने लक्ष्य अपने सामने रखा है उसको हमने १९५२ में ही प्राप्त कर लिया होता।

अब सवाल पैदा होता है कि आखिरकार यह जो समस्या है इसको कैसे सुधारा जाये। इस को सुधारने के वास्ते दूसरे देशों ने जो उपाय अपनाये थे, उनमें से कुछ के उदाहरण मैं आपके सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ। आज हमारे सामने जापान, इटली और जर्मनी के उदाहरण हैं। जिन नीतियों पर ये देश चले, उन्हीं नीतियों को हम यहां पर अपना सकते हैं और उनका अनुकरण हम कर सकते हैं। मैं सबसे पहले आपके सामने जापान का उदाहरण पेश करता हूँ। युद्ध के अन्त में जापान के पास केवल १ लाख टन के जहाज काम लायक थे और उसके बाद जापान ने करीब ३६ लाख टन के जहाज बनाये। सात साल के अन्दर जापान के पास ३५ लाख टन के जहाज हो गए। आप पूछेंगे कि जापान

ने इतनी तरक्की कैसे की। जापान ने तरक्की इस प्रकार की कि उसने ३०० करोड़ रुपया जहाजी कम्पनियों को ऋण के तौर पर दिया। ऋण भी उसने इस प्रकार दिया कि ४३ प्रतिशत तो सबसिडी (अर्थ सहायता) के रूप में दिया गया और ५७ प्रतिशत जापान के कमरशल बैंक ने उनको ऋण के तौर पर दिया। इस प्रकार से प्रतिटन जहाज के निर्माण में जितना रुपया लगता था वह सारा का सारा या तो सरकार ने दिया या फिर कमरशल बैंक ने दिया। इस प्रकार से ३०० करोड़ रुपये की लागत से जापान ने अपने जहाज के व्यवसाय का विकास किया। इस वर्ष भी यदि आप देखें तो आपको मालूम होगा कि जापान ने अपने बजट में ४ करोड़ ६७ लाख रुपया इस वास्ते रखा है कि यदि वहां की जो कम्पनियां हैं वे विदेशी कम्पनियों से या विदेशी बैंकों से रुपया उधार लें तो उस पर जो सूद पड़ता है वह सरकार अपनी ओर से दे सके। दूसरे जहाजों के निर्माण में जो लोहा खर्च होता है वह भी जिस भाव पर लोहा औरों को बेचा जाता है, उससे एक सौ रुपया प्रति टन के हिसाब से सस्ता इन कम्पनियों को दिया जाता है। तीसरी बात यह है कि उन्होंने एक एक्ट (अधिनियम) पास किया है जिसका नाम कि शुगर लिंक सिस्टम है। इसका मतलब यह है कि देश में जितनी भी चीनी की मिलें हैं उनसे जो भी लाभ होता है, वह सारे का सारा जहाजों के लिये खर्च कर दिया जाता है। इस प्रकार आप देखेंगे तो आपको मालूम होगा कि युद्ध के बाद से उनके पास ३७ लाख टन के जहाज हो गये हैं जब कि उससे पहले केवल एक लाख टन के जहाज उनके पास काम लायक थे।

अब मैं आपके सामने जर्मनी का उदाहरण रखना चाहता हूँ। युद्ध के पश्चात् जर्मनी के पास केवल ७५,००० टन के जहाज थे। आज जर्मनी के पास करीब २० लाख टन के जहाज हैं। उसने जहाजरानी के विकास के लिए तीन चार सिस्टम निकाले। पहला तरीका तो यह निकाला कि रिकंस्ट्रक्शन (पुनर्निर्माण) के वास्ते स्टेट की तरफ से सहायता दी जाए। दूसरा सिस्टम यह किया कि उन लोगों को जो अपना रुपया जहाजी व्यवसाय में लगायेंगे उनके ऊपर इनकम टैक्स नहीं लगेगा। तीसरा तरीका यह निकाला कि अगर कोई कम्पनी जहाज बनाती है तो उस जहाज में जितना रुपया इनवेस्ट (बिनिवेशन) होता है, उतने में ही उस जहाज को सरकार अपने पास रहन रख ले। १९५४ के अन्त तक २११० मिलियन डालर मार्क जर्मनी ने अपने

जहाजी व्यवसाय में इनवेस्ट किए। यह करीब करीब १४० करोड़ रुपये के बराबर होते हैं। अपने यहां पर इनकम टैक्स का तरीका यह किया है कि अन्त में जाकर आप ८० सकड़ा इनकम टैक्स ले लेते हैं। जर्मनी ने ऐसा किया कि अगर कोई इनकम टैक्स देता है तो उसको इस शर्त पर एग्रेज्मेंट (सूक्त) किया जा सकता है कि वह सारा रुपया जहाजी व्यवसाय में इनवेस्ट कर दे। इस तरह से जो भी अपना सारा रुपया इसमें इनवेस्ट कर देता है उसको इनकम टैक्स नहीं देना पड़ता है। यहां पर तो यह तरीका है कि एक लाख या दो लाख के बाद, यदि कोई आदमी १० लाख रुपया कमाता है, तो उससे ८० प्रतिशत तक इनकम टैक्स ले लिया जाता है। लेकिन जर्मनी में अगर कोई सारे का सारा रुपया इनवेस्ट कर देता है इस व्यवसाय में तो उसको एक पैसा भी इनकम टैक्स नहीं देना पड़ता है। इस प्रकार से प्राइवेट सेक्टर को इनवेस्ट करने के लिए वहां की सरकार ने प्रोत्साहित किया। करीब करीब १४० करोड़ रुपया इस प्रकार से इनकम टैक्स के रूप में न देकर के उसको इस व्यवसाय में इनवेस्ट किया गया है।

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

अब मैं आपके सामने इटली की मिसाल पेश करता हूँ। युद्ध के अन्त में इटली के पास ३ लाख टन के जहाज थे। आज इटली के पास ३६ लाख के जहाज हैं। आप हेरान होंगे कि जिस इटली के पास न लोहा है और न कोयला है, उसके पास इतने ज्यादा टन के जहाज कैसे हो सकते हैं। लेकिन यह सत्य है कि उसके पास इतने टन के जहाज हैं। इस के विपरीत भारत के पास लोहा होते हुए भी, कोयला होते हुए भी, साख होते हुए भी इतने ज्यादा जहाज नहीं हैं। मैं इसका कारण आपको बतलाता हूँ। इटली ने २५ मार्च १९४६ को ला नम्बर ७५ पास किया। उस ला में कहा गया था कि जो जहाज बनेंगे उनको कीमत का ३३ प्रतिशत तो सरकार देगी और ४० प्रतिशत सरकार उनको सबसिडी के रूप में देगी, अर्थात् ७३ प्रतिशत रुपया सरकार उनको देगी। साथ ही साथ जबसे जहाज बनाने का कार्यक्रम आरम्भ होगा तब से तीन बरस तक अगर किसी जहाजी कम्पनी को लाभ होगा तो उसपर कोई इनकम टैक्स नहीं लिया जाएगा। आज हिन्दुस्तान में क्या होता है? अगर कल किसी जहाजी कम्पनी को लाभ होना शुरू हो जाये तो आप सीधे उस पर इनकम टैक्स लगा देंगे हैं। तो इस प्रकार वहां यह सहूलियत दी

जाती है कि उनसे तीन बरस तक इनकम टैक्स नहीं लिया जाता।

दूसरी बात इटली में यह है कि वहां रक्षा विभाग अपने बजट में से जहाज के व्यवसाय को सहायता देता है। हमें बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है कि इस विषय में हिन्दुस्तान में रक्षा विभाग बिल्कुल कान में तेल डाले बैठा हुआ है। वह समझता है कि जहाजों के विषय में सारी जिम्मेदारी श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री और श्री अलगेशन के सिर पर है। लेकिन आप देखें कि आज दुनिया में दूसरे देशों के रक्षा विभाग वहां के जहाजी व्यवसाय में कितना हिस्सा लेते हैं। इटली के बजट में एक बहुत बड़ी राशि हर साल इस लिए रखी जाती है कि जहाजी कम्पनियों को सहायता दी जाये। वह सहायता करीब करीब तीन मिलियन लीरा की होती है। लेकिन हमारे यहां का रक्षा विभाग इस ओर कोई ध्यान ही नहीं देता। त्यागी जी को यह मानना चाहिये कि केवल त्याग से ही देश का काम नहीं चलेगा, उनको कुछ दान भी करना होगा तब काम चलेगा। हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा त्याग से नहीं होगी बल्कि शक्ति से होगी। वह शक्ति कैसे पैदा होगी? वह हमारे जहाजों द्वारा पैदा हो सकती है। पिछले महायुद्ध में पी० एंड ओ० ने ही इंग्लैंड की रक्षा की और अमरीका की रक्षा की। यदि वह न होता तो न तो इंग्लैंड की रक्षा हो पाती और न अमरीका की रक्षा हो पाती। इसलिए आजाद देशों में हमेशा से रक्षा विभाग यह प्रयास करता आया है कि जहाजी व्यवसाय को सहायता दी जाये। आपको मालूम होना चाहिए पाकिस्तान का ८० प्रतिशत बजट सुरक्षा के लिए है। हमारी २००० मील की कोस्ट लाइन (समुद्रतट) है। क्या आप इसकी रक्षा एक या दो क्रूजर और डेस्ट्रॉयर से कर सकेंगे। दुनिया में कहा गया है कि मरिचेंट नेवी (वणिज्य पोत) सैंकिंग लाइन आफ डिफेंस (द्वितीय प्रतिरक्षा पंक्ति) होती है। तो इस सैंकिंग लाइन आफ डिफेंस के लिए हमारे रक्षा विभाग का क्या कंटीब्यूशन (अंशदान) है यह हम जानना चाहते हैं।

अब आप पूछेंगे कि इस विषय में हमारे सुझाव क्या हैं। क्योंकि समय कम है इसलिए मैं अपने सुझावों को थोड़े में ही आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

मेरा पहला सुझाव तो यह है कि हम अपने डिफेंस बजट में से १० या १५ करोड़ रुपया प्रतिवर्ष जहाज व्यवसाय को सहायता देने के

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

लिए रखें जैसे कि इटली और जर्मनी कर रहे हैं। हमारे एक तरफ 'सीटो' है और दूसरी तरफ 'मीडो' है और इन दोनों के बीच में हमको अपनी २००० लम्बी कोस्ट लाइन की रक्षा करनी है। यह काम आप कैसे करेंगे? यह काम आप जहाजी व्यवसाय को सहायता देकर ही कर सकते हैं और जब आप उसको सहायता देंगे तो यह व्यवसाय आपकी उसी तरह रक्षा करेगा जिस तरह कि इसने इंग्लैंड, अमरीका और जापान आदि की रक्षा की है।

मेरा दूसरा सुझाव यह है कि जो नये जहाज बनें उन की आमदनी पर आयकर न लिया जाय। कम से कम जैसा कि जर्मनी ने किया है उन की आमदनी पर तीन बरस तक आयकर न लिया जाये। यह आयकर इन पर इसलिये छोड़ा जाय कि उससे वे नये जहाज बनावें।

मेरा तीसरा सुझाव यह है कि जो हिन्दुस्तानी व्यापारी अपना रुपया जहाज के व्यवसाय में लगाना चाहें उनको इनकम टैक्स से मुक्त किया जाये। जैसा कि मैं ने आपको बताया, जर्मनी में जो व्यवसायी अपना रुपया जहाज के व्यवसाय में लगाना चाहते हैं उनसे उतनी हद तक आयकर नहीं लिया जाता। इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि जो अपनी आमदनी का ८० प्रतिशत वह सरकार को देगा उसे इस व्यवसाय में लगावेगा क्योंकि इसमें उसको लाभ होगा। तो ऐसा करने से व्यापारी का भी लाभ होगा और जहाज के व्यवसाय के विकास से जनता को भी लाभ होगा।

चौथी बात में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा जर्मनी में होता है, जो लोहा जहाजी में लगाया जाये उस पर कम्पनी को कम से कम सौ रुपये ति टन के हिसाब से छुट दी जाये।

प्र

पांचवीं बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि आप जो ऋण जहाजी कम्पनियों को दें उस पर सूद न लिया जाये। हमारे अलगेशन जी और शास्त्री जी ढाई करोड़ रुपया जहाजी कम्पनियों की ऋण के रूप में देना चाहते थे पर उन्होंने इसको लिया नहीं। इसका कारण यह है कि आपने जो इंस्टर्न शिपिंग कम्पनी शुरू की उसमें लाभ नहीं हुआ। इसी प्रकार दूसरी जहाजी कम्पनियों की हालत आजकल अच्छी नहीं है। इस बास्ते मेरा यह सुझाव है कि जो ऋण इन कम्पनियों को दिया जाय उस पर सूद न लिया जाये।

अब आप कहेंगे कि अगर इन कम्पनियों पर इनकम टैक्स न लिया जाये और जो ऋण उनको दिया जाये उस पर सूद न लिया जाये तो इससे देश को क्या लाभ होगा। मैं आपको बतलाता हूँ कि इससे देश को क्या फायदा होगा। यूनाइटेड किंगडम को जहाज के व्यवसाय से २१६ करोड़ प्रतिवर्ष के फारिन एक्सचेंज (विदेशी मुद्रा) की आमदनी होती है, इटली को १६० करोड़ की, जर्मनी को १०० करोड़ की, जापान को १०० करोड़ की, नार्वे को ६७ करोड़ की फारिन एक्सचेंज की प्रतिवर्ष आमदनी होती है। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान को प्रति वर्ष १५० करोड़ रुपया विदेशों को देना पड़ता है। अगर हमारे जहाजी व्यवसाय का पूरा विकास हो जाये तो यह १५० करोड़ जो हम विदेशों को देते हैं यह बच जायेगा। इसके अलावा सरकार को जो ८० करोड़ प्रतिवर्ष की कस्टम (सीमा शुल्क) से आमदनी होती है यह भी जहाजी व्यवसाय द्वारा ही आती है। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर हम १५० करोड़ प्रतिवर्ष अपना फारिन एक्सचेंज बचा लेंगे तो न हमको अमरीका से सहायता लेने की आवश्यकता होगी, न इंग्लैंड से सहायता लेने की आवश्यकता होगी, न कामनवेल्थ कंट्रीज से सहायता लेने की आवश्यकता होगी। हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो सकेंगे। इसलिये मैं आपसे कहता हूँ कि आप मेरे सुझावों की ओर ध्यान दें और अपने जहाजी व्यवसाय का विकास करें।

महात्मा गांधी ने स्वदेशी का आन्दोलन चलाया था। हम गांधीवादी रोज जब सुबह प्रार्थना करते हैं तो स्वदेशी की प्रतिज्ञा लेते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे शास्त्री जी भी रोज यह प्रतिज्ञा लेते होंगे और यह प्रार्थना करते होंगे। तो आज मैं शास्त्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह जहाजी व्यवसाय का विकास करने के लिये स्वदेशी का आन्दोलन प्रारम्भ करें ताकि हमारा जहाजी व्यवसाय स्वदेशी हो जाये। यही हिन्दुस्तान की सबसे बड़ी सेवा होगी।

Shri Anandchand (Bilaspur): I will not tire this House by going into the whole question of the transport system as such in this country. I would only speak a few words about road transport and its policy.

As you know, the achievement of the Ministry will be measured by the degree of co-ordination it succeeds in bringing about in the development of the different forms of transport. If we look into the actual expenditure of the First Plan

on Transport, we will arrive at the figures which, I briefly submit to the House, are as under. From 1951 to 1954 the expenditure on railways was actually Rs. 200 crores while on roads it was Rs. 59 crores. Now, from 1956 to 1961, in the Second Plan, the expenditure on railways is estimated to be about Rs. 900 crores and on roads about Rs. 268 crores. I agree that in this country, railways are bearing the brunt of something like ninety per cent. of the traffic. But I think there is quite a lot of room to increase our transport—whether it is road transport or whether it is inland waterways—to such an extent that the congestion on the railways can be avoided. This can happen if the road transport comes under a kind of co-ordinated scheme in the country.

Now, so far as road transport itself is concerned, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that—as we see the achievements or the activities of the Ministry we find—although we had a Central Board of Transport set up in 1947 it last met in January, 1953 and not after that. That means about three years ago. Of course, the Report says that there had been meetings of the Standing Committee, a sort of monthly or bi-monthly meetings, but I think this shows that not very much importance is being attached to framing a co-ordinated kind of road transport in the country.

The other factor is that the constitutional provisions in regard to the construction and maintenance of various types of roads have also thrown varying responsibilities on the Centre and the States. I will give only two examples, Sir, with your permission. One is the overlapping in taxation. For example, in road traffic there is a lot of overlapping in taxation. The States have been asked, and they are taking steps, to put in taxation whether it is on passenger traffic or goods traffic in such a manner that it is not co-ordinated. I submit that the incidence of this kind of taxation in India—as I have seen the figures in other countries—has reached a very high figure.

The other thing that I was going to speak about was that the nationalisation of passenger transport in this country is not being pushed ahead with the speed that it deserves. It is true that Parliament has enacted the Road Transport Corporation Act in 1950 and the idea was that after this enactment the States would follow one after the other

and have their own road transport and come in the general scheme of nationalised road transport. So far as passenger traffic is concerned, what do we find? We find that in the last year, 1955-56, one State only,—that is PEPSU,—has come forward with the proposal of nationalisation of road transport. Although it is said that other States are looking into the matter they have not in a majority of cases set up any Road Transport Corporations. This is a matter which I think must be gone into in great detail, because in the country as it is today, we are well aware; the House is well aware, the transport arrangements in a number of cases where it is left to private enterprise, passenger traffic or goods traffic,—are far from satisfactory. Moreover, it has also been accepted, in the Second Five Year Plan that, so far as road transport is concerned nationalisation of passenger traffic not only is conducive to the efficient running of these services, provision of more comfort to the passengers and to travel at lesser cost but is also part of the national economy because we spend large sums of money to build up roads, we are opening up the country and therefore this system of nationalised transport is a stand-by which earns and at the same time serves the public at large. So I wish that this thing is taken into consideration and more and more States are asked to fall into line. Maybe there are difficulties. I know private operators in many States—I know especially the State of Punjab has stood in the way—have their own limited companies. Some have put in lots of money in this road transport business. But I think there is hardly any reason why the State cannot pay them off and nationalise the passenger traffic as early as possible.

Now I would also like to make a few observations about the Delhi Transport Authority. As the House knows the Delhi Road Transport Authority came into existence six years ago. I had an occasion to read a Press report. I was not present in the House but I think the hon. Minister was once asked a supplementary question as to whether he was aware that the working of the Delhi Road Transport was the worst in the whole of India so far as traffic was concerned and, I think he admitted that it was bad though it was not the worst!

So far as the Delhi Transport Authority is concerned, there are three grievances that I have to put forward to

[Shri Anandchand]

the Minister in charge and I believe the Members in this House will agree with me. Those three are like this. The first is, high fares are still prevalent. I know that the fares that are being levied at the present moment are 1948 fares. The Report says so. 1948, the year which has been taken as the basic year for these fares, was an year only 3 years after the war when the prices were very high and money was easily available. So the 1948 fares, I think, were on the higher side. Therefore, in 1956 there must be some ground for the revision of these fares and the lowering of these fares in certain cases because I find—I have not much experience of road transport in other States of India, but as compared to the City of Bombay for example—that the fares we pay in the Delhi Transport Service are very much on the higher side.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The other thing to which I would like to draw your attention is the rash driving indulged in by the people of this Delhi Transport Service. As a pedestrian—I sometimes walk; of course, very often I might go in the car and there too they are a menace so far as driving is concerned—from a pedestrian's point of view the Delhi Transport Service people are very rash. I think for these public transport vehicles which carry 40 or 50 lives of men, women, and children there must be a certain norm, a certain kind of check on the type of people that we employ because they should not be a danger to the men in the road. I was trying to look at the figures here. Of course the Delhi Transport Authority's figures are there showing how many buses are run on the road, how many passengers are being carried every day and so on, but I do not see here the number of accidents which I believe is quite large. This is most important because the driving, as I said, is rash and negligent. When we go along the road what do we see? In many cases the Delhi Transport Authority buses are left on the road with the mudguard gone or some other part caved in. Why should a public vehicle which is to carry so many lives be driven in such a rash way? I think there is some ground here to go into this question.

The third thing I wanted to say was that there is paucity of shelters. With the vagaries of weather—of course,

there is not so much of rain here as there is in Bombay or other parts of the country—it is a necessity. There is a paucity of shelters in all the bus-stops. I think hardly 5 per cent of them have shelters for the passengers and they have to stand out in the open, in the sun here in June when the season is very hot, in long queues. I think something should be done on that score.

Lastly, I want to say that there is paucity of buses. Perhaps it is not the paucity of buses so much, it is the way that the time-table is set because we have got 400 buses here as I see from this Report. But the time-table is such I think which needs looking into. During rush hours we find large queues of people waiting at the bus-stops. Why go elsewhere; let us look at the Secretariat South Block bus-stop. We find at this bus-stop which is so near us large number of people waiting in the queue for hours to go home because the buses are not available and in whatever buses are available they say: "No space here. It is absolutely crowded".

Therefore, I have said then little things about the Delhi Transport Authority. I am not saying this in any sort of criticism of the Authority as such, if they might take it as a hostile criticism. All that I am trying to point out is that charity begins at home. If we have a transport system, if we are going to nationalise transport in the country, if we want the country and the public to be transport-minded and travel in these vehicles, I think we must start right under our own wings here a road transport system which should serve as a model for the whole country.

I might in the end say a few words about the dire necessity of a kind of Master Plan for transport development in this country. As I tried to put forward in the very beginning, although we have a Central Board of Transport it has not been meeting very often in the last three years. Therefore my proposal is, for whatever it is worth, that to remedy the drawbacks of the transport policy a kind of Transport Development Authority might be set up or a Transport Commission with high powers may be appointed so that it might bring about co-ordination in the schemes of development of different modes of transport and by doing that it might prepare a co-ordinated scheme

not only so far as road transport is concerned but also far inland waterways and shipping.

12 NOON

Shri Mohanlal Seksena (Lucknow Distt. *cum* Bara Banki Distt.): I should like to make some suggestions for consideration of this House and the Hon. Minister. Indeed, five years back I had made a suggestion to the Finance Minister in connection with economy that the staff cars given to the various Ministries and departments, may be withdrawn and that the Transport Ministry should maintain a fleet of cars which may be given to the various Ministries as and when they are needed. I do not know whether any consideration has been given to that suggestion of mine. But I know that staff cars are still there, and the funny thing is, their number has gone up. You are aware, and I think everyone here is aware, that the staff cars have become a very big source of wastage and extravagance. Not only that. While officers are supposed to work in the day-time, the staff cars are often seen plying in the night as well, and thank God, the staff cars have not got tongues to wag, otherwise many a reputation would become absolute mud.

I think it is time for the Transport Ministry to learn of the necessity for keeping a separate fleet of cars for use in office as the road corporations run vehicles for the transport of the people. Why can't it maintain a fleet of cars for providing conveyance to the officers as and when they are required? Recently, a case was brought to my notice. An officer of the status of Joint Secretary went to Bombay from Delhi and stayed there for a few weeks. During that period he had requisitioned the services of a staff car from the Bombay Government, and all the time he was using the car, and without bringing it to the notice of the Ministry concerned, he continued drawing D. A. as well. Later on, when the Bombay Government made a debit to the Central Government on account of the use of their car—the amount came to a few thousands—this thing was found out, and interested parties began to work. Ultimately the Finance Ministry was persuaded to make that officer refund only a few hundred rupees which he had drawn in excess of D. A. while staying in Bombay. So, this is how the staff cars are being abused.

I know that during wartime staff cars were introduced and they were a necessity then. But in Delhi, when we are having so many cars plying for hire, why should we maintain so many staff cars? Suppose there are about a hundred or more of staff cars now maintained, I am sure the Transport Ministry, by keeping only about 50 of them, can efficiently and economically make arrangements for the conveyance of the officers as and when necessary. We have got a Public Works Department which does the construction work for all the Ministries; similarly, there is a Government Press, which does the printing work for all the departments. We do not see each and every Ministry having its own P.W.D. arrangements or its own printing arrangements. So, why should not the Transport Ministry have a separate fleet of staff cars for the use of all the Ministries? I ask the Minister to tell me whether this suggestion which I made in 1951, to the Finance Ministry, was ever considered by his Ministry. If not, I would like him to consider it. I shall take up the point again when the Demands for Grants under the Finance Ministry, is taken up and make suggestions for economy.

I would like to refer to another form of transport. I know in the so-called atomic age, it becomes rather incongruous to talk about this form of transport, namely the bullock-cart. But because we talk of big things and of doing them in a big way, the small things escape our attention and also slip off our hands. The small things matter much more so far as the ordinary people are concerned. Sometimes it is a question of life and death for them and therefore, it should not be strange when one talks of bullock-carts. As I shall presently show, bullock-carts lift more goods than all other modes of transport combined, this can be proved by facts and figures.

About six months back I wrote a number of papers dealing with the different aspects of the Second Five Year Plan, and one of them dealt with transport. I sent them to the Chairman of the Planning Commission, the Prime Minister. I wonder whether the hon. Minister of Transport had time to go through it or even any of the officers of the Transport Ministry has examined it. Therein, I have showed that whether we like it or not, we shall have to depend upon the bullock-cart transport for two or three decades to come. It is not possible to manage otherwise. I

[Shri Mohanlal Saksena] have shown that the number of bullock-carts has gone up. It is about 99 lakhs now. It was about 83 lakhs in 1951. It has since increased. Not only that. You will find that we have got about 550,000 far flung villages throughout the country. The Nagpur Plan in regard to the roads, which was prepared in 1943, envisaged that during a period of ten years, if the road mileage could be raised from about 2,60,000 to four lakhs, then at least every village will be brought within a distance of five miles of a *pucca* road. Now, what is the performance? I find that in the first Plan period, they claim that one-third of the target has been completed. Not only that. During the last 13 years, ever since the Nagpur Plan was formulated, I would like to know what has been the progress of development in regard to the roads? I am not satisfied with progress to the extent one-third that they claim to have made. I would like the Minister to show by facts and figures how many roads have been constructed during the First Plan and how many will be constructed during the Second Plan period out of the 1,40,000 miles of roads that was proposed as additional mileage to be constructed by the Nagpur Plan. It is said in the second Plan that nearly two-thirds would have been completed by 1960. That is, within 17 years of the Nagpur Plan, they hope to two-thirds of the target. I am not satisfied. I think there is some mixing up of the figures. I would like the Minister to show by facts and figures how many miles of roads will be built during the next Plan period. Even if his proposals materialise, what would be the result? Even supposing two-thirds is done it would mean that, at least one-third of the villages will still remain beyond five miles of a *pucca* road.

We are naturally fond of making comparisons with other countries and we aspire to come up to the standards of the foreign countries. Now in regard to roads, while in India, we have about 19·16 miles of roads—all forms of roads—for every 100 square miles; in England road mileage is 230; 103 in U.S.A. and 95 in Germany. Our proportion of road mileage to every 100 square miles is only one-tenth of that in Great Britain. When we compare road mileage with the population of the country, the percentage variation becomes still more significant. We find that for every one lakh of population in England, they have got 392 miles of roads. In U.S.A. it is 2,500 miles. In

Germany, it is 265 miles, while in India, it is only 89 miles. For every one lakh of population, we have just 89 miles of roads, while in U.S.A. it is about 2,500. Therefore, whether we like it or not, we shall have to depend upon this form of transport, namely, bullock-cart for two or three decades to come. I am sorry to say that nothing is being done for it. It is said that it is the concern of the State Governments. Many things are the concern of the State Government but still we are planning for the whole country. We have a Transport Board or a Transport Council—I do not know what it is called. It meets very frequently. There was a recent meeting in February. I would like to know whether they have considered this problem.

After all, transport can be a very big bottleneck. Even the Finance Minister in his latest budget speech said that whatever our plans or schemes might be, unless the bottlenecks are removed, they cannot be worked well. Amongst the bottlenecks he referred to the bottleneck of transport.

We also know that the railways wanted more than Rs. 1,400 crores for purposes of expansion of railways in order to lift the additional quantity of goods that would be available during the Second Plan period, namely, 61 million tons. As against that, they have been provided with only Rs. 1125 crores and the authorities feel that with that provision they may not be able to lift more than 43 million tons. So what is to be done? I for one have got many suggestions. Even with that money, with proper savings and re-organisation and rationalisation of transport, I feel we should be able to lift that quantity of goods. But for that I will take some other occasion.

Here I want to confine my observations to this mode of transport only. I am grateful to the hon. the Prime Minister for having raised this question in the National Development Council meeting held on the 20th of January. He brought it to the notice of the members present that whatever the importance of railways and automobiles may be, there is no denying the fact that bullock-carts are lifting the bulk of the goods, and we have to improve the efficiency of bullock-carts. The hon. Minister was present and he said that he will put the question before the Transport Council which was to meet on the 6th or 7th February. I do not know what has transpired and what action if any has been taken.

Not only that, a study group was appointed to study the transport problem. I have gone through its report, a bulky report. It has dealt with the railways. It has devoted about 71 typed pages to automobiles. They have also referred to inland waterways; but not a word has been said about the bullock-carts as if they did not matter—this is our approach.

We have become so much engrossed with big things and doing every thing in a big way that we do not think of these small things which will solve our problem. So in my note I have suggested that the situation requires that we should nationalise transport. We must lift goods by bullock-carts up to a distance of 30 miles. They must lift goods from the farm to the store house in the village and from the village to the nearest marketing town and so on. Automobiles or trucks must lift the goods up to a distance of 200 miles and beyond that the railways. Thereby a number of wagons will be available and the competition will be avoided. Many States have taken steps in the direction of nationalisation of transport. But why not the railways function in such a way and remember that the other forms of transport are auxiliary and not competitors of railways? I am one of those who believe that the railways themselves should take into service bullock-carts and automobiles and organise their services in such a way that the goods may be lifted from the streets and delivered in the streets. It may have many other advantages. So much of corruption can be avoided. Leakage and pilferage can also be avoided. Then the most important consideration is the volume of employment that it will provide. A very large number of persons will be provided with employment.

The hon. Minister in the meeting of the National Development Council had said that for providing pneumatic tyres they may have to give subsidy to the bullock-carts and even if they pay Rs. 200 it will come to a huge figure. This is our approach, which I call the arithmetical approach. I say that once you show the villages that by having these pneumatic tyres they are able to lift more goods, they are able to do more work and they are able to earn more they will themselves come forward and fit their bullock-carts with pneumatic tyres. You have to do it only in the beginning. You begin thinking: there are 99 lakhs bullock-carts and if we

have to fit in pneumatic tyres for at least one lakh bullock-carts, it would be a very huge amount even if we give a subsidy of Rs. 200 each. I am trying to organise a pioneer bullock-cart service regularly in Delhi.

After all, we are going to invest over 200 crores of rupees in the cottage industries. The cottage industries will be located in villages. Raw materials have to be taken to the villages and the manufactured and finished products have to be brought from the villages. How is it to be done? The trucks will not reach those villages.

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

Shri Mohanlal Saksena : I am going to finish. These trucks will not reach those villages. Again railways are out of the question. Then how are you going to take raw materials to, and the finished products from, the villages? I think it is high time that we started a pilot service or pilot schemes. My submission is that you may entrust this work to the Khadi and Village Industries Board. They may have a small board or a small committee for that purpose. They will work for the improvement of these bullock-carts and see how much they can help in easing the problem of transport.

As I said, I have prepared a long note and have made other suggestions. But I am leaving it to some other occasion. I hope the hon. Minister, if he has not already read it, will go through it and kindly let me know afterwards as to what are his reactions.

I wanted to say something about country-boats. We are talking so much about steamers and ships. But I know that thousands of country boats are remaining idle without any work. Why can't you utilise them? When we are going to have planning and when we know what the additional quantity will have to be transported, why can't we put these idle boats and boatmen into service, give them some employment and also solve to some extent the transport problem of the country?

Shri T. Subrahmanyam (Bellary): While supporting the Demands relating to the Transport Ministry, I would like to make some observations regarding some matters.

[Shri T. Subrahmanyam]

I shall first take up the inland waterways and the development of railways. The inland waterways were neglected by the British colonial interests. They neglected the development of inland waterways so that they may not compete with the railways. For railways everything had to be brought from England. The rails, the rolling stock, locomotives and all these things were manufactured in England and they found a market here, whereas canals, even though they provided water for irrigation purposes and for drinking purposes and also served as navigational or inland waterways, were completely neglected. For strategic purposes also railways were taken up. These railways were useful for raw materials being taken to England and for consumption goods to be dumped into India. For these reasons the British colonial interests encouraged deliberately the expansion of railways and ignored deliberately the expansion of irrigation and navigational canals. But, nevertheless, this expansion of the railways has proved a great blessing to our country. Today we have 34,278 miles of railways in which we have invested about Rs. 868 crores. It is a legitimate source of pride, it is a blessing in disguise and a great national asset, and we must take it up and expand it. At the same time I earnestly urge that these inland transport and inland waterways should be taken up seriously.

There are at present 5,500 miles of inland waterways of which the important ones are Ganga, Brahmaputra and its tributaries, Godavari and Krishna, the backwaters and canals of Travancore-Cochin, the Buckingham Canal and the Mahanadi Canals in Orissa. We are now on the eve of the Second Five Year Plan, and I suggest that the river valley projects and the multi-purpose projects which we are taking up should also be utilised for purposes of navigation.

At present the Damodar Valley Project is said to provide navigation facilities from Calcutta to the Raniganj coalfields, and in Bombay the Kakrapar Project is going to provide navigation from the sea to the dam site and fifty miles further inland. The Hirakud Dam will make the Mahanadi river navigable for the last three hundred miles down to the sea. There are other projects coming up, and there is the Tungabhadra Project in my district of Bellary. The Canals on the right and left bank

are being completed, and I suggest that these canals should also be used for inland waterways conveniences.

There was one engineer about whom I would like to remind this House on this occasion, and that was Sir Arthur Cotton. He was responsible for the completion of the Godavari Anicut and the Coleroon (Cauveri) Waterworks in the South. He had great imagination and he had even then envisaged the use of irrigation canals as waterways. I saw, several years back, the maps drawn up by him for connecting all the river systems in India, the Ganges, the Brahmaputra, Mahanadi, Godavari, Krishna, Tungabhadra and Cauveri, and he had provided navigation canals throughout India. I suggest that now that we are on the eve of the Second Five Year Plan, this problem should be thought of seriously and navigation or inland waterways transport also should be taken up seriously.

Then I shall take up the subject of tourist traffic. It is an important source of foreign exchange and it is a vital instrument for the promotion of international understanding. A Tourist Traffic Division has been opened by the Transport Ministry. This was in 1949. And several Tourist Offices have been opened in several parts of the country, and Tourist Training Centres have also been arranged in several parts of India.

Amenities for tourists have been provided, and in 1951 about 20,000 tourists came to India and in 1954 39,330 tourists came from foreign countries and our annual income has been about the order of Rs. 5 crores. Both from inside the country and from outside, tourists are visiting places of historical importance, architectural beauty and places of national importance and industrial importance. I therefore suggest to the Railway Ministry that several centres must be taken up to provide more amenities and facilities for tourists, whether from inside the country or from abroad, to make these very attractive and provide amenities.

In this connection I would suggest that a tourist centre should be opened at Hospet in Bellary District. There is Hampi which is very near. It is a place of ancient importance. The Vijayanagara Empire was there, and it was the seat of the Vijayanagar Empire. Those ruins remind us even today as to what should have been the glory

of those ancient engineers and artistic workmen and the imagination of the rulers there. Even today it is a place of inspiring interest. There is also the Tungabhadra Project nearby. It submerges about 140 square miles, it is a huge lake. And on both sides you have rest houses. On one side of the dam you have a place called Vaikunt and on the other side Kailash. Hospet is a place where the past glory of India and the future prosperity of India, both meet in a wonderful and strange fashion. I suggest to the Railway Ministry that this place of great importance should be taken up for being developed as a tourist centre. The hon. the Railway Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, had come there. The hon. Deputy Minister, Shri Alagesan, had also come there. They are both aware of the importance of this place, of the past glory of Hampi and of the future prosperity of the Tungabhadra Project. I suggest that a hotel should be constructed at Kamalapur or at Hampi which should provide all amenities for travellers of various kinds, both from abroad and from within the country. I suggest that other amenities like books and posters, picture postcards and all these things should be provided. And cheap catering houses should be provided at Kamalapur and Hospet.

Government have this year provided about Rs. 8.08 lakhs for tourist publicity and Rs. 17,38,000 for the development of tourist centres. These are the sums budgetted for 1956-57. I suggest the amounts should be increased because more places of historical importance should be taken up and I suggest particularly that Hampi should be developed and Hospet should be developed as places of tourist interest.

I shall say a word with regard to National Highways and other roads. National Highways are the subject of the Central Government, while State Highways and district and village roads are the subject of the State Governments. 18,000 miles of all-weather roads we have at present. In the First Five Year Plan Rs. 100 crores were provided for 3,000 miles of new roads and 17,000 miles of village roads through community efforts, one-third to be provided by villagers in the form of labour or otherwise and two-thirds by the Central Government and State Governments. And a Village Road Co-operative Development Fund has been

opened and provided so that village feeder roads could be completed. I suggest that this is a very important matter—big cities are usually catered for, we have tarred and cement roads in big cities; they are necessary—but we should not forget the lakhs of villages. And I know there is one taluk, Kudligi Taluk in Bellary District, which I have toured often. There are numerous places there and in Sandur Taluk which cannot be reached even by jeep. I suggest that this scheme of extending village roads to towns and other villages to connect them with trunk roads or State roads should be taken up more actively.

Another subject to which I would like to refer is bridges across rivers. Both the hon. Minister and the Deputy Minister came to Bellary District, and numerous representations were made to them with regard to bridges to be constructed across the Tungabhadra river at Siruguppa, Kampli and Holal where for long distances it is not possible to go across the river. I suggest that this request of the villagers and the people there should be sympathetically considered. These bridges, if constructed, will open up commerce and business on both sides. These areas are connecting the Hyderabad part of Karnataka with Mysore, and also Bombay. I suggest that this matter should be considered and bridges should be constructed at suitable places.

Finally I have one suggestion to make. We depend for all road-making machines on foreign countries, for instance for diesel rollers, steam road rollers, stone crushers and boilers either for bitumen or tar; for these we have to depend upon foreign countries. Just now efforts are being made to open up factories, and negotiations are being conducted with regard to the steps to be taken to manufacture these. I suggest that these should be manufactured in our own country under the Second Five Year Plan and the factories should be set up.

Shri Mulchand Dube (Farrukhabad Dist.—North) : I wish to point out certain local grievances of my district. I find from the Report of the Activities of the Ministry of Transport on page 106, item 18 is :

“Construction of road from Pakhna railway station to Sarnath in Farrukhabad district (length 5 miles 41 furlongs).”

[Shri Mulchand Dube]

The word Sarnath is apparently a mistake for Sankissa. Sarnath is near Banaras.

The Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri L. B. Shastri): That is so. It is a printing mistake.

Shri Mulchand Dube: There are some other printing mistakes also. The length is said to be 5 miles 41 furlongs. I think it should be 5 miles 4 furlongs.

Shri L. B. Shastri: That is right.

Shri Mulchand Dube: The total distance of the road is 9 miles. The Central Government has undertaken the construction of the road, 9 miles long from Pakhna to Sankissa. I think that the construction of this road has been undertaken without a full realisation of the local conditions. Pakhna is merely a flag station, with probably a single line. It is not connected by any metalled road. Any passengers or pilgrims that detrain at Pakhna will be hard put to it to find a conveyance or transport from Pakhna to Sankissa. If Nibkarori had been chosen, the mileage for construction would have been the same. Nibkarori is connected by metalled road which runs from Gwalior, Etawah, Farrukhabad and onwards to Bareilly etc. This road meets the grand trunk road at Bawar so that passengers coming from Delhi, Gwalior, Etawah and other places would be able to get easily motor cars and buses to Sankissa. By leaving out a distance of about 5 miles from Nibkarori to Sitholi, considerable inconvenience would be caused. I had written in this connection to the Central Government. I received a reply that the Centre had agreed to pay half the cost of the construction of the road from Nibkarori to Sitholi, with a ceiling of Rs. 2 lakhs. I wrote to the State Government about it. I received a reply saying that they had again approached the Central Government to meet the entire cost of this road. This happened in the month of January. I do not know what further steps have been taken in this matter after that : whether the construction of the road from Nibkarori to Sitholi has been undertaken by the Centre or partly by the Centre and partly by the State. Sitholi is about 5 miles from Pakhna. This road from Pakhna to Sitholi is not going to be as useful as the other road from Nibkarori to Sitholi. That portion has been constructed. It may serve as an approach road.

In the meantime, the portion from Nibkarori to Sitholi should be undertaken and completed before May so that pilgrims and other persons visiting Sankissa, the holy place of Buddhist pilgrimage may not be put to any inconvenience. Government is doing all it can for the convenience of the people. If this portion is left out, much of the money that has been spent over the construction of this road would be to a certain extent, not as useful as it would otherwise have been.

I also wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the necessity of providing a permanent bridge over the Ganga at Farrukhabad. I have been writing about this also. There is a very great public demand for this bridge. The transport facilities between Farrukhabad and Shahjahanpur are practically none. There is certainly a metalled road. That cannot be used for about 7 months in the year when the river Ganga and Ram Ganga are in floods. These rivers flow within a few miles of each other, one in Farrukhabad district and the other in Shahjahanpur district. The result is that during the rainy season, both the rivers get swollen and over-flooded. A large area of land is inundated with great loss to the cultivators. The river Ganga has changed its course with the result that about 10 villages have been completely washed away and the whole area has been inundated. During the years 1953 and 1954, according to the district authorities, the total loss of crops from this inundation is of the tune of Rs. 32 lakhs and the area inundated is probably 2,32,000 acres. This amount does not take into account the subsidies, takkavi loans and remission in land revenue which the Government has to make every year. The loss that has been estimated errs on the side of moderation, because the estimate is at the rate of Rs. 12 per acre for one crop. Obviously, this is an under-estimate. If a cultivator is to get Rs. 12 for one crop in a year per acre, he will not at all be able to make both ends meet. If the estimate is taken to be about Rs. 50 lakhs per year in Farrukhabad district and Rs. 25 lakhs in the Shahjahanpur district, there is a national loss of Rs. 75 lakhs every year. Even if the Government has to spend about Rs. 2 or 3 crores in completing the bridges, I think the loss could be made up in about 5 to 7 years, by levying a toll because there is considerable traffic over

these rivers. Recently, the State Government has opened a national extension service block across the Ganga. That also is not going to be as useful as it otherwise would be. Because, the place is across the Ganga and it will not be easy for any one to visit that place and see how the things are working unless he spends the whole day in crossing the river Ganga on a boat. The other method of transport would be by rail *via* Kasganj, Bareilly, Shahjahanpur and on the other side *via* Kanpur, Lucknow, Hardoi and Shahjahanpur. My submission, therefore, is that a road-cum-rail bridge be built over the Ganga and the Ram Ganga as soon as finances permit. I personally think that greater attention is being paid to the damage caused by floods in the eastern districts. These floods have occurred after 85 years. I do not think that they require as much attention as the control of floods in the Ganga and the Ram Ganga do, because this is an annual affair which requires closer attention.

Shri M. D. Joshi: (Ratnagiri-South): The Transport Ministry is carrying on its shoulders a very heavy burden, because it is also saddled with the responsibility for the development of railways. I have noticed, in certain quarters it is said that the Railway Ministry and the Transport Ministry should be separated. It is true that this combined Ministry is faced with a gigantic task, and it is taxed to the utmost capacity of its energy. But, from what little experience I have during the last 3 to 4 years, I find that the present combination is the best. Personally, I would prefer that the Railway Ministry and the Transport Ministry should not be separated. We are aiming at road-rail co-ordination. We are trying to see that road, rail and sea transport is also being co-ordinated by the setting up of committees. And this co-ordination has already been existing there in the form of our Railway Ministry and the Transport Ministry combined in one person, in the person of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri assisted by his colleagues. Therefore, I for one, welcome the fusion which exists at present of these two departments. I find and many of my friends would agree that the present arrangements are quite satisfactory and the Government are doing all they can for the development both of railways and all the different departments of Transport.

I shall touch very briefly upon the question of shipping. We have heard

just now my friend Shri Raghunath Singh who espoused the cause of shipping so energetically in the last session and also today. He and several other friends are blaming the Government for not taking proper steps towards the development of shipping. In this connection it would be pertinent to examine what the Government have done and what they propose to do.

We started at the beginning of the First Five Year Plan period with a tonnage of 380,000. In the First Five Year Plan, the development of an additional 220,000 tons of shipping was envisaged. That means, the total to be reached was 600,000 tons. We have already reached the 5 lakh ton mark and one lakh tons more are under construction. So, by the end of the First Five Year Plan we shall reach the mark aimed at in the First Five Year Plan. We cannot say that Government are oblivious or indifferent to the development of shipping. Government are being criticised for being slow in the programme of the development of shipping. My friend Shri Raghunath Singh cited the example of Germany, Italy and several other nations. The U.S.A. also is being cited. Now, the Governments of all these countries are helping their private sectors, but we must remember also that these countries have been self-governing for a long period. India has very recently attained self-government. We have been independent for the last eight or nine years only, and during the last nine years we must remember that our Government have done everything possible towards the development of shipping. But we find that at present it has become the fashion for the private sector to blame Government for their sins of omission. Here, in the House, too, the Government are being blamed, for not paying sufficient attention to the development of Indian Shipping. Let us find out what the Government have done and what they have not done.

After the reference which I am going to make to the activities of Government very briefly, I hope the House will agree with me that Government are not sitting complacently, nor are they indifferent. For example, for the development of shipping and coastal trade and other trades, Government have set up a Rail-Sea Co-ordination Committee

[Shri M. D. Joshi]

in June, 1955. We find from the annual report that the report of that committee will be submitted to Government in June, 1956, and as a result of the committee's recommendations more traffic is expected to flow in Indian bottoms.

The Second Five Year Plan provides for development by aiming at the acquisition of an additional tonnage of 100,000. Coastal trade, it will be found, has been completely reserved for Indian ships and there is no foreign ship which is carrying on coastal traffic.

As far as trade with adjacent countries is concerned, it is true that at present we are only carrying 40 per cent as against 75 per cent of the adjacent trade envisaged in the shipping policy report of 1947. That report said that of the adjacent trade, our ships must carry at least 75 per cent. But it has to be remembered that other neighbouring countries like Pakistan, Burma and Indonesia are also developing their shipping. Just as we are anxious that we should develop our shipping, that we should be in a position to carry the major part of the adjacent trade, they are also anxious to expand their merchant shipping and increase their trade. Therefore, it will be a matter not merely of competition, not merely of first come first served, but it will be a matter of mutual accommodation, of mutual understanding between nations, and India as a nation has to accommodate other nations in order that she should be accommodated in the sphere of foreign trade and adjacent trade. The study groups appointed by Government now realise that we cannot aim at carrying much more than 50 per cent of the adjacent trade. Though it was recommended that we should carry 75 per cent. of the trade, they now realise that we cannot carry more than 50 per cent of the trade. That must also be remembered.

Thirdly, in the matter of foreign trade much has got to be done and I believe that our Government and the Transport Ministry are fully conscious of what has got to be done. The second Five Year Plan is going to add tonnage which will enable us to carry about 15 per cent of foreign trade. I therefore have no doubt that Government will take steps to attain this target. The Government are entering into mutual trade agreements, I understand, with

other countries as regards foreign trade and for that purpose Government are at present advancing loans to steamer companies. Government have advanced loans of about 95 per cent in regard to new ships, at a concessional rate of 2½ per cent for overseas and 4½ per cent for coastal trade vessels. Therefore, I have no doubt that Government are doing they can to help the shipping companies to do their bit. It is, therefore, in my humble opinion not right every time, in season and out of season, to blame Government for their sins of omission—I will not say commission because there are no sins of commission.

At present on the coastline there is more cargo, I understand, available for the ships to carry than they can carry. Therefore, it is not right for them to blame Government on that score also.

The shipping companies very recently moved the Government for an increase in freight rates and Government have allowed them an increase of 5 per cent. They are not satisfied with that. They want an increase of 15 per cent. I do not think that demand is justified. I think Government should proceed firmly on the basis of the recommendations which will be made by the Rail-Sea Co-ordination Committee.

Coming to a narrower sphere, I also understand that the Bombay Steam Navigation Company are asking for an increase in the passenger fares along the West Coast, which personally concerns me and my constituency. They are asking for an increase of 35 per cent in the steamer fares for passengers. The present rates themselves are very high, and they have registered an increase of over 200 per cent on the rates obtaining during the pre-war period; and they are about 180 per cent even of the war-time rates. Still, the company wants an increase of 35 per cent. I must congratulate Government on this occasion for having set up a committee in the person of Mr. Justice Lokur, which is holding an enquiry into the matter at present.

At the same time, it has to be borne in mind that the Bombay Steam Navigation Company has not spent a single pie on passenger welfare during the last seventy-five years, and yet they are claiming an increase in passenger fares by 35 per cent. To give the House a concrete idea of what the increase in fares will mean to the people, I would.

like to give a few figures. The distance between Bombay and Poona is 120 miles; the railway fare for that journey is Rs. 3-12-0 by the mail. The distance between Ratnagiri and Bombay is exactly 120 miles, and the present sea-fare is Rs. 6-14-0. The shipping company want an increase of 35 per cent even on that.

So far as the railways are concerned, they have to maintain the tracks, the cabins, the stations, the staff and so on; and they are also affording so much of facilities to the passengers, to the staff and so on by way of providing houses, hospitals, education facilities etc. But what have the steamer companies done? If the shipping Company are asking for more, I must strongly protest on behalf of the Konkani people. I would urge Government to straightway take up this passenger service and to nationalise that concern.

Particularly, I have to blame the steamer company, for I understand that the Scindia Company have cancelled the passenger route which formerly existed between Madras and Burma. This is a matter of great national concern. Why should they have stopped that? I would say that the Scindia Company both in the matter of Madras-Burma route and also in the matter of the coastal passenger service along the West Coast, are callous and indifferent to the needs of the passengers, and they merely want to make money at the expense of the poor public of India. They must not be allowed to do so. Therefore, I would urge Government that they should not only nationalise the West Coast passenger traffic, but they should also nationalise and take on hand the passenger route between Burma and Madras.

I must congratulate Government again for having set up a deck passenger committee for looking after the welfare of passengers. In this connection, I would like to point out that the recommendations of the deck passenger committees are not listened to, and are not paid heed to by the steamer companies. I have personal knowledge of this because even in such a small and ordinary matter as changing a small time-table from morning to evening, the Bombay Steam Navigation Company are adamant and they have refused to accept the advice given by the deck passenger committee. The deck passenger committee travelled through the Ratnagiri district, and they made recommendations

2-30.L.S.

which were unanimous, for the benefit of the passengers, and yet the steamer company has refused to comply with their advice. This is the way in which the private sector is co-operating with Government. Therefore, I charge the Steamer Company for not having done their duty. It is no use their blaming Government every now and then and saying that the private sector had done this or that. I know, and I am quite conscious of the fact, that the Scindia Co. have done much in the past for the national shipping of India. I know that they have fought their own battles when the British were here. Yet, we cannot be oblivious to the fact that they are not paying heed to the needs of the country, and they are merely coming forward to blame Government.

Therefore, I am firmly of the opinion that if the private sector is not doing its duty, then it is time for Government to take matters in their hands and to nationalise wherever possible, and wherever they can.

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah): At the outset, I would like to thank my hon. friend Shri Mohanlal Saksena for the memorandum which he has submitted to the Planning Commission, and a copy of which was sent over to me. I read it carefully, and I am quite sure that it is a document worth perusing, and I would recommend that document to the Minister for his careful consideration. It will also help me incidentally in regard to some of the points that I intend raising in the course of my speech.

I appreciate my hon. friend's reference to bullock-carts and inland waterways. Since my time is limited, I do not know whether I shall be able to deal with all the points that I want to raise.

The subjects under the Transport Ministry are major and minor ports, maritime shipping and navigation, light-houses and lightships, road transport, road development, including national highways, inland water transport and tourism.

Though I wish very much to supplement what my hon. friend Shri Raghunath Singh has said about shipping, I am resisting that temptation because I want to dwell more upon inland waterways, tourism and roads. At the same

[Shri Matthen]

time, I do not want the previous speaker to believe that I can support all the statements that he has made in regard to shipping.

I have no brief for the private sector. But I cannot help mentioning that the targets approved by Government on the recommendation of the Shipping Policy Committee of 1948 are still a long way off. My hon. friend Shri M. D. Joshi said that Germany and U.K. are independent countries, and they are having a lot of resources. But I would like to tell my hon. friend that Germany, Italy and Japan were down and out after the war, and in fact, most of them could not even find a meal unless America had come.

Shri M. D. Joshi: Does my hon. friend know that their equipment was complete, and they only wanted to expand? But our equipment was not complete at all.

Shri Matthen: Yes. I am not going to argue that matter out now.

Shri M. D. Joshi: That is all right.

Shri Matthen: I acknowledge the fact that the Minister has done a magnificent job not only in the railways but even in the matter of the transport subjects like shipping, roads, etc., it is magnificent in the background that he has got today.

I do not agree with my hon. friend that there need not be a separate Minister for Transport. In fact, the recommendation of the Estimates Committee is that it is humanly impossible for a Minister who looks after the railways, which is such a giant of an organisation, to look after any other subjects adequately. I however entirely agree with him, as I said earlier, that the Minister has done a magnificent job in the present background in which he is placed.

For want of time, I am now passing on the subject of inland waterways. The report of the study group on Transport, appointed by the Planning Commission, says:

"The revival of interest in the other means of transport is still to acquire some momentum in this country. Though some measures have been taken, and policy statements made from time to time, no definite policy making due recognition of the part played by road

transport, inland water navigation, and coastal shipping has been finally adopted by Government."

1 P.M.

I am only mentioning the points because of the limitation of time, but I hope the Minister will understand what I am saying, though it may not appear to be well argued out.

Let us know where our other modes of transport stand *vis-a-vis* the railways. The Ministry's report clearly says:

• "Inland water transport played an important role in the transport system of India upto the middle of the 19th century. With the development of the railways and with the withdrawal of large volume of water for irrigation in the upper reaches of the rivers, water transport declined in importance except in North-Eastern regions of India and on the East and West coast of the peninsula."

Even here it has deteriorated considerably. On account of the sand that has come in, the silt that has formed, the river level is going up. When this matter was considered by the Policy Committee on a former occasion, and as early as 1948, the Minister of Transport and Railways assured the interests concerned that the Government of India were interested in co-ordinating all forms of transport, river, road, railways, and if the river services were found to be better suited to meet the needs of a particular area, the Government would be prepared to consider their development even in preference to the railways.

My submission is that this matter has least attracted the Transport Ministry's attention—I mean inland waterways. This is one industry which can be developed without much investment and whose results can be found very soon, unlike other industries. But, unfortunately, it has not received adequate attention. One reason why it has not received adequate attention in spite of the assurance of Government, is that the hon. Minister had not had sufficient time to look into it, because of the giant railways. Something still of the old tradition of the British days, when the railway companies were owned by the British interests though in independent India it does not exist, continues in the Ministry. In a way there is a certain amount

of rivalry, though not deliberately, I admit; that is another reason why a separate Ministry should be formed.

I do not know how far I am correct,—I am speaking subject to correction—when the target was cut down by the Planning Commission for subjects other than railways, there was no protest from the Transport Ministry, while there was vehement protest in the matter of railways. I do not in the least grudge the work he has done for the railways; but it is very necessary that more adequate attention should be devoted to waterways. In fact, the pressure on the railways can to a great extent be relieved if other forms of transport like inland waterways and roads are fully developed. In fact, they are mutually complementary.

Coming as I do from Travancore-Cochin I can understand the great potentials of inland waterways. Even there on account of the neglect of the Government in not dredging the rivers properly a lot of sand has come in, and most of the rivers which were navigable are not navigable today except the backwaters.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil) : The backwaters are diminishing.

Shri Matthen: Yes. I am not at all minimising what the Minister has done; far from it.

Page 24 of the report of the Ministry speaks of the creation of a Ganga-Brahmaputra Water Transport Board. The Government of India had obtained the opinion of an expert from Holland by name Mr. Surie. He is reported to have suggested two alternatives for making these rivers more navigable: by deepening the channel by regulation works, canalisation, dredging, etc., or by using crafts specially designed to negotiate shallow stretches. What I do not understand is, why should it be "or"? Why not "and"? Along with using shallow flat bottomed vessels, the rivers should be dredged. The Ministry has accepted the latter, as the former is very expensive. In these days when you do not mind spending crores of rupees on steel factories and other projects, the subject of inland waterways which has tremendous employment potentialities,—as my hon. friend Shri Saksena just now mentioned, hundreds and thousands of boatmen will benefit by this,—has not received adequate attention at the hands of Government. Today most of our rivers are navigable only during the season lasting for

two or three months. Therefore, my submission is that both these alternatives should be tried.

At any rate I am glad of the formation of this Board. If the hon. Minister had more time to devote to this subject, matters would have been expedited. In South India the hon. Minister suggested a similar course, but for lack of co-operation and support from the Ministers concerned, he had to give it up. This is a very large subject and Ministers in South India are more concerned with power politics and linguistic reorganisations; I am sorry they have not got the vision to appreciate these large subjects.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, very often hon. Members make remarks on State Ministers. The States have got their own legislatures. If some of the Members of the State Legislatures were to make similar remarks about the Central Ministers, how will hon. Members relish it?

An. Hon. Member: They are not spared.

Mr. Speaker: That is very wrong. Hon. Members ought not to make sweeping remarks against State Ministers. In the State Legislatures it is not so done. The facts will speak for themselves. It is no good making remarks against a State Government, or State legislature or the Governor. They are not here to defend themselves, and there are good parliaments there and within limited spheres they are allotted powers under the Constitution.

I would request hon. Members to avoid such references, lest they also may start, though I am glad they have not so far started. They are not one, but about twenty.

Shri Matthen: I was not making any personal remarks, but was only commenting on the report.

Mr. Speaker: We have got other business to do.

Shri Matthen: I was only making comments on the report of the Ministry of Transport.

Mr. Speaker: Even that report is wrong. Does the report say that the other Ministers did not attend to this?

Shri Matthen: I was only expanding according to my light. The fact is that they refuse to co-operate. My only object was to impress on the Minister.....

Mr. Speaker: I took exception to the hon. Member's remark that the Ministers in South India do not pay as much attention to this subject as they do to power politics. If they did not co-operate with the Central Government, it is up to the hon. Member to suggest that this Government should take powers to carry on its affairs through its own agency. I can understand such a statement.

Shri Matthen: I am sorry, I withdraw that statement.

Shri L. B. Shastri: We have never said that they have not co-operated. It was suggested that there should be a Joint Board of the Travancore-Cochin State and Madras. They considered it separately and ultimately decided that they should have separate boards. That is the position. Whenever they form the Board we shall try to assist them as much as we can.

Shri Matthen: There is a suggestion in this connection. I am not making any remarks about anybody; I have no idea of doing so.

In regard to tourism I find that adequate response and co-operation is not coming from the States, whose well-wishers all of us are. In this matter until they are in a position to appreciate the position, I would expect the Minister to take up the matter from the Centre, because this is a very important factor on which the development of our economy depends. In regard to development of inland waterways I would suggest that powers to regulate them should be vested in Zonal Councils, because rivers go through different States. Let them have power to take these inland waterways themselves. I am glad the Buckingham canal is being developed by the Ministry in the Second Plan; so also is the case with the development of the West Coast canals, which are in my part of the country. But the provision of Rs. 1 lakh for investigating the former is very inadequate. Inland water transport is admittedly cheaper. Some more money should be spent on it. I think it is a penny wise and pound foolish policy not to spend more money on this.

Then I come to the roads. Due to the inherent efficiency, economy and flexibility of road transport, advanced countries of the west are taking more and more to it than they are doing in the case of railways. According to the Nagpur Plan, construction of 111,000 miles of new roads was envisaged by 1953-54. As was already pointed out, at the beginning of the First Plan, we had 97,000 miles of hard surface roads and 1,47,000 miles of earth roads. At the end of the Plan, we will be implementing one-third of the target of the Nagpur Plan. According to the estimates of the Second Plan, it may go up by another one-third. So even after eight years, we will not have reached the target contemplated by the Nagpur Plan which had not envisaged the economic development as a result of the two Plans. Therefore, my submission is that more funds should be given to develop roads.

I understand from one of the meetings of the Committee that it will be difficult to construct any new road because of lack of funds, and the utmost they can do is to complete the commitments they have already got. Having built up that tempo, it will be a great pity if it is not taken advantage of in developing more roads. I perfectly appreciate the limitation of the Commission which has a gap of Rs. 1,200 crores to implement the Second Plan. But within the limited means, we want to increase the efficiency of road transport.

In the first place, the vehicles must carry more weight. The original proposal of the Policy Committee of 1940 was that the weight limit should be raised to 32,000 lbs. per vehicle. The present permissible weight is from 14,500 lbs. to 20,000 lbs. This is one factor responsible for the high cost. I suggest that for National Highways, the weight stipulation should be a maximum of about 28,000 lbs., for State Highways, 22,000 lbs., and for other roads, about 20,000 lbs.

Another thing is with regard to smoother road surface. This will not only economise the cost but will also lengthen the life of the vehicles. Therefore, more funds devoted to smoothing of the roads will produce immediate results. It is far more important to ensure that existing roads, bridges and culverts are improved to carry an optimum load at greater speed and lower cost.

You are frightening me by looking at the clock.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is also expected to look at the clock.

Shri Matthen: I have been doing so with fear and trembling.

I admit there has been an increase in the motor vehicle sales recently, but compared with the pre-1950 period, the increase is considerably less. During 1920-21 to 1950-51, the annual increase was 12.5 per cent, but during the period 1950-51 to 1954-55, the increase was only 3.5 per cent. So there is a big leeway to be made up.

Then there is another point. It is true that we have not got funds enough. But if we can give the private sector, of course, creating a climate for it, an assurance that road transport, that is, new lines, will not be nationalised at least for, say, ten years, and if taxation is lightened, the private sector will provide the funds for construction of new roads. The real problem which is worrying the hon. Minister is in respect of the carrying capacity, how to cope with the increased tempo of economic activity without any additional cost.

Mr. Speaker: Normally I allow only 15 minutes. I have allowed the hon. Member 21 minutes.

Shri Matthen: I will finish with tourism.

Tourism is another very important department in which the Ministry has been taking considerable interest. Western countries like France, Italy, Switzerland and even U.K. are spending millions of pounds to develop tourism because it is a source of great invisible export. Our Government are doing it, but there is one serious handicap. In this, as in several others, we in South India are feeling neglected. Tourists come to Bombay, Delhi and then go to the Taj Mahal. They never go to the South. Is not the South worth seeing? I understand that in one or two years, most of the 'planes in which they will be travelling will be jet 'planes.

An Hon. Member: It should be encouraged.

Shri Matthen: But they cannot land in the Madras airport. I request the hon. Minister to look into it. I thought the Deputy Minister coming from Madras would have appreciated it more than I do. Today no international plane lands in Madras. You cannot expect a man

coming to Delhi to go all the way to Travancore-Cochin or Madura or Rameshwaram in train and see things. I admit that the hon. Minister's portfolio is not concerned with that. But he can do his level best and get the airport better equipped so that international planes may land there.

Even in respect of inland road development, I understand the State Governments are not giving adequate co-operation. They tell the Centre: 'You are the beneficiary. You get the foreign exchange. What do we care? We cannot spend any money'. So unless the Centre develops the roads and also takes up publicity, it will be difficult to attract tourists. I request the hon. Minister to ignore the State Governments. We are more a unitary State—80 per cent—than a federal one—I wish it was cent per cent.

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): He attacked the Ministers; now he is attacking the Constitution.

Shri Matthen: I appreciate the solicitude the Deputy Minister has for the Constitution. I wish he had more solicitude for his Ministry, with which he is mainly concerned.

This is a very important line of tremendous potential to South India. People from the North who have gone to the South, our part of the country, speak in golden terms of the pleasant surprise they have got, when they went and saw the South. I submit that more facilities must be provided and more publicity must be arranged for the beautiful places of South India which, I am sure, nobody will be sorry to visit.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I am unable to present any bouquets to the hon. Minister, because going through the details, I find that most of the subjects dealt with in the Transport Ministry indicate that the problems have not been seriously tackled and that there has been clear evidence of bungling in every one of them.

I do not propose to go into all the details which I have tried to raise in this House through my cut motions. But I must say that to the transport industry in India, the hon. Minister, as also the Government of India, have given something like a step-motherly treatment. If you go through the draft formulations of the Second Five Year Plan, you will find

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

that such a vital industry as the transport industry of India is dismissed with a mere observation contained in four or five lines. To me, it has very different problems because India, in the present context, cannot, and will not, develop to its full stature unless we open up more roads, unless we connect up the thousands of villages and also develop the motor transport industry to a greater extent. We know that the motor transport industry today has over 115,000 operating vehicles employing about 4 lakh people. The very basis of the industry is not secure. The tendency now is that wherever we were using petrol we are going in now for diesel because we find that the costs of operation of diesel trucks and diesel buses are less than those of operation on petrol. It is not as if we can go on importing diesel engines at the fantastic prices which we are paying through the nose today. Have we really started trying to go to the root of this problem? Have we really made an attempt to have diesel buses made in India? May be, the hon. Minister will turn round and say that this is a matter for the Ministry of Commerce and Industries. But, this is a very fundamental issue.

Then, there is also the question of amenities which are given to labour. As I said before, it covers over 4 lakhs of people in all parts of India. There is the State-owned industry, which, of course, has better working conditions than the private-owned industry. In the private-owned transport industry, the conditions are really abominable. I was going through a memorandum prepared by the Road Transport workers where it has quoted some figures from the International Labour Office bulletin. It states that in India the working hours for those who are engaged in the motor transport industry are 9 hours a day, the minimum driving time. In the Year Book on Labour Statistics, 1955, in which are extracted the figures for countries such as Canada, U.S.A., Japan, Philippines, France etc., I find that even today, in India alone the driving time is not less than 9 hours. I know that in the State Transport undertaking in Travancore-Cochin, for example, it is not only 9 hours, but it is 12 hours and 13 hours. Much worse is the case of the private-owned industry where sometimes it goes up to 17 hours.

We have seen several committees appointed. I ask the hon. Minister, have

we so far had any committee to enquire comprehensively into the problems of the transport industry? I am not speaking merely about labour. There are ever so many other aspects. Has the Government so far taken into consideration the necessity, the extremely urgent necessity, of having a very thorough enquiry into this industry which has a vital role to play in the future building up of our economy? That shows that the attitude of the Government or the Ministry in regard to this matter is but of a step-motherly nature. I would not go into the details of this, but I would only say that Government ought to change their attitude in this matter because the Railways alone cannot deliver the goods. The Railways have to be fed by the trucks, by the lorries, and in such a context I say that Government ought to take more interest.

There is another matter—I specifically refer to the Motor Vehicles Act. There is a Bill before this House. That does not change the situation at all. May be, here and there, there may be a change but the entire condition of the industry, even after passing the legislation which is before us—as I have read it—will not at all change. They talk of workers' participation. It has now become a fashion with the hon. Ministers to say that in the various portfolios in their particular Ministries, there is going to be a greater participation given to the workers. The trade unions are not recognised. There is the All India Federation of Road Transport Employees which is not recognised by the Central Government today. That is the only organisation of its kind in India and there is no other rival organisation and yet the Government of India is not recognising it. This being the attitude, I cannot understand how any credit can be given to the hon. Minister for running this particular branch of his Ministry so efficiently.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I would, therefore, suggest that first and foremost the Government should appoint a committee to make a comprehensive enquiry into the various questions relating to the transport industry not merely in the private transport industry but in all aspects—for the simple reason that we know that from the 3-ton trucks and 3-ton lorries which we were having some 4 or 5 years back, we are now trying to introduce, for the sake of economy, in their hundreds, trucks and lorries having 7, 8 and 9 tons. You know that operating or driving a truck which has got a

weight of 3 tons is very much different from operating an 8 or 9-ton truck. Whether it is a truck or a bus, it does not matter. Previously in a 3-ton bus the seating capacity was about 23 or 24 but in a 8-ton bus, the seating capacity is 65. The driver who has to run it on diesel oil—and it is reported that operation of diesel engines is more injurious to the driver—even apart from that) for driving that, has to spend much more energy, which is not compensated for. There are so many problems like this, but I do not want to go into details. What I want to urge upon the House and upon the hon. Minister is that the attitude which he is taking towards this problem of the motor transport industry must change and change at once.

I was looking up the Budget provision. There is some provision for communications in the coasts. I personally know that all along the coast in the South there are many accidents in the sea due to change in weather. I was rather amused. I had put a question on very definite information about an accident in the sea which deprived 4 or 5 fishermen of their lives. When the question was put on the list, I was away in my constituency. This accident happened very near my constituency. I knew that those persons had lost their lives. When the question was answered here, I read from the papers, the hon. Minister for Food, in answering the question, said that there was no accident at all. There is no protection given to the coastal vessels. All of them are not operated by machines.

Last year, when I was in China, I found what sort of warning they could give to the ships in the sea by what was called the warning tower. There were hundreds of them spread all along the coast. Except lighthouses, what have we got? We talk of communications, but do we have any network of communications on the coast which will afford adequate protection not merely to the vessels but also to the persons who go out into the deep sea for fishing? Is it not the duty of the Transport Ministry to ensure that at least this much of protection is given; or is it that I should plead these things before the Food Ministry? I want to know that.

I do not really know how I can speak on all the cut motions, but I would discuss some aspects about the shipping industry also. Many things have been said about the shipping industry and Shri Raghunath Singh, who is fortunately here, is an

authority on that. I do not want to cover the same ground. In the speech of the hon. Deputy Minister in reply to the Resolution of Shri Raghunath Singh I heard him say that Government were extending all possible help to the private sector in the shipping industry and Government are not prepared to erase the private sector from the shipping industry. The loans which were originally given at the rate of 66-2/3 per cent were raised upto 90 and even 95 per cent. And, Shri Alagesan, the Deputy Minister even said that the Government were prepared to give up to 100 per cent. Thank God, he did not say that they were prepared to give up to 110 or even 120 per cent. What really is the contribution of the private sector in shipping now? Have they kept up the glorious traditions of the shipping industry given to us by pioneers like the late V. O. Chidambaram Pillai? Is it not a fact that the private shipping industry has not kept pace with the developmental economy of this country? Is it not also a fact that out of the loans which are given by Government they reap profits while Government sits idle? I want to ask these questions very plainly. I do not talk about nationalisation. When Government are giving loans and when Government are subsidising the purchase of ships—for example, a ship which will normally cost about a crore of rupees is supplied to one of the Indian shipping companies at a subsidised rate and they need pay only at U.K. parity prices—the demand now seems to be too high and we must get it at world parity prices. About Rs. 40 to Rs. 45 lakhs will be the deficit, and Government loses this amount in delivering ships which are made in one of our shipyards. Besides this, all the purchase money up to 100 per cent—that is what Shri Alagesan said—is also invested by the Government as loan. What is their control?

Shri Alagesan: I do not remember that I have said so—I speak subject to correction. I do not know from where the hon. Member got it.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I have never been incorrect in such matters, as the hon. Minister very well knows. I was reading his speech only this morning and my memory is fresh. He said that Government are prepared even to go up to 100 per cent. I am not talking now of 100 per cent. Let it be for the purpose of argument 90 per cent. Shri Alagesan will agree that he said 90 per cent and I also agree to that for the time being.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Does the hon. Member withdraw his previous remark?

Shri V. P. Nayar: If you give 90 per cent of the purchase money in this way and incur a loss of Rs. 25 lakhs or Rs. 30 lakhs, I ask what is the case for continuing this sort of help when you talk of a socialist pattern of society. We know it for certain that the shipping industry has not discharged its functions properly.

Shri Alagesan: May I interrupt him for a moment? The Deputy Leader of his party wanted that in addition to these loans, subsidy should be given to private shipping companies, and it was in that context that I said something. I do not have the text of my speech before me now.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I have read the speech of Comrade Mukerjee also and I know where Shri Alagesan had misunderstood it. Now I ask a plain question: When we are prepared to loan 80 or 90 per cent of the purchase money of the ships which the private capitalists in India are to spend on the ships, why should we not give the same money and make an investment out of it? I do not say for a moment that immediately you have to nationalise it, but when Government is losing about Rs. 20 to Rs. 30 lakhs on ships which are supplied, and when Government is giving 90 per cent of the purchase money that is required in order to subsidise an industry which we know for certain has not discharged its functions as some other industries in the private sector have done, why is it that, considering the very vital significance of the shipping industry in India, Government feels reluctant to make this advance as an investment? There may be better terms of amortization; fifteen years may be quite good; but why not have it as a direct investment for a company? For years various Committees have pointed out the inadequacy of our shipping and we know also that overnight we cannot increase the tonnage by millions of tons. It is absolutely impossible. Do we have any doubts about it? The shipping interests always talk of the incidence of labour having increased the cost considerably and say that the cost is getting heavier and heavier. Has the Government made any enquiry to establish the exact incidence of the labour cost on the charge levied per ton of cargo handled by shippers? Do we have any figures to indicate whether the real

wages of the labour involved in the shipping industry have increased? Do we have any indication from official sources of figures to show how much of this is due to the system of stevedoring which we still have? A comprehensive enquiry as I said in the case of the road transport industry is also inevitable in the present context. I submit that when Government makes over another loan or advances even a rupee to the shipping industry, it must not be advanced as loan on favourable conditions of interest and amortization, but it should necessarily be given only as an investment. If that is done, we can at least hope that after a few years, the shipping industry will come in the way we want it to come. I know of the difficulties and that it is not possible to build shipyards here and there and increase the tonnage by millions of tons. It is a long process and India has to go a long way for this. But even today when the hon. Minister gets up and says that we are not prepared to erase the private industry, we must look at facts. Is there a case for the private industry which justifies this sort of continuance of loans on very advantageous terms when the industry has completely failed to fulfil its very important role? It is not a case like the textile industry or the jute industry or anything like that. The reason is not far to seek; it is because there are some disadvantages. Let us consider the question of the overseas shipping. It is good that we say that Government is trying to get Indian ships into the conference line and all that. I remember—I speak subject to correction—that a few weeks or months back the foreign shipping interests tried to enhance the shipping rates, and it was Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, of all persons, who said that if it is done, governmental action will be taken. I am glad I got at least one opportunity to give my bouquets to him, but I understand later....

Shri Raghunath Singh: Not half-hearted, but full-hearted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Anyhow it is a bouquet.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I do not give half-hearted bouquets at all. When Shri T. T. Krishnamachari came out with his announcement, the foreign shipping monopolies were forced to confine themselves to their old rates, but they took the advantage by the backdoor, by resorting to a system of what is called 'surcharge'. I have not been able to work out the implications in rupees, annas and pies of the surcharge, but I find it is there.

Then there is the question of unloading *en route*. Supposing a steamer gets a cargo of 3,000 tons booked for Aden. Even today it can be unloaded at Aden, and from Aden the same space cannot be filled. I want to know what the Government has done as a government to see that this sort of thing does not happen with our overseas shipping. It is difficult to get a shipload in full from a port in India, say, Bombay or Calcutta, up to London. On one or other of the wayside ports they have necessarily to unload and reload from there. If that is not allowed, then it is one of the reasons for keeping down our activities in the matter of overseas shipping. We know also that the Government has done precious little although they say it is beyond them.

An Hon. Member: That is what they always say.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Shri Alagesan stated last time that they sounded certain interests in India to get into a joint venture but that he was not encouraged. That is precisely the reason why we should not hereafter advance loans either for overseas shipping or for the coastal trade, because even when the Minister or the Ministry sounds a joint participation, the shippers know that they can make hay while the sun shines.

We know that in India water transport is costlier, as Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri knows it. A ton of coal brought to the Cochin Port by water course will be costing very much more than if brought by railways from the Bengal-Bihar collieries to the Cochin Port. I understand that the difference will be over Rs. 15 a ton. Why is it that when in all other countries water transport is very much cheaper than any other form of transport, in our own country India, water transport should necessarily be like this? We know for one thing that the vessels which have to come round Ceylone. I do not know how the Sethusamudram Project is progressing or how it stands now.

In regard to one more point—and I have done—I want to speak specifically about the attitude of the Government in the matter of some bridges and certain roads which are very essential for the defence of our country. As you know, in the Bengal border there are some roads. Even there the Minister can get up and say that it is a matter for the Defence Ministry, but there are certain roads, for

example, from Swarupnagar to Hakimpur and from Swarupnagar to Koijhuri. These are the roads which the Transport Ministry has to take up. It is not for the West Bengal Government to take up such a road because it is very important for the defence and security of the country.

I come to bridges. A bridge has to be constructed at a place called Aroor Mukkum. I often pass that way and I have been seeing the development. The water is 40-50' deep there and the foundation stone for the construction of the bridge at that place was laid by the Chief Minister about two or three years back. Even now the foundation stone is there but there is no bridge. No attempt has been made to construct the bridge.

The President also laid a foundation stone very recently in another place called Alwaye but here too nothing has been done further. The Transport Ministry should at least attempt to take up the work on hand. People had some hope that the bridges would be constructed but they now feel that it has almost become a farce. A lot of goods had to be carried across that water to reach Cochin which is a growing and important port. After two years of the laying of the foundation, not even the articles required for a preliminary survey to construct the bridge have been procured and I do not know how we could hope for a bridge there in the next Plan. Because you are very anxious I am not inclined to continue.

Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Dist.—East): I have been watching ever since this debate on the Budget and on various Demands started and each corner of the House has been going on pressing for more and more expenditure as each Ministry's Demands came up. Probably, I feel, the same demands to which we have listened today, will be made when the Demands for the Education, the Health, etc. Ministries come up. And they will turn round and say: Parliament is the authority; give us more money and we will spend. I feel that in the national context and also in the context of so many things that are happening these days, it is very necessary that we should take a balanced view of the situation. It is no use; so many things are important for this country of nearly four hundred millions with abject poverty, squalor, neglect and all these things.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Despair, misery, what not.

Shri T. N. Singh: What not—and the legacy of so many thousands of years of slavery.

An Hon. Member: Thousands?

Shri T. N. Singh: Yes. What will happen if we start running after everything that attracts us like children who say: 'let us have it.'? Where will we be? Should we keep a balance or not? When we discuss the Demands on various Ministries I would very strongly urge on this House that they should not press for more and more expenditure. Our resources are very limited; our problems are unlimited. We have to be very careful and cautious in husbanding our resources to the utmost.

With this preliminary observation I shall now examine the Demands of the Ministry of Transport. It is all right for people to say that Indian shipping is very important and it should be encouraged at all costs and millions and millions should be invested, or the private industry should be subsidised and so on. Some want to nationalise it. All kinds of suggestions may be made. We should not be carried away by such slogans. Let us see what we can do. What are our limitations and how far can we go? To start with, I personally feel that it is high time that we understood as to how far we could subsidise the private industry. Indian shipping has got a good deal of help—probably, in the opinion of some, much more than what it should have got. We have got to be careful about it. We are not clear about certain of these things in our minds nor do I think that the House has given a guidance. Neither the Estimates Committee nor the Public Accounts Committee have given us any guidance as to how far it should be nationalised and where the line should be drawn in the structure of the various enterprises. Some say that it should be mixed or semi-Government while some others say that it should be totally Government. All these are yet to be considered. I regret that very few people give thought to this problem and yet we go on suggesting spending this much and that much. We have to see that there exists a proper administrative set-up, well-thought-out rules and regulations as to the manner in which this shall be done. If it is a mixed organisation or semi-Government organisation what will be the position? Will it be a statutory corporation or some other kind of management? All these things should be thought of before we embark on all kinds of

suggestions in this House especially because it happens to attract our attention when this Demand is considered. I would, therefore, through you, Sir, warn them to be very careful when they talk of subsidising the private industry, this and that. If it can be called hesitation, I welcome it. Things cannot be done as everyone of us wants and the Ministry cannot rush things in this manner. I congratulate the Minister on this point and I entirely disagree with the views of those who want to rush things and get all kinds of assistance to each and every private industry which is running shipping today. I have been in the know of these things for some months now and I think that it is a wrong tendency which must be checked.

I heard with great attention the speech of an hon. Member about the development of waterways. Look at the investment required and the enormity and scope of the problem. It is a huge country and there are thousands of rivers—some of them partly navigable and others not at all navigable. Let us make the inland waters navigable—he said so. Is that the way to proceed about it? We cannot do it like that. I am sure in this unfortunate country of ours, if it so happens and the Minister starts having waterways and developing them, it will so happen that the big rivers like Jumna and Ganga will come in first and each one will then think that his province has been neglected. All charges and counter-charges will be levelled on the floor of this very House. So, all these have to be thought out very carefully.

I regret very much a suggestion that has come from one of our Committees which I have held in the highest esteem and regard the Estimates Committee. I personally think that it should be none of the business of our Committees to suggest additions to Ministries. Have another Ministry or two—such are the suggestions. Where shall we end? I do not like this kind of thing—I may say very frankly. As a matter of fact, I feel that the Ministry of Railways and Transport—especially the Transport Ministry mostly does some co-ordination job. Three-fourths of the work with which this Ministry is associated is being done in the States—I mean, the building of roads. They are all State subjects. Why should we go on multiplying our Ministries for something that the States are doing. I am very much opposed to interference with the initiative of the States. This is almost a matter of principle with

me because we should decentralise our work as much as possible. That is the way to achieve some results in this country. What is the use of our saying that we have no faith in this or that State? Everyone will have grievances. We are accustomed to airing our grievances against anybody and everybody and on that basis go on changing the administrative set-up. In that way one can suggest the setting up of a dozen Ministries. As a matter of fact, one can ask for all kinds of Ministries, one can think of including a Ministry for entertainment. So I would very strongly deprecate any idea of multiplying our Ministries without due and valid reason, and for Transport to be made into a separate Ministry, unless we want a few more Ministers, I do not see any reason.....

An Hon. Member: That is the reason.

Shri T. N. Singh:..... to go for it.

What is wrong now? Let us take a rational view of our inland waterways. I say it is beyond our resources to take up the various rivers and make them all navigable for 500 or 600 miles. If the Ministry has decided to encourage flat-bottomed vessels for transport purposes what is wrong with it except that some more money is going to be spent on it? I think that is the only sensible way to tackle this problem within our limited resources. I for one, probably, has earned a bad name of being very stingy or opposing expenses. I want to scrutinise everything. I am very strict personally. Therefore, I do not want money to be spent on a large scale, when our resources are very limited, on all kinds of things which are desirable. They may be good things but there is a time to spend. We cannot do it at present. We have got so many things to be done under the Five Year Plan in view of the things that are happening those days. Therefore I would very strongly urge, let us go slow in all these things.

Having done with shipping and waterways, I would now like to deal with the subject of road transport. I feel that road transport these days is a costly affair. We, the consumers or the people of this country, are paying the manufacturers about 80 per cent more price for each vehicle that is brought here. It is a highly protected industry. Who is paying for it? It is the user who is paying. It is an accepted axiom for investments that in days when machinery and plants cost high it is not always desirable to

launch on big capital programmes. It is in days of low prices that big capital projects should be generally launched upon. Now, I will tell you about the history of this subject in Germany. In the years 1932, 1933 and 1934—those were the days of low prices—they launched on heavy capital expenditure. That was a wise thing to do. But, here, apart from the heavy prices that are ruling in this country, because of the protection we are giving to the motor vehicle industry, we are paying through our nose very heavy prices and, mind you, depreciation on a motor vehicle is very high. The highest depreciation rate is applicable to motor vehicles. In 3, 4 or 5 years they must be renewed or replaced. That is the position. Therefore, in that regard, as one who wants public money to be spent after due care and scrutiny, I would very strongly urge, let us think twice before launching on a very large-scale programme of road transport.

Then there is another thing. People are saying that nationalisation of transport is going on all right in so many States. But, even with these high prices the motor operators in Punjab—all credit to them—are able to compete successfully with the Railways. Here the private *motor-car-walas* want all kinds of help and assistance from the Government. What for? So that inefficient transport service may be pushed up with public money. That should not be done.

As a matter of fact, I quite agree that we should explore the possibility of manufacturing diesel engines on a larger scale in India. I think it has now become possible. I endorse Shri V. P. Nayar's remarks that we should try to manufacture these. I do not know how far that comes within the purview of our Transport Ministry. But, if the Government will try to manufacture diesel engines, probably, we can manufacture them and also at competitive rates. That is my view and it should be possible. Petrol engines will be very difficult to be manufactured in the present context of things, but with diesel engines I have hopes. Probably we may manufacture them in larger numbers and then it is worthwhile expanding our capacity to manufacture more and more diesel engines. So far as road transport is concerned that is what I would strongly urge.

Then there is a small point about the roads themselves. I say if we can concentrate more on feeder roads that would be a good thing. The States have

[Shri T. N. Singh]

very poor finances. With regard to national highways we are trying to finance them as far as possible and it does not seem possible now to help them. But, if you want the cultivator to get good prices for his products it is no use having these big roads. They cannot help beyond a certain limit that category of people who are getting very poor prices for their products. If they had feeder roads—which item is essentially a responsibility of the State Governments—it would help them in getting good prices for their products. So, having smooth roads, first class national highways and that kind of thing can be thought of when the nation becomes prosperous. Now let us carry on with what we have.

Shri B. D. Pande (Almora Distt. North-East): Not even pucca roads?

Shri T. N. Singh: Of course, up to Garhwal.

In winding up, I would only urge let us be very conscious of our limitations; try to do whatever we can with our limited resources and not launch on ambitious programmes which we cannot manage. Then only I think we can proceed properly.

श्री राधा रमण (दिल्ली नगर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सर्वप्रथम अपने परिवहन विभाग यानी ट्रांसपोर्ट मंत्रालय को उस की अब तक की सफलताओं के लिये बधाई देना चाहता हूँ। मेरा अपना ऐसा विश्वास है कि इस मंत्रालय ने अब तक जो कुछ काम किया है वह अपनी शक्ति के अनुसार बहुत अच्छा किया है। यह ठीक है कि हमारा देश बहुत बड़ा है और उस की आवश्यकतायें भी इतनी हैं कि अगर हम इन को साल ब साल इस सदन के सामने रखते चले जायें तो बहुत वर्ष लगेंगे जब हर एक सदस्य इस सदन का यह कह सकेगा कि जो माँग उस ने सदन के सामने रखी थी, वे पूरी हुई हैं।

2 P.M.

जैसा कि अभी हमारे भाई श्री टी०एन०सिंह जी ने कहा कि जब हम इस प्रकार की माँगें सदन के सामने रखते हैं तो हमें इस बात का ध्यान आवश्यक रखना चाहिये कि हर एक मंत्रालय को अपने अपने काम को अधिक से अधिक बढ़ाने और हमारे देशवासियों को अधिक से अधिक संतोष देने के लिये एक परिमित परिमाण में ही रकम मिल सकती है, और यदि इस परिमित परिमाण की

रकम को वह हर एक सदस्य की हर एक इच्छा को पूर्ण करने में किसी तरह लगा दे तो सम्भवतः हमारी कोई भी इच्छा पूर्ण नहीं होगी, सब की सब इच्छायें अधूरी रह जायेंगी। इसलिये यह बहुत आवश्यक है कि हर मंत्रालय अपने काम के फैलाव में इन सारी चीजों को देखे कि कहां अधिक आवश्यकता है और कहां पर अधिक से अधिक रकम खर्च करनी चाहिये, जिस के खर्च करने से अधिक से अधिक संख्या में हमारे देशवासियों को संतोष मिल सके।

मेने अभी इस मंत्रालय के विषय में माननीय सदस्यों ने जो विचार प्रकट किये उन को सुना। जहां तक शिपिंग (नौवहन) का तालुक है, मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में जब से वह स्वतन्त्र हुआ है, इस सम्बन्ध में काफी प्रगति हुई है, और हमें यह बात भली प्रकार मालूम होगी कि हमारे देश का नैविगेशन (नौ-परिवहन) बहुत ही अन्दर डेवलप्ड (अधिक-कसित) और बहुत ही गुरुत्वात् की स्टेज में हमारे हाथों में आया था, जिस समय कि हम स्वतन्त्र हुए थे। इतना होते हुए भी मंत्रालय ने इस विषय पर काफी ध्यान दिया है और भले ही जो नये शिप्स (जलयान) तैयार किये गये हैं और जो सुविधायें हम को उन जहाजों में चलने और भ्रमण करने की मिलने लगी हैं वह पर्याप्त न हों, लेकिन फिर भी हम इस बात को सामने रखकर संतोष कर सकते हैं कि हमारा काम आगे बढ़ रहा है। मंत्रालय के लिये जरूर यह सोचने की आवश्यकता है कि जितनी तेजी से हम कदम बढ़ाना चाहते हैं या हमारे देशवासी हमारी सरकार के कदम जितनी तेजी से बढ़ते देखना चाहते हैं, यदि उस में किसी प्रकार का दोष या किसी प्रकार की कमी है तो उसे कम से कम समय में और अधिक से अधिक मात्रा में दूर किया जाना चाहिये।

इस विषय में मैं बहुत ज्यादा न कहता हुआ सिर्फ रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट (सड़क परिवहन) के बारे में कुछ अपने विचार रखना चाहूंगा। हमारे देश के अन्दर एक बहुत बड़ा प्रोग्राम (कार्यक्रम) पिछली पंचवर्षीय योजना के मातहत चला और एक बहुत बड़ा प्रोग्राम (कार्यक्रम) रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट (सड़क परिवहन) और नेशनल हाइवेज (राष्ट्रीय राजपथ) बगैरह का हमारे सामने अगली पंचवर्षीय योजना के मातहत आने वाला है। मैं इस राय से विस्तृत इत्तफाक रखता हूँ कि जहां हमें बड़े बड़े नेशनल हाइवेज (राष्ट्रीय राजपथ) बनाने चाहिये, या जो

हमारी ऐसी सड़कें हैं जिन के द्वारा हम आने-जाने और भ्रमण के कार्यों को ज्यादा सुचारू और अच्छा बना सकते हैं, उन को हमें हाथ में लेना चाहिये क्योंकि आम जनता को एक दूसरे के साथ मिलाने या एक दूसरे के साथ उस का सम्पर्क बढ़ाने की बड़ी आवश्यकता है, और अगर हम ऐसा करें तो हमें देश को एकता में बांधने में बड़ी आसानी होगी। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि आज हमारा ध्यान अधिकतर बड़ी बड़ी सड़कों की तरफ और इस प्रकार के भ्रमणकारी साधनों जैसे बड़ी बड़ी बसों या मोटरकारों की तरफ अथवा कलात्मक वैहिकल्स की तरफ ही जाता है। इस के कारण हमारे गांवों में और छोटे छोटे कस्बों में अब तक जो आने-जाने के या भ्रमण करने के साधन थे वह आहिस्ता आहिस्ता खत्म होते जा रहे हैं या उसी दशा में पड़े हैं जिनमें वे आज से बीस या पच्चीस वर्ष पहले थे। कभी कभी जब हमें उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार या अन्य प्रदेशों के गांवों में, कस्बों में और छोटे शहरों में जाने का मौका मिलता है तो पता चलता है, और देखने में भी आता है, कि आज से बीस या पच्चीस वर्ष पहले जो वहां पर एक बहुत पुराने किस्म का गड़्ढा या इक्का चलता था वही चलता चला आता है। उन पर बैठने वालों को कितनी कठिनाई होती है और उन इक्के वालों को भी आने-जाने के नये साधनों के कारण कितना कष्ट उठाना पड़ता है, इस की तरफ हमारी सरकार की तबज्जह होनी चाहिये। जहां हम इन यातायात के नवीन साधनों को या आने-जाने और भ्रमणकारी साधनों को अपने देश में फैलाना चाहते हैं वहां हमें पुराने साधनों को भी बिल्कुल खत्म नहीं करना चाहिये, बल्कि नये नये सुझाव रखकर उनको बढ़ाना चाहिये प्रगति देनी चाहिये, उनमें जिस प्रकार के भी इम्प्रूवमेंट (सुधार) हो सकें उन को हमें करना चाहिये। हम देखते हैं कि अगर आप सारे देश के छोटे छोटे शहरों, छोटे बड़े गांवों और कस्बों में जायें तो किस्म किस्म की रिकशायें, तांगे, चक्के और अन्य प्रकार के वाहन मिलेंगे। कई जगह इन्हें मनुष्य स्वयं चलाते हैं जिस के कारण उनमें बैठकर सफर करने की इच्छा भी नहीं होती है। जहां हमारा मंत्रालय इस बात की कोशिश कर रहा है कि आने-जाने और भ्रमण के साधनों को बढ़ाया जाये और उनके उपयोग में यात्रियों को ज्यादा सुविधा हो, वहां हमें इस बात का भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि जो पुराने तरीके के साधन हैं, जिनको हम अपने गांवों में, कस्बों में या अपने प्रदेशों के छोटे छोटे इलाकों में वर्षों से देख रहे हैं, और जिनमें हजारों की तादाद में काम करने

वाले लगे हुए हैं और अपना पेट भर रहे हैं, उनमें भी आहिस्ता आहिस्ता इम्प्रूवमेंट (सुधार) हो। उनमें सुधार करने की ओर हमारे मंत्रालय को अवश्य ध्यान देना चाहिये। हम अपने देश के अन्दर हजारों बसें चला दें, बड़ी बड़ी सड़कें बना दें और उनके ऊपर बहुत तेजी से वे बसें दौड़ने लगे और लोगों को भी अधिक आराम होने लग जाये, अगर हमारा दृष्टिकोण यह होना चाहिये इन नये नये साधनों के कारण पुराने साधनों को हम अपने गांवों, कस्बों और शहरों से निकाल न दें क्योंकि ऐसा करने से एक प्रकार से हम बेकारी बढ़ाने चले जाते हैं। हमें इसकी ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये कि हम उन में कुछ सुधार करें और ऐसे सुधार करें जिनसे उनमें शारीरिक शक्ति कम खर्च हो, उन के चलने-फिरने में ज्यादा तेजी आ जाये। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि इस प्रकार का कार्य बहुत अच्छा होगा और साथ ही साथ जहां हम यातायात के बारे में हर प्रकार की प्रगति कर रहे हैं वहां हम इन शक्तियों का भी इस्तेमाल अपने यातायात के काम में, भ्रमण के काम में और आने-जाने के काम में कर सकेंगे।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में नैशनल हाईवेज (राष्ट्रीय राजपथ) जो हैं वे बढ़ते ही जा रहे हैं, आने जाने की जो सुविधायें हैं वे भी ज्यादा होती जा रही हैं, लेकिन हमारे मंत्रालय को एक बात का ध्यान अवश्य रखना चाहिये कि नैशनल हाईवेज (राष्ट्रीय राजपथों) पर जितने भी ब्रिज अथवा पुल आते हैं या तो वे ओवर ब्रिज हों या अन्डर ब्रिज हों क्योंकि इससे आने जाने वालों को बहुत सुविधा होगी। मैं देखता हूँ कि आज हमारी सड़कें बहुत लम्बी लम्बी हैं। चाहे हम मोटर में चलें, चाहे हम गाड़ी में चलें या ट्रक में चलें, किसी भी तरीके से चलें, हम को बहुत से रास्ते ऐसे मिलेंगे जहां पर रेलगाड़ियों के आने-जाने के कारण पुकों को बन्द कर दिया जाता है और वहां पर यात्रियों को अपने वाहन के साथ खड़ा होना पड़ता है और बाज दफा तो वहां पर काफी वक्त लग जाता है क्योंकि ट्रेन के आने तक मोटर गाड़ियों और बसों को वहां पर रुकना पड़ता है। इस लिये इस की ओर भी ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। मैं ऐसा नहीं समझता हूँ कि इसमें बहुत ज्यादा खर्च होगा। बल्कि मेरा तो यह स्थान है कि शनैः शनैः अगर इस पर ध्यान दिया जाये और मंत्रालय इन हाईवेज को इन कठिनाइयों से सुरक्षित कर दे तो उसमें रेलगाड़ियों के आने-जाने से भी कोई

[श्री राधा रमण]

बाबा नहीं पड़ेगी और लोगों को भी बहुत सुविधा हो जायेगी ।

अब मैं ज्यादा वक्त न लेते हुए कुछ बातें दिल्ली ट्रांसपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में भी कहना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि यह मेरे अपने सूबे से ताल्लुक रखता है । जो रिपोर्ट पेश हुई है उसमें इस की व्यवस्था को बड़ा अच्छा बताया गया है और उसमें मुनाफा भी दिखाया गया है । मैं यह बात जरूर मानता हूँ कि दिल्ली ट्रांसपोर्ट का काम साल-ब-साल बेहतर होता जाता है । हमने जो टारगेट (लक्ष्य) पहले पांच साला प्लान (योजना) में रखे उनको हमने प्राप्त कर लिया है और प्लान के अन्त तक ४०० बसों के चलाने की जो बात कही थी वह पूरी हो गई है । लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो संख्या की बात हमने कही थी, वह तो अवश्य पूरी कर ली है । लेकिन इनमें से बहुत सी ऐसी बसें हैं जो बहुत पुरानी हैं और जी० एन० आई० टी० के समय से हमारे पास हैं । और इन में बहुत सी ऐसी बसें भी हैं जो डीजल से चलती हैं । डीजल से चलने वाली बसों का आजकल बहुत ज्यादा प्रचार हो रहा है और इनको ज्यादा पसन्द किया जा रहा है । इसका कारण यह है कि ये सस्ती पड़ती हैं और इनको चलाने में खर्च भी कम आता है । लेकिन यह बसें बहुत बुरा धुआं फेंकती हैं और जब यह घनी बस्तियों में इस प्रकार धुआं फेंकती गुजरती हैं तो पीछे पैदल चलने वाले लोगों को बड़ा कष्ट पहुंचता है । यहां तक कि वह बीमारी का शिकार भी बन जाते हैं । इस वास्ते ऐसी जगहों पर इन डीजल वाली बसों को न चलाया जाए तो अच्छा है । उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं और दूसरे माननीय सदस्य भी जानते हैं कि दिल्ली सूबा एक ऐसा सूबा है जो सबसे ज्यादा डेंसली पापुलेटेड है यानि घनी आबाद है । यही एक ऐसा सूबा है जिसको कि यह फर्रुहासिल है कि वह अपने अन्दर बाहर वालों को जञ्ब करता जाता है । आज भी हजारों की तादाद में लोग आ कर दिल्ली में बस रहे हैं और यहां पर समाते जाते हैं । जब यह बात है तो हमें इस बात पर भी विचार करना चाहिये कि हम उन बसों को, जोकि पुरानी हैं, जो एन० आई० टी० के वक्त की हैं जिनके एंजिनों में डीजल आयल के जलने का तरीका पुराना है, जिनमें से बहुत ज्यादा धुआं निकलता है जिससे कि चलने वालों को तकलीफ होती है, हटा लें और उनकी जगह नई बसें चलायें ।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो शैल्टर आपने बनाये हैं वह बिल्कुल नाकाफी तो हैं ही लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ उन का जो आकार है वह भी बहुत छोटा है और बारिश से तथा धूप से बचने के लिये जितनी हिफाजत की वहां पर जरूरत होनी चाहिये वह नहीं होती है । आपने अगली पंच-वर्षीय योजना के दौरान में १०० नये शैल्टर बनाने का इरादा किया है । इस के लिये मैं आप को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ । साथ ही साथ मैं यह जरूर अर्ज करता हूँ, कि जो आप नये शैल्टर बनायें उन में दो बातों का अवश्य ख्याल रखें । मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि सफर करने वाले यात्रियों की तादाद दिन-प्रति-दिन बढ़ती जा रही है और जो पीक आवर्ज में सफर करते हैं उन सब के लिये शैल्टर प्रोवाइड नहीं किया जा सकता है । आज कल जो शैल्टर बनाये गये हैं उन में १०-१५ आदमियों से ज्यादा खड़े नहीं हो सकते हैं । बाकी जो लोग बच जाते हैं उन को धूप में या बारिश में ही खड़ा रहना पड़ता है । अगर आप इन सब के लिये शैल्टर प्रोवाइड नहीं कर सकते तो कम से कम इतने बड़े शैल्टर तो बनायें जिन को कि संतोषजनक कहा जा सके । साथ ही साथ धूप और बारिश से बचने के लिये उन के आकार में कुछ परिवर्तन किया जाना चाहिये । मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्रालय इस ओर ध्यान दे ।

एक बात अब मुझे टूरिज्म (पर्यटन) के सम्बन्ध में कहनी है । आपने इस सिलसिले में एक एडवाइजरी कमेटी बनाई है और कुछ आफिसिस भी खोले हैं और अगले पांच सालों के लिये आप के पास एक एम्बीशंस प्रोग्राम (महत्व-कांक्षी कार्यक्रम) भी है । मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि दिल्ली एक बहुत ही सुन्दर शहर है और भ्रमणकारियों को इतनी ज्यादा तादाद में आकर्षित कर सकता है कि हमें बहुत ज्यादा आमदनी होने की आशा हो सकती है । लेकिन अगर हम चाहें कि जितनी भी सुन्दर जगहें हैं, जितनी भी अच्छी-अच्छी जगहें हैं, जितने भी देखने लायक जगहें हैं उन सब जगहों पर होटलों का प्रबन्ध कर दें, रेस्ट हाउसिस का प्रबन्ध कर दें, यात्रियों के लिये सुख-सुविधाओं का प्रबन्ध कर दें और यह भी एक या दो साल में, तो यह नामुमकिन सी बात है । लेकिन मैं यह जरूर सोचता हूँ कि इस तरफ यदि आप थोड़ा सा खर्च कर दें तो आप को आमदनी काफी हो सकती है और जितना आप खर्च करेंगे उस के साथ आमदनी बढ़ भी सकती है । इस के बारे में

अभी मिस्टर सिंह ने भी कहा और मैं भी कहता हूँ कि अगर इस तरफ आप का ध्यान ज्यादा हो और आप उन स्थानों पर कि जहाँ यात्रियों को आकर्षित किया जा सकता है, या जहाँ यात्री जा कर खुश हो सकते हैं, सस्ते और अच्छे रेस्ट हाउसिस बना दें तो अच्छा होगा। आपने टूरिज्म को बढ़ावा देने के लिये लखनऊ बसिस का भी इन्तजाम किया है। लखनऊ बसिस का मतलब यह है कि जिन लोगों के पास पैसा है, जो धनी लोग हैं, वही इन का लाभ उठा सकते हैं। मैं भ्रज कहूँगा कि जहाँ आप लखनऊ बसिस चलाते हैं वहाँ आप को बहुत साधारण और चीप बसिस भी चलानी चाहिये जिन्हें साधारण यात्री पिकनिक इत्यादि के लिये भी उपयोग में ला सकें। यदि आप सस्ती बसिस चलायेंगे तो अधिक संख्या में यात्री फायदा उठा सकेंगे। थोड़े आदमियों को आराम पहुँचाने की गज्र से आप जो महंगी बसिस चलायेंगे उन से आप को जितना फायदा होगा उस से ज्यादा फायदा सस्ती बसें चलाने से हो सकता है।

अब आखिरी बात मैं रेस्ट हाउसिस के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ और मैं आशा करता हूँ कि उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, भूजे आप एक मिनट और देंगे। दिल्ली भारत की राजधानी है। यहाँ पर पहले एक रेस्ट हाउस हुआ करता था और वह भी रिक्तिंग सेंटर बन गया है। एक हार्डिंग सराय जो किसी जमाने में बनी थी इतनी सस्ती थी कि वह हमेशा इतनी भरी रहती है जिसका हदोहिसाब ही नहीं। जो होटल हैं जिन में कि यात्री लोग ठहर सकते हैं, उन की जो हालत है वह मैं समझता हूँ, जो संसद सदस्य दिल्ली में रहते हैं, वे खूब अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ दिल्ली एक ऐतिहासिक नगर है, यहाँ अनेक चीजें हैं जो कि देखने के काबिल हैं। राजधानी होने के नाते भी हजारों यात्री यहाँ आते हैं और अधिक आ सकते हैं। लेकिन फिर भी क्या कारण है कि यहाँ पर एक भी रेस्ट हाउस आप नहीं बना सके हैं ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर गवर्नमेंट के पास पैसा नहीं है तो गवर्नमेंट ऐसी स्कीम जारी कर सकती है कि जिस स्कीम में प्राइवेट रुपया लगा कर यात्रियों को उन से कंट्रोल रेट पर पैसा ले कर वहाँ पर ठहराया जा सके और उन की सुख-सुविधाओं की देख-भाल हो सके।

अन्त में मैं मंत्रालय को जो काम उस ने किया है उस के लिये बधाई देता हूँ और साथ ही साथ मैं आशा करता हूँ कि अभी तक जो काम मंत्रालय

नहीं कर पाया है उस को वह भविष्य में तेजी से और उत्सुकता से करेगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Before I call upon the next speaker I have to make an announcement. The following are the selected cut motions relating to various Demands under the Ministry of Transport which have been indicated by the Members to be moved :

Demand No.	No. of Cut Motions				
95	305, 780, 785,	306, 781, 786,	307, 782, 787,	390, 783, 788.	779, 784,
96	789,	790,	791,	793,	794.
97	795,	796.			
99	797,	798.			
100	799,	800.			
141	802,	803.			
142	804.				

Scope for developing Tourist Traffic in the Chulka-Gopalpur Area

Shri U. C. Patnaik : I beg to move:

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

Need for Naval Co-operation in building Ships for Coastal Trade

Shri U. C. Patnaik : I beg to move:

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

Provision for Easy Conversion of Merchant Vessels for Naval Use in Emergencies

Shri U. C. Patnaik : I beg to move :

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

Necessity for Co-ordinating the Three Defence Services for Defence Needs of Harbours, Ports and Lighthouses

Shri U. C. Patnaik : I beg to move :

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

National Highways and Bridges in Karnataka

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

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

Policy in regard to the Shipping Freight on Coastal and Foreign Shipping

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Inadequate Expansion of Mercantile Marine

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Policy regarding Tourist Traffic

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Lack of Regular Shipping Service from Calicut to Laccadives and Maldives.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Delay in Bringing Forward Necessary Legislation in the Matter of Motor Vehicles

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Policy of Developing Minor Ports

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Failure to Make Arrangement for a Ship Building Base at Cochin Port

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Failure to Construct near Kurnool a Road Bridge over Tungabhadra River

Shri Gadilingana Gowd: I beg to move:

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

Policy in the Matter of Coastal and Foreign Shipping

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Construction of Bhatkal Port on the West Coast

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

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

Delay in starting a Rating Training Establishment on the West Coast

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Labour Policy in Regard to the Employment of Labour in Ports

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Attitude in Regard to the Labour in Cochin Port

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Construction of Major Port Near Malapay and Karwar

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

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

Inadequacy of proper arrangements for warning ships against bad weather

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Lack of proper Communication in the Coastal regions to help Sea-Going Craft

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Need for Construction of Bridges over all Major River Connecting Highways

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

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

Delay in constructing the bridge at Aroor Mukkan and Alway in Travancore-Cochin

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Labour employed in the Delhi Road Transport Authority

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Working of the Delhi Road Transport Authority

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Inadequacy of outlay on roads in Travancore-Cochin State having regard to the special unemployment position in the State

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Capital Outlay on Roads' be reduced by Rs. 100."

3—30 L. S.

Policy in regard to Capital Outlay in road building

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Capital Outlay on Roads' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Policy regarding expenditure under Other Capital Outlay on the Ministry of Transport

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All these cut motions are now before the House. It is now time for me to call upon the hon. Minister. But if Mr. Patnaik can give his points in five minutes I shall allow him—though for that also I have to snatch from the Minister's time.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ghumsur): We are at present faced with a very important problem, and that is whether to curtail our planning expenditure, the expenditure of the different Ministries, in order to meet any contingency in the international sphere. From that point of view I beg to point out that in all the other countries there is no such air-tight or water-tight compartmental system in the different Ministries as we have got here in India as the heritage of British bureaucracy. In other countries there is a co-ordination of the different departments. As the time given to me is very short I shall point out in a few sentences how the Transport Ministry is not to be viewed merely as a Ministry in charge of water transport, sea transport, road transport and tourist traffic, but it is also an auxiliary to the other departments whose expenditure has got to be increased. And to some extent the Ministry of Transport will have to see that we strengthen our national defences through this transport organisation, which is being done in other countries.

I would point out that in every other country the merchant navy, which was formerly called the Mercantile Marine is considered to be the second line of naval defence. In the U.K., practically the entire naval defence organisation has been built up on the mercantile marine, built even earlier by mediaeval Buccaneers, Pirates and others. You know, Sir, that the first aircraft carrier built by the

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

U.K.—the *Angus*—in 1914-17 was a merchant vessel, which was converted for naval purposes. In other countries also, the situation is the same. In the U.S.A., for instance, in 1936, the foundations of a revitalised mercantile marine were laid and the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was passed to promote American commerce and provide for national defence. Its purpose was not only development of commerce; it was also meant to serve as a naval auxiliary in times of war or national emergency. It was to be operated under the U.S. Flag, and composed of the best, safest and most suitable types of vessels which could be used for coastal shipping, and at the same time convertible by providing for gun enplacements and other gadgets for naval purposes to be commandeered for war. The seamen trained in the merchant vessels too, may be utilised as naval volunteers and auxiliaries. In the U.S.S.R., in the first Five Year Plan, merchant ship-building was taken up on a very large scale. In 1918, the Soviet Mercantile Marine was founded. The total tonnage of merchant ships which, in 1919 was 412,000 tons, rose in 1936 to 12 lakh tons. In 1938, in one year, the U.S.S.R., spent 25 million roubles in purchasing such ships. The same is the case in other countries also. My hon. friend Shri Ragnath Singh has pointed out how Germany and Italy and other countries have been subsidising the merchant navy for naval purposes as naval auxiliaries. They give loans, subsidies and other aids to the merchant ships at nominal rates of interest over long periods of time, provided the building conforms to the specifications and designs given by naval engineers, so that, wherever necessary they could be commandeered for naval purposes.

There is another very important point on which the Ministry of Transport will have to co-operate with the Defence Ministry, and that is in providing defence for ports and harbours. In every country the Port or Harbour administration is fully co-ordinated with the Army, Navy and Air Force in ensuring coastal defence, by making the necessary provisions. Here, in our country, it is not only a question of not co-operating, but it is positive non-co-operating, going against the naval interests in certain matters. I shall point out, for instance the Cochin base where you have a civilian base as well as a naval base. The misfortune is that the civilian base does not have any naval officers to advise them. There is only a railway man and a customs man to represent the Government.

The Navy is not represented, with the result that extensive areas of very great strategic importance, like the Willingdon island, which is just abutting the naval base, are being given over to private persons. Similarly, the *Candle* island has been given to a foreign firm by the port trust authorities which is against our national interests because that island guards the passage to the naval base. In every port and harbour, they can easily put up radar sets, search lights, Anti-aircrafts, Asdics and other things which are lying in certain Ordnance depots for years which I can mention to the hon. Minister if he likes, which could be brought to the various ports and harbours and properly utilised. Our ports and harbour defences should be strengthened and such defence can easily be provided if the Transport and Defence Ministries co-operate.

I should like to mention one point about tourist traffic. The hon. Minister himself had been to Gopalpur and Chilka lake some time ago. These are places of very great beauty and interest. To develop these places for tourist traffic would be of immense help in earning foreign exchange for this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon'ble Minister. I think he wanted only half an hour.

Shri L. B. Shastri: I shall finish by 2-55.

There are 5 branches of activity under the Transport Ministry, dealing with roads, rivers, sea, besides tourism and the D. T. S. (Delhi Transport Service). Hon. Members have said something on each of these branches. I shall deal with shipping first. I might say that we have almost achieved the target we had fixed. It is true that the target was 6 lakh tons. It is also true that we have to get 18 ships in order to make up the deficiency. But, orders have already been placed. We expect to get these ships by the middle of the next year. It is true, it has very often been emphasised and it was said, perhaps, more than once by Shri Matthen that the Shipping Policy Committee suggested a tonnage target of 2 million tons for our country and that we are very much behind the target. We have found in practice that we can only reach the target slowly. As I said just now, we expect that our tonnage at the end of March will be of the order of 480,000 tons. A further 120,000 tons are, as I said just

now, in various stages of construction in various yards both in India and abroad. We expect that these new constructions will be ready for delivery before the middle of 1957, so that, by that time, we would have reached the target of 6 lakh tons. The Second Five Year Plan which has now been practically finalised provides for a tonnage target of 9 lakh tons. As I have said elsewhere, not in this House, there is none more sorry than myself for the fact that it has not been possible to provide for the full target of 10,45,000 tons, recommended by the study group of the Consultative Committee of Ship-owners. But, the House has to realise that there is no help because the limitation of finances cannot be got over. I expect that the Indian shipping companies who have already been approached by the Transport Ministry for working out their individual plans, will come forward and utilise the provision actually made in the Second Five Year Plan within the first three years of the Plan period. Upon that will depend the possibility of securing larger funds for additional tonnage within the Second Plan itself. I am aware that we are at present carrying in our ships not more than 5 or 6 per cent. of our overseas trade and that our total tonnage does not constitute more than half a per cent. of the total tonnage of the world. But, I am not a pessimist like Shri Matthen or one or two other Members who have spoken just now. I believe in action. Even if we are slow, we must be steady. We should pursue our work with determination and courage. We have to function under certain limitations: funds, technical knowledge, etc. But, within these limitations, we hope that by the end of the Second Plan period, not only will we be able to lift 100 per cent. of our coastal trade which we are even now doing, but also at least 50 per cent. of our adjacent trade and 15 per cent. of our overseas trade.

I might also inform the House that one particular line of shipping in which our country is lacking has recently attracted attention. I refer to tanker tonnage. This is a specialised branch of shipping which presents some special difficulties which have hitherto kept the Indian shipping companies away from this field. The Government of India have, however, devoted their attention to the development of this branch of shipping, and I am glad to say that a firm decision has now been taken for India to have at least three

tankers to begin with. We expect that one of these tankers which would be owned in the private sector will be registered in India before the end of March, 1956, that is before the end of this month, and two other tankers are expected to be acquired in the public sector by the Eastern Shipping Corporation, and these two should be in commission before long.

I might also inform the House that in furtherance of the announcement made in the joint *communiqué* issued by the Prime Ministers of India and the Soviet Union regarding the establishment of a regular shipping service between India and the Soviet ports, discussions are now proceeding between the Ministry of Transport and a delegation of the representatives of the Soviet Government with a view to establishing a shipping service between the two countries immediately. The talks are nearing conclusion and it is expected that an agreement for the establishment of the shipping service will be signed some time next week. The proposals envisage the regular operation between Indian ports and the Black Sea ports of Soviet Russia of a fleet of ten to twelve vessels comprising Indian and Soviet vessels on a parity basis as regards tonnage according to a pre-arranged schedule for a period of three months settled in consultation between the Soviet and Indian authorities. It is expected that the service will come into operation as soon as the agreement is signed. The intention is to expand the service by the addition of more vessels to keep pace with the development of trade between the two countries.

I might also inform the House that talks are in progress with a trade delegation from Yugoslavia for the establishment of a shipping service between India and Yugoslavia and for the utilisation of the spare capacity in Yugoslav shipyards to meet the needs of India for additional shipping during the Second Five Year Plan.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): What will be the freight charges? How do they compare with the present freight charges?

Shri L. B. Shastri: They are being discussed by our representatives as well as the representatives who have come from Russia and Yugoslavia. I do not want to divulge the proposals that are

[Shri L. B. Shastri]

being discussed, but I can say that the freight charges will be fairly reasonable in so far as we are concerned.

I might say that I do not at the present juncture want to go into the question of nationalisation of the shipping industry. Our objective at the present moment is to increase our tonnage, and shipping being a hazardous trade we do want to take the help and co-operation of others also. I shall not enter into the controversy, but it is a strange contradiction that the views which the deputy leader of the Communist Party expressed last time in this House were entirely different from the views expressed just now by Shri V. P. Nayar. But, as I said, I do not want to quarrel on that point. My purpose is to increase our present tonnage, and we will take the help of the private shipping companies in that matter, and the Government will also have to take initiative whenever they find it necessary. I may tell Shri Nayar that the Eastern Shipping Corporation is going to be taken over entirely by the Government. It is felt by the Ministry of Transport that Scindias who are partners in the Eastern Shipping Corporation should be permitted to withdraw from that Corporation so that the Corporation may be cent per cent Government-owned and Government-managed. Arrangements to give effect to the decision are under our active consideration. The budget estimates for 1956-57 contain a provision of Rs. 74 lakhs on account of the Eastern Shipping Corporation which would enable Government to meet their Commitment of 74 per cent. in respect of the additional capital of Rs. 100 lakhs proposed to be issued by the Corporation in 1956-57. If before this issue Government take over the Corporation, then the entire further capital of Rs. 100 lakhs will have to be invested by Government. The additional requirements of funds of Rs. 26 lakhs, I may tell the House beforehand, will then be met either by re-appropriation or by resort to a Supplementary Demand.

The House is, perhaps, aware that the proposals for the establishment of a second shipping corporation for the operation of shipping services to the Persian Gulf and Red Sea have also been formulated, and a decision is expected to be taken shortly for the establishment of the second corporation. I have appealed to the shipping companies to come forward, as I said just

now, to utilise the loan that we have kept at their disposal, but I would like to say it quite clearly that in case the response from the shipping companies is not satisfactory, the Government is not going to lag behind. We will enter the field and expand the shipping industry as we cannot afford to remain behind in this matter.

Shri Raghunath Singh said something about the Defence Ministry coming to our rescue and Shri Patnaik just now emphasized the fact that there should be complete co-ordination between the Navy and the merchant shipping. I do not know, I shall leave it to the Government of India in the Defence Ministry to consider the suggestions made by Shri Raghunath Singh, and I hope they will attach due weight to them. I might inform Shri Patnaik that there has been complete co-operation and to some extent co-ordination between the Defence Ministry and the Transport Ministry in certain matters. I might give one example. The United Kingdom Government suggested that gun stiffening of ships should take place so that no time may be wasted in mounting guns on merchant ships for their protection at the time of an emergency. This proposal found support with the Defence Ministry and they recommended that the Transport Ministry should also adopt the same technique. That proposal was accepted by us, and I might inform him and the House that all ships that are being built ever since at the Hindusthan Shipyard are being manufactured accordingly. I shall not go into the other points raised by Shri U. C. Patnaik, because there is hardly any time left.

I might only briefly mention that, as the House is aware, we have set up a rail-sea co-ordination committee. The main function of this committee is to go into the question of rationalisation and co-ordination of cargo movement. Shri B. Das, one of its prominent members is just now sitting in my front. The members of this committee have been meeting frequently to discuss these matters. This committee is expected to submit its report by the end of June, 1956, and we hope that as a result of its recommendations, a greater volume of cargo will move by coastal shipping. The Second Five Year Plan provides for an addition of one lakh tons of coastal tonnage to meet this increased demand.

Regarding ports, I would like to say that the major ports which are the direct responsibility of the Central Government have, during the First Five Year Plan undertaken development programmes estimated to cost Rs. 60 crores, intended to rehabilitate worn-out assets and equipments in the existing ports, and to provide a new major port at Kandla.

The construction of the Kandla port is now fast nearing completion. The *bandar* and the oil berths have been put into operation, and by October, 1956, two cargo berths are expected to be completed. The remaining works will be completed by March, 1957. This port will increase our port capacity by one million tons. In the Second Five Year Plan, provision has been made for providing two more berths to cater for more traffic which is now clearly in prospect.

The largest single item of work undertaken in the existing major ports is the provision of a marine oil terminal (at Bombay at a cost of Rs. 10 crores), which is now completed. The major ports have drawn up schemes estimated to cost Rs. 77 crores during the Second Five Year Plan period, for which a provision of Rs. 40 crores by way of Central assistance during the Plan period is being provided.

I shall say a few words now about the minor ports, because some Members have referred to this matter. At the outset, I might make it clear that minor ports are the responsibility of the State Governments. The First Five Year Plan included a provision of Rs. 1 crore of Central assistance to the State Governments for the development of the minor ports. The Central Government assisted the State Governments in the formulation of the Second Plan by appointing an officer on special duty to visit every port in the various States, needing development, and to advise as to the precise nature of the facilities required. A sum of Rs. 5 crores has been provided for minor ports in the Second Plan. About half of this will be required for individual items of work at several ports. It is intended to utilise the remaining Rs. 2½ crores for projects like the development of Paradwip, Tuticorin, Mangalore and Malpai ports. What is immediately feasible at Paradwip in the circumstances is the putting up of such shore facilities as will

be necessary, such as the pier for loading and unloading of ores brought to the ports by canals or other means of transport, and loaded through lighters taking the cargo into ships anchored and restowed. We are advised that by this means an appreciable volume of ore traffic can be handled. The Government of India are accordingly deputing their engineering officer to visit Paradwip in order to prepare a scheme on these lines.

I might also inform the House that with a view to make adequate provision for surveys of minor ports, it was recommended by the hydrographic survey sub-committee that a third ship was essential for this purpose. So, we have decided in consultation with the Ministry of Defence to convert an existing naval vessel into a survey vessel. For this purpose, a provision of a sum of Rs. 35 lakhs has been made in the next financial year, that is 1956-57.

Now I come to river transport. Our transport system includes about 5,500 miles of navigable waterways, of which the important ones are the Ganga, the Brahmaputra and their tributaries, the Godavari and the Krishna, the Buckingham canal, the Mahanadi canals in Orissa and the backwaters and canals of Travancore-Cochin.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Rivers.

Shri L. B. Shastri: Considerable volume of traffic is catered by these waterways. The economy of Assam and the export trade in jute and tea are greatly dependent on water transport. The possibilities of increasing the transport potential of our rivers have recently been studied.

It is very easy to say that there should be no delay in furthering this scheme or project, but the problem mainly is one of designing craft suitable for economic operation on shallow waterways. The manufacture of this craft will take some time. The design was made after very careful consideration, and on the advice of a foreign expert who was brought to this country. I might say that a good beginning has already been made. A special type of craft has been designed, and orders have been placed for their construction. We are now setting up the organisation necessary for the operation of the craft.

Shri Matthen: May I know when the Minister expects to get them?

Shri L. B. Shastri: Let us wait and see. Anyhow, I hope that they will try to expedite. I cannot force them to supply them, say, tomorrow or the day after, or in a month or two. It is a technical thing, and it all depends.

Shri Matthen: Within a year?

Shri L. B. Shastri: I hope so. Perhaps earlier than that. We are taking the other preliminary steps. We are setting up the organisation necessary for the operation of the craft.

Then this is to be followed by similar projects on the Brahmaputra. It is also proposed to operate a modern diesel ferry service at a selected point across the Brahmaputra. We have provided Rs. 3.4 crores in the Second Plan for the development of river transport. I shall not go into the details. Provision has also been included in the Second Plan for the improvement of the Buckingham Canal and the West Coast Canal.

Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang): What about Assam?

Shri L. B. Shastri: There is hardly any time now, I have to finish in five or six minutes, and I must cover one or two more points.

Shri T. N. Singh: Assam is safe.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: We are not safe. We are in great difficulty. We are under a monopoly.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Minister might continue.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: Is there any scheme to break the monopoly?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would ask the Hon. Member not to interrupt the Minister. The Minister has very little time left at his disposal.

Shri L. B. Shastri: I wanted to say a few words about other matters. But I shall leave the point at this, because I must deal with roads.

In regard to the national highways, I shall merely reply to the point made by Shri Mohanlal Saksena. He asked

what progress has been made as compared to the targets fixed by the Nagpur plan. The Nagpur plan envisaged provision of 1,23,000 miles of metalled roads, and 2,08,000 miles of earth roads. At the commencement of the plan, there were 97,000 miles of metalled roads and 1,47,000 miles of unmetalled roads. At the end of the First Plan, the country is expected to have 1,07,000 miles of metalled roads, and 1,67,000 miles of earth roads. There is a small gap only. The Second Plan provides for doubling the rate of expansion as compared to the First Plan. On this basis, the country is expected to reach the Nagpur plan target in respect of road mileage by the end of the Second Plan. The Nagpur Plan target will not, however, be reached in respect of bridge construction. This is where the deficiency will have to be made up in the Third Plan.

Shri V. P. Nayar: But that Plan itself was inadequate, considering the present economy.

Shri L. B. Shastri: That may be so. Anyhow, the Hon. Member is aware that it is not the Central Government which executes this plan. The construction of roads is done by the State Governments as agents of the Central Government. But with the co-operation of both the State and Central Governments, we hope to go ahead with this plan.

Then he said something about bullock-carts. I entirely agree with him in that respect; I do not attach less importance to the use of the bullock-carts.

An Hon. Member: What about donkeys?

Shri L. B. Shastri: But we have done one thing in respect of the wheels of bullock-carts. We have given free steel for wide tyres for a number of carts to each State to try and popularise the wider tyres. At our request, the Central Road Research Institute is performing experiments with different designs of self-aligning hubs. But I might tell him that about the fitting up of rubber tyres on these vehicles, Shri J. C. Kuma-rappa, who is a great believer in the bullock-cart and in the development of village industries—I am not saying it in any jocular or sarcastic manner—has written to me strongly criticising our proposals. He has said that it would be uneconomic from the cultivator's point

of view, and it will mean an additional burden on the cultivator. But still I discussed this matter at the last meeting of the Transport Advisory Council. They have decided to start a pilot scheme, instead of taking it up as a whole on a very extensive scale, to assess the increase in the load carrying capacity of the pneumatic tyred cart. The State Governments have agreed to go ahead with it. We will, help them also financially, if required.

There has been enough talk of providing better co-ordination between rail, road, sea and other means of transport. Shri V. P. Nayar was not quite correct when he said that we were not paying sufficient attention to the manufacture of trucks or other vehicles in our country. I shall only read three or four lines from the report of the Study Group:

"The Council agreed that special efforts must be made"—

the Council referred to is the Transport Advisory Council—

"where necessary, in order to increase the demand for each type of vehicle so that production could become economical. It was considered that absorption of about 10,000 to 12,000 trucks per annum during the next few years, in addition to those required for the replacement of over-aged vehicles, would be a reasonable target to be aimed at".

Personally, I think it is a very big target, and if we can implement it, well and good. But Shri V. P. Nayar knows that we are already manufacturing diesel trucks on a big scale in our country.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Foreign companies.

Shri L. B. Shastri: The Minister, to whom he paid compliments, is responsible for manufacturing that; he is doing it.

I might merely say that I have considered this matter of co-ordination. I have given further thought to it and I have decided that a Central Board should be set up under the chairmanship of the Secretary, Transport Ministry. This Central Board will have separate sub-committees dealing with subjects like inland waterways, shipping and other means of transport.

These sub-committees will, be functioning in close co-ordination with the Central Board of Transport. The details, naturally, will have to be worked out very carefully.

Regarding tourism, we have made significant advances in that direction. Tourist traffic in India has shown an increase from 21,000 in 1951 to 45,000 in 1955, an upward trend of about 20 per cent. annually is being maintained. I would like hon. Members to see some of the letters we have received from the tourists. If they do so, they will themselves compliment the work that the tourist department is doing.

About D.T.S., I shall merely inform Shri Radha Raman that a provision of Rs. 70 lakhs is being made in the budgets for 1956-57.

An Hon. Member: Why so much?

Shri L. B. Shastri: Perhaps due to some mistake, one Hon. Member—I think it was Shri Anandchand—said that I had said that the work of the D.T.S. was rather unsatisfactory or very bad. I can only say that he is thinking of perhaps the first year when I spoke on the D.T.S.—in 1952.

Shri T. N. Singh: He is thinking of his own Bilaspur State.

Shri L. B. Shastri: Yes, his old State. Anyhow, the position has completely changed since 1952, and we are running the Delhi Transport Service at a profit of about Rs. 3,60,000 or even a little more.

Shri V. P. Nayar: But nowhere else are the bus charges so high.

Shri L. B. Shastri: I must finish in one minute; otherwise, I would have replied to that.

Shri V. P. Nayar: He takes shelter under that.

Shri L. B. Shastri: If the Deputy-Speaker will permit me, I will answer that also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That point can be discussed between the hon. Member and the Hon. Minister.

Shri L. B. Shastri: If he so desires.

As regards other facilities in the D.T.S. like shelters and other matters, we are already considering those things. I hope the House will find that there will be consistent and constant improvement in the service which we are providing in the capital city of our country, namely Delhi.

Before I conclude, permit me to say that the problem of labour at ports has been somewhat exercising our minds. I might merely say that the difficulties and problems of labour always receive our most sympathetic and earnest consideration. Recently the piece-rate system has been adopted. I am very glad that the workers have agreed to accept that system, and I hope that the output of work in the ports will definitely improve. I would urge upon workers to give the experiment a fair trial. It is absolutely essential that there should be a peaceful atmosphere in the ports, if not for anything else, at least for the proper execution of the Second Five Year Plan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put all the cut motions to the vote of the House.

All the cut motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1957, in respect of the following heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof:

Demands Nos. 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 140, 141, and 142".

The motion was adopted.

[The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced below.—Ed.]

DEMAND No. 95—MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 44,53,000 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, 1957 in respect of 'Ministry of Transport'."

DEMAND No. 96—PORTS AND PILOTAGE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 62,64,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

DEMAND No. 97—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 98,73,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

DEMAND No. 98—CENTRAL ROAD FUND

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,99,30,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Central Road Fund'."

DEMAND No. 99—COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING NATIONAL HIGHWAYS)

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,09,67,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Communications (including National Highways)'."

DEMAND No. 100—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 40,24,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Transport'."

DEMAND NO. 140—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON PORTS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,40,00,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Ports'."

DEMAND NO. 141—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON ROADS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,97,08,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Roads'."

DEMAND NO. 142—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,95,71,000 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, 1957, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Transport'."

3 P.M.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FORTY SEVENTH REPORT

Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sinha (Hazari-bagh-East) : On behalf of the Chairman of the Committee, I beg to move :

"That this House agrees with the Forty-Seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st March, 1956."

The Report has been presented earlier and it has been circulated to the Members of the House with the recommendations contained therein. I hope the House will agree to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Forty-Seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st March, 1956."

The motion was adopted.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt. West cum Rae Bareilly District—East) : Since this Report has been agreed to, may I know whether my Bill will be taken up immediately after Shrimati Renu Chakravartty has finished her speech because Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava is absent?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Member would be satisfied if he listens to the next announcement.

The House will now take up Private Members' Bills shown in the agenda already circulated to Members. Before I call upon Shri S. V. Ramaswamy to move the motion for introduction of his Bill, I would like to inform the House that the Proceedings of Legislatures (Protection of Publication) Bill by Shri Feroze Gandhi, which at present stands as item No. 31 in the List of Business, will be taken up, in conformity with the past practice, after item No. 8, that is, after the Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, after which the Bills in category 'B' have been put down.

ABOLITION OF ADOPTION BILL

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem) : Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to abolish the system of adoption in India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to abolish the system of adoption in India."

The motion was negatived.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy : rose—