

[Shri Datar]

has been a greater emphasis on the developmental than on the merely administrative work. Therefore, these officers have to carry out their duties with a new orientated outlook which is in full consonance with the democratic set up. That is the reason why I am quite confident that these officers would come up to the level that we had in view when this particular Act was passed

It was contended by my friend Shri Menon that the final control so far as these all-India services are concerned rests with the Government of India. That is not correct.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I said disciplinary control and not administrative control.

Shri Datar: All these officers, when they are borne on State cadres, are under the administrative control of the State concerned, and only when an occasion arises for a disciplinary proceeding against them, are they referred to us. Then we take the opinion of the UPSC and then final orders are passed. Therefore, even the IAS and IPS officers working in connection with the affairs of the States have to be under the control of the State concerned, and therefore there can be no question of the Central Government taking powers to themselves.

I am glad that the provisions of this Bill in their application especially to the State of Jammu and Kashmir have been accepted with acclamation by all the Members of all the parties.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That the Bill to amend the All-India Services Act, 1951, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: There is no amendment.

The question is:

"That clauses 1 and 2, the Enacting Formula and the Title

stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 1 and 2, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri Datar: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

15.16 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS (RAILWAYS)—1954-55

Mr. Chairman: I shall first place the Demands before the House.

DEMAND No. 4—REVENUE WORKING EXPENSES—ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 9,79,263 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Administration' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955"

DEMAND No. 5—REVENUE WORKING EXPENSES—REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 1,67,37,177 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Repairs and Maintenance' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

DEMAND No. 6—REVENUE WORKING EXPENSES—OPERATING STAFF

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 53,01,078 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Operating Staff' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

**DEMAND NO. 7—REVENUE WORKING
EXPENSES—OPERATION (FUEL)****Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 71,73,430 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Operation (Fuel)' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

**DEMAND NO. 9A—REVENUE WORKING
EXPENSES—LABOUR WELFARE****Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 2,11,315 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Labour Welfare' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

**DEMAND NO. 13—APPROPRIATION TO
DEVELOPMENT FUND****Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 2,53,03,759 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Appropriation to Development Fund' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

**DEMAND NO. 17—OPEN LINE WORKS—
REPLACEMENTS****Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 2,71,02,416 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Open Line Works—Replacements' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

**DEMAND NO. 18—OPEN LINE WORKS—
DEVELOPMENT FUND****Mr. Chairman:** Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs. 63,20,007 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Open Line Works—Development Fund' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): The House is asked to vote nearly Rs. 9 crores by way of excess expenditure incurred by the railways during the year 1954-55. It appears it has become a habit with the railways to come in with Demands for Excess Grants without giving the House a satisfactory explanation as to why such excess expenditure has been incurred.

In the Budget in 1954-55 of the railways of nearly Rs. 250 crores, an excess demand to the tune of Rs. 9 crores represents virtually four per cent. of the entire expenditure, and it is not a small deviation from what the House voted at the time of the Budget. If it becomes a habit with the railways to incur excess expenditure year after year and then to come to this House in the hope, and perhaps with an assurance that the House will sanction this grant, I doubt what will remain of the sanctity of the Budget and our voting on Demands.

It is very surprising also that the Railway Ministry comes to the House after a lapse of 3½ years. There has been inordinate delay, and I fail to understand why the Railway Minister should not have come to the House earlier than this.

Normally for the year 1954-55 the accounts must have closed on 31st March 1955, and making allowance for some pending Bills and arrears of adjustments, this Demand should have come before the House in the first quarter of 1956. Instead of that we find that it is being placed before the House in the third quarter of 1958. I am afraid the hon. Railway Minister does not treat this House with sufficient courtesy when he comes here after 3½ years and, on a haphazard explanation, asks this House to vote his Demand for Rs. 9 crores.

If one turns to the various Demands, one finds that there is the usual repetition of a slackness on the part of the railways. Instead of explaining to this House what these Excess Demands were due to, one finds a

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

monotonous repetition of the explanation that there has been inadvertence here and inadvertence there, heavier expenditure than anticipated, more expenses because of heavier traffic, without any statistics being given to us in support of this explanation. I do not know what concept the hon. Minister has in the matter of Excess Grants. He thinks by using some vague phraseology he complies with the provisions of the Constitution. I am afraid this House expects more before voting Rs 9 crores of the Railway Minister. He should support his demands by statistics whenever any excess expenditure has occurred. It is not enough to say that more train services have been put into operation; he has got to explain how many and where and when. These things are required by the House in order to enable it to judge whether this excess expenditure was reasonable.

Sir, Demand No. 4 relates to 'Fuel' where an expenditure of Rs. 71 lakhs more than what the House voted has been incurred. I had repeatedly made a complaint on the floor of the House at the time the Railway Budget was considered that our coal consumption required to be economised, that this matter required to be looked into. On one occasion, I think it was in the year 1957, when I pointed out to the Railway Minister that the coal consumption had exceeded the previous year's provision by Rs. 3½ crores, he was frank enough to admit that he had given explanations with regard to the increased consumption of coal but he himself was not satisfied with his explanations and that a committee would be appointed. I know that some committee has been appointed. But I do not know what the result has been, whether the committee has made recommendations for economy in coal consumption and whether the Government has acted upon them. But here we find that Rs. 71 lakhs more than what the House sanctioned in the matter of coal have been spent by the railways. And what is the explanation? The breakdown of this Rs. 71

lakhs is this. Rs. 19 lakhs have been put down somewhere due to inadvertence, and Rs. 13 lakhs due to erroneous adjustment. I should like to know whether our Railway Board is paying the railway officers four-figure salaries for erroneous adjustments and for inadvertence. Then we have Rs. 23 lakhs more freight paid than anticipated. I think that requires a tightening of control. I do not know what exact procedure is being adopted in connection with such matters, but surely when a railway officer comes and says that Rs. 19 lakhs have been put down due to inadvertence, and Rs. 13 lakhs due to erroneous adjustment, this House must take serious notice of it.

Still more glaring than these lapses is the one in connection with allocation of funds to the Development Fund. It is surprising that at page 6 of this booklet, we have been told that a demand is made here for Rs. 2.53 crores and that:

"That excess of Rs. 253 lakhs under this Grant was due to the actual surplus on the working of the Railways for the year, available for appropriation to the Development Fund, being more than anticipated in the Revised Estimate. Although, technically, this is an excess over the grant, this appropriation is not expenditure but only an adjustment of the actual surplus."

It is hardly any explanation to say that this is not an expenditure but merely an adjustment of surplus.

The first point that I should like to know from the Railway Minister is this. Are there any principles laid down at all for allocation of any amount to the Development Fund, or is it just like the Depreciation Fund on the railways where the railways put in anything that they can spare for the moment and then present to the House a so-called surplus budget?

Commenting on the question of Depreciation Fund I had stated that there were no principle at all. As

to whether there was going to be depreciation in the case of rolling-stock on the basis of the mileage run or the life of the assets, we do not know anything. The Railway Minister said that depreciation was set aside on the basis of whatever they could spare. What businesslike method the railways are adopting? I am surprised to know I think with regard to the Development Fund also, the same principles are operating. The biggest principle is that there are no principles at all on which allocation to the Development Fund is made.

In the year in question, namely 1954-55, Rs. 6½ crores were allotted to the Development Fund. Now, we are told that after checking up the accounts, the railways have found Rs. 2½ crores more surplus. They made this discovery three and a half years after all the accounts were closed. And now the House is told that instead of Rs. 6½ crores, let us put Rs. 2½ crores more. May I point out to this House that in an estimate of Rs. 6½ crores, to go wrong by Rs. 2½ crores means that your estimates are going wide of the mark by 40 per cent? What type of budgeting is this that after three and a half years, the Railway Board discovers suddenly that its estimates have gone wrong to the extent of 40 per cent under one item? I think the House is being treated very lightly in this respect. It is taken for granted that because these excess demands come after three and a half years, the interest in the whole matter will subside, and probably the House will grant them without asking any question. But I do hope the House will request the Railway Minister to explain to us clearly the principles on which these amounts are allocated to the Development Fund. As to whether there are any principles at all in existence, I have got my grave doubts on that.

I would also like to know what difference this belated adjustment to the Development Fund has made to the railways' contribution to the

general revenues. It is a well-known fact that out of the surplus, a certain portion has to be handed over to the general revenues by way of contribution on certain principles. If you have wrongly calculated your surpluses to the extent of Rs. 2½ crores, obviously, that makes also some difference to the amount to be contributed to the general revenues or other funds. It would, therefore, appear that this wrong adjustment might also affect the quota or the contribution which the railways would have otherwise made to the general revenues or depreciation fund.

There is also another Demand, namely Demand No. 17 for Rs. 2.7 crores for open line works—replacements. We are told that the railways did not anticipate that the materials would be supplied in such large quantities at the fag end of the year, and, therefore, there is this divergence between the budget grant and the actual expenditure incurred. At page 7, in para 2, we find

"The excess of Rs. 271 lakhs was mainly due to supply of materials towards the close of the year specially for Track Renewals, being better than could be anticipated, (supply of track materials, particularly steel, having been precarious during the year, it was impossible to forecast with accuracy the extent to which materials would become available)."

That, I submit, is not at all a satisfactory explanation. Surely, it could not be said that in the last month of the year, all the materials, to such a huge extent, were dumped on the railways. The railways did anticipate either in the matter of procurement of steel or in the matter of other track material, they had their contracts, and they had their delivery periods assigned, and very probably they had advance intimation of the fact that supplies were going to be effected in a particular month. So, it is impossible that all these erroneous adjustments could be attributed to failure

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

to anticipate. If it is really so, I am afraid the railway officers do not show that standard of efficiency and foresight which we expect of them normally.

I do not know whether it is due to the fact that there is always the end-of-the-year rush, which is a common characteristic in all public works. It may be that the last-minute rush in undertaking various projects, might perhaps have resulted in over-expenditure, but whatever it is, we do expect that when our railway officers handle receipt of materials, they would know at least approximately when material is going to come. This explanation, therefore, is not satisfactory.

The conclusion that we reach is that the Railway Ministry takes it for granted that the House will sanction everything, and that is being done year after year. Therefore, whether the excess demands amount to four per cent. of the entire budget,—which in a budget of Rs. 800 crores would make a difference of nearly Rs. 32 crores, which is more than the budget of a small State—or more the Railway Ministry seems to be taking it for granted that never mind what the variation is, they can come to the House and then get away with the excess grant.

The issue is important in this respect that it has cut into the sanctity of the budget grants. Why does this House sit day after day and week after week allotting particular grants to particular departments and discussing them and not granting anything more, if three years thereafter it has to find that all its budget grants that had been voted have been upset, because the railways or the other departments have incurred a higher expenditure? The sanctity of budget grants is destroyed. One could understand a minor variation of a crore or two here or there in the entire budget, but I submit that it merely means reckless spending, not even caring to know whether the spending is within the budget limits.

I, therefore, submit that in future, if at all occasion arises for demands for excess grants, the Railway Ministry should give this House a better explanation than it has given now. We are not at all satisfied with this. All the demands for excess grants must be supported by statistics, and I hope a fuller explanation will be given than what has been given this year.

Inordinate delay in presenting to the House Demands for Excess Grants for 1954-55

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

“That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 9,79,263 in respect of ‘Ordinary Working Expenses—Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Defective repairs and maintenance of Rolling Stock and Tracks

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): I beg to move:

“That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 1,67,38,177 in respect of ‘Ordinary Working Expenses—Repairs and Maintenance’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

Inadequate number of lady doctors in Division Headquarter Hospitals

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

“That the demand for an Excess of Grant of a sum of Rs. 2,11,315 in respect of ‘Ordinary Working Expenses—Labour Welfare’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

Bad accounting, erroneous adjustments and failure to gauge properly arrivals of railway material

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

“That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 2,71,02,416 in respect of ‘Open Line Works—Replacements’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

Excessive coal consumption

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 71,73,430 in respect of 'Ordinary Working Expenses—Operation (Fuel)' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Excessive freights paid for coal

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 71,73,430 in respect of 'Ordinary Working Expenses—Operation (Fuel)' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Faulty estimates and haphazard manner of appropriations to Development Fund

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the demand for an Excess Grant of a sum of Rs. 2,53,03,759 in respect of 'Appropriation to Development Fund' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Patent and obvious defect in the estimate

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the demand for an Excess of Grant of a sum of Rs. 2,53,03,759 in respect of 'Appropriation to Development Fund' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Mr. Chairman: All these cut motions are now before the House.

Shri Tangamani: I have moved four cut motions, namely cut motion No. 5 to Demand No. 5, No. 6 to Demand No. 7, No. 7 to Demand No. 9A, No. 8 to Demand No. 13. As far as possible, I shall confine myself to these four Demands.

I fully support what Shri Naushir Bharucha has stated about the inadequate explanation that has been given. The amount that is sought by way of these demands for excess grants is Rs. 8.91 crores, but the explanation

that has been given under these heads is of a very general nature. At least, I request the Minister, when he replies, to tell us greater details about the various items which have been mentioned in the booklet that has been supplied to us.

Another point that must also be explained in addition to the large amount that is involved is the delay in taking the House into confidence.

So far as the question of track renewals and maintenance of track is concerned—it is covered by Demands Nos. 5 and 17—I would like to make the following observations. Under Demand No. 5, it is stated:

"The excess was chiefly due to heavier expenditure towards the end of the year on repairs to rolling stock, which could not be precisely anticipated, nor postponed since the closing months synchronise with the busy season, heavier expenditure on repairs and maintenance of track, bridges, service and residential buildings including repairs occasioned by floods, storm etc.."

This Demand deals with expenditure on repairs and maintenance of railway assets like track. So far as Demand No. 17 is concerned, the excess of Rs. 271 lakhs was mainly due to supply of materials towards the close of the year—supply for track renewals. When so much has been spent on track renewals, on maintenance of the tracks and also repairs and maintenance of rolling stock, I would like to know why a series of derailments have been taking place. In reply to one of my questions during the last session, the hon. Deputy Minister stated, I believe for the year 1955-56, the number of derailments was in the neighbourhood of 700 to 800, that is, two or three derailments on the average per day. When so much has been spent on maintenance of tracks, we would like to know why these derailments are taking place. Is it due to wrong maintenance of tracks or the over-age of the tracks or has it got anything to do with the rolling stock?

(Shri Tangamani)

Some experts who were in the railways say that defective wagons also lead to derailments. During 1954-55 and in subsequent years also, we have the old MSMC unit wagons. People who are in the know of things say that these wagons are bad and have got to be condemned. If we are spending money on maintaining these wagons and repairing them, it is really waste of good money. Occasionally, we find in certain railway stations a slip given to the driver asking him to go slow. The slip says: 'Observe caution due to excessive wear to rails'. I happened to come across one such between Kumbhokanam and Shri Nageshwaram asking the driver to go slow because of excessive wear to rails.

So I think it is about time we know in which areas and which sectors there is excessive strain on these rails. Otherwise, we are really risking the lives of thousands of people. Recently an accident took place in place where an accident had taken place in 1956 after this budget was passed, after this specific provision was made for track renewals and also for maintaining these tracks. A serious accident took place towards the end of 1956 between Villupuram and Trichinopoly. Two or three days ago, in the same place we find a similar accident taking place. It was a derailment, and nearly 24 bogies—this time it happened to be a goods train—were washed away in the same river.

This matter also calls for very serious attention, accidents happening in identical places because the track maintenance was bad, because the bridge was not kept in proper order. The reason given is monsoon and rising of the water to a particular level. The same reason was given in connection with the Ariyallur accident. I am bringing this to the notice of the hon. Minister so that this aspect of maintenance, renewal and repair of tracks and repair of these wagons is taken serious note of. I remember that the

Railway Board appointed certain neutral examiners to find out whether the wagons are properly repaired. Ultimately, these examiners had to be removed. It happened in Perambur. When wagons were not repaired properly, they were passed off as properly repaired. This aspect is very important when we consider the question of track renewals.

Another demand is regarding labour welfare. For labour welfare, a sum of Rs. 2,11,000 more is demanded. The demand is for expenditure on medical facilities, health and welfare services, education, canteens and other amenities provided for railway staff. It is in addition to what has already been provided for. Since 1954, we have been receiving complaints. One complaint relates to the lack of women doctors in the headquarters hospitals. The old headquarters hospitals have now become headquarters hospitals for the divisional headquarters. Even the small hospitals are converted into divisional headquarters hospitals. The general complaint is that there is lack of women doctors. I would like to know many women doctors were included in this allocation. The cry for women doctors has now become more or less a uniform cry, and the defect continues as before.

In spite of the expenditure that is being incurred and although we find that a particular doctor in charge of a hospital is willing to provide for more beds, there is a restriction in hospitals as regards the number of beds. They say 'Thus far and no further'. Although this point is a little out of the way, I would request the Minister to consider the question of increasing the number of beds in the old headquarters hospitals or the new hospitals coming up in the divisional headquarters. I know that there is a distinct case for intervention in Golden Rock where more beds are required. I do not think the medical authorities there are unwilling to have more beds, but they are

prevented from doing so by the restrictions as to the number of beds that is allotted to them.

My hon. friends has mentioned with regard to Demand No. 13 about the excess of Rs. 253 lakhs taken over to the Development Fund. That shows how that estimate has been very unreal. Let us hear from the hon. Minister how our estimate has failed us during the past five or six years, so that at least in the future there may be a slight correction about this. Where the original estimate was Rs. 6½ crores, the new estimate is going to be Rs. 9 crores. There is something very serious in this matter also. This aspect of major mistakes being committed must also be gone into.

I would, before concluding, again request the hon. Minister to take the House into confidence and tell us in a detailed manner how this money was spent. It is no use saying that Rs. 65 lakhs were spent in the fag end; it is no use saying that they did not expect that such a thing would come about and the excess was due to heavier expenditure and the busy season. This type of explanations does not carry us very far. I do not suggest that it is not based upon the actual expenditure. But, unless certain details are given, it does not lead us anywhere. I once again request the hon. Minister to give us more details about the various items that have been mentioned.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the amount which has been placed before the House pertains to actual expenditure in 1954-55. Shri Naushir Bharucha has very correctly pointed out that this House has been taken into confidence for this amount is being placed before the House after a lapse of nearly 3½ years. So, this is more a case of post mortem with even the body missing; we are doing post mortem on the bones. So, we cannot possibly say much about it and yet I have something to say to the Railway Ministry and the Minister.

If we see the actual explanations we find that this demand is for expenditure on medical facilities, health, welfare services, education and other amenities provided for the railway staff. I would only say something about the medical facilities.

I have drawn the attention of our Minister towards the growing menace of T.B. among railway employees. In reply to an unstarred question in this House, the hon. Minister stated that on 1-1-58, cases of T.B. among the railway employees were as under:

Class I	Nil.
Class II	2
Class III	1,078
Class IV	3,734

So, you can imagine what attention is paid to these class III and class IV employees. Even those who are granted leave do not get their salaries during this period. For increasing our welfare activities we demand money and are spending money; and our hon. Minister wants us to vote for this amount after the lapse of 3½ years. But what we are seeing is that for these T.B. patients there is nothing left and they have to pay for the maintenance and treatment.

Then, about welfare activities labour welfare is a very broad term. We are all happy to maintain the industrial relations between the employer and the employee. I am bringing a petty instance to the notice of the hon. Minister. What is the attitude of the officers towards the employees? When we are spending so much for the betterment of the employees and when we want more to see that industrial relations improve, what do we see?

On 2nd August 1958, a few days back, one of the respected officers visited Agra Cantt. Employees of classes III and IV wanted to show the condition of the quarters they live in. They wanted to place certain grievances before him pertaining to labour welfare and other amenities. He never saw them until there was some sort of demonstration. After 9 hours the officer

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

sent for the Union representative and said that he had made it a principle of his life not to meet union officials like that. As a result of that deputation or demonstration—whatever term might be used by the Railway Ministry—four people have been served with a show cause notice for removal from service. If this is the attitude of the officers, I do not know the use of sanctioning more amounts for labour welfare. I do not think any fruitful purpose would be served by sanctioning this amount. In this case, whether it is sanctioned or not, it will be voted because of the majority in the House; and as the money has already been spent, it is a case of post mortem.

My attention has also been drawn to the conditions of the wagons which my hon. friend Shri Tangamani has already mentioned. I remember a statement issued by the Vice-President of the Train Examiners' Association that if the Train Examiners confined their duties to only 8 hours, half the wagons in the country would not move. I do not know. But, in this very House the hon. Deputy Minister in reply to a question said that this is not the condition and that they can assure the House that all the wagons would move and move to the correct destination. But what is happening? Cases of derailment; and this Ministry has almost become the Ministry for Accidents. Nobody feels comfortable in the train. We do not know what we are losing. If this is the condition, I do not know what will happen.

Before concluding I may request the hon. Minister to see that conditions improve in the railways. Accidents and derailments have become the order of the day. We are even tired of raising questions in Parliament because we know that every day there will be some accident or other—minor, major or something in between. Enough attention should be paid to these accidents and derailments so that people may feel secure in the hands of the Railway Ministry and Minister.

Demand No. 4 deals with expenditure in the case of staff and also the Railway Protection Police, at present the Railway Protection Force. I do not know whom they protecting. Recently, you know, three people, R.M.S. people were murdered in the train. The Railway Protection Force were also travelling in the same train. I have seen the bogie in which they travelled. The whole bogie in which 24 to 30 people could sit was occupied by 4 people and nobody goes there. I do not know why the Railway Protection Police or Force could not protect the lives of these R.M.S. employees. There is no use spending more and more on them.

Still one station master at Muttra railway station is on fast. He does not demand the betterment of his salary; he does not want his service conditions to be improved; he only wants protection. He says some protection should be given against goondas and dacoits. This station master does not want anything more. He says even in day time anybody can come and rob them. He only wants protection from the Railway Minister.

The Minister of Railway (Shri Jagjivan Ram): Protection from the Railway Minister!

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I say the Railway Ministry or somebody should protect him. Still that station master is on fast and I do not know what will become of him.

So, I submit that the Railway Minister should give sufficient explanations for all these things. It is not as if a demand for about Rs. 9 crores is brought before the House with the hope that because there is a majority of the ruling party it will be voted. The explanation given here is not at all satisfactory and we demand that he should give more explanation and justify these grants, these excess grants to the tune of Rs. 9 crores.

श्री बाबब (बाराबंकी) : अधिष्ठाता महोदय, रेलवे मंत्रालय के संबंध में १९५४-५५ की ज: ये पूरक मांगें हमारे सामने आई हैं, उससे बड़ा ही आश्चर्य होता है। नौ करोड़ रुपया एक बहुत बड़ी रकम है और वह भी १९५४-५५ का। उस को काफी प्रसा हो गया है। इससे साफ जाहिर है कि इस विभाग में—वैसे तो सारी सरकार की यही अवस्था है—निपुणता की बहुत कमी है और एफिशिएंसी गिर गई है। इस विभाग के अधिकारियों को भविष्य में होने वाले खर्च के बारे में कोई जानकारी नहीं है। हम देखते हैं कि इस विभाग के द्वारा मुसाफिरों और छोटे कर्मचारियों को सुविधा देने की तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है और न ही रेलों के देरी से चलने और प्रायः दिन होने वाली दुर्घटनाओं के विषय में कोई कार्यवाही की गई है। ऐसी अवस्था में नौ करोड़ रुपये की रकम बिना इस सदन की मंजूरी लिये हुये खर्च कर डालना और फिर साढ़े तीन साल के बाद यहां आ कर मांग करना कि यह पूरक मांग मंजूर की जाय कहां तक उचित हो सकता है। जहां तक इस रकम के खर्च का संबंध है, हमें कोई वाजिब कारण दिखाई नहीं देता, जिन के आधार पर इतना रुपया खर्च किया गया।

प्रायः दिन होने वाली दुर्घटनाओं के संबंध में मैं यह कहूंगा कि मिनिस्टर महोदय ने इस विषय में जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है, उस पर इस सदन में बहस होनी चाहिये। प्राज रेल-गाड़ियों पर सफर करना जितना मुश्किल हो गया है, उस में जितना खतरा महसूस होता है, उस तरफ मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान बिल्कुल नहीं जाता है। एक प्राइमम में कहा गया है कि पटरियों को दुस्त करने में ज्यादा खर्च हो गया है। प्राज हालत यह है कि जहां पर खर्च होना चाहिये, वहां खर्च नहीं किया जाता है। प्राज स्टेशनों को सजाने के लिये—और वह नौ किसी खास खास दिन और किसी विशेष व्यक्ति के जाने पर—और कुछ लोगों को विशेष सुविधाएँ देने के लिये सारी

एनर्जी—सारी शक्ति—व्यर्थ में खर्च की जाती है। जहां तक रेल की पटरियों को दुस्त करने का ताल्लुक है, जिन को दुस्त करने से एक्सपेंडेंस रुक सकते हैं, उस पर विशेष ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है। मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान उस ओर जाना चाहिये। अगर मंत्री महोदय इस बात का साफ जबाब नहीं देते हैं कि यह रुपया क्यों खर्च हुआ है, तो यह समझना चाहिये कि वह एक तरह से इस सदन का ध्रममान है। उनकी ओर से जो बेग एक्सप्लेनेशन दे दिये जाते हैं, वे नाकाफी हैं।

मेरे पूर्ववक्ता महोदय ने रेलवे प्रोटेक्शन पुलिस का जिक्र किया है। यात्रियों की सुविधा और उनकी सुरक्षा के लिये पुलिस रेल में बला करती है। मुझे भी इन लोगों के बारे में प्रायः दिन तजुर्बा हुआ करता है। क्या होता है ? रेलवे पुलिस के लोग साधारणतया एक जगह पर बैठ जाते हैं और मुसाफिरों की जगह घेर लेते हैं। ऐसा भी होता है कि फस्ट क्लास के यात्रियों के नीकरों के लिये जो कम्पार्टमेंट होता है, उस में वे घाम तौर पर जम कर बैठ जाते हैं और किसी ओर को उसमें धाने नहीं देते हैं। मेरे पूर्ववक्ता महोदय ने प्रा० एम० एस० एम्पलाईज की दुर्घटना के बारे में बताया है। प्राभी भ्रखबार में समाचार छपा है कि कुछ यात्री लोगों को रेल में लूट लिया गया। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि रेल में किसी की जान-भन की सुरक्षा असम्भव है। लोग या तो किसी एक्सपेंडेंट के शिकार हो सकते हैं, या किसी चोर डाकू या गिरहकट के शिकार हो सकते हैं। मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में रेल-यात्रा करने वाले सभी श्री जगजीवन राम जी के शिकार हैं। मैं श्री जगजीवन राम और उनकी सरकार से यही निवेदन करूंगा कि काफी दुर्घटनायें घट चुकी हैं, काफी जन-धन का वृत्त-पयोग हो चुका है, काफी जाने जाया हो गई है, इन मंत्री महोदय की कृपा से जो सुविधाएँ मिली हैं, काफी लोग उन का फल भी भुक्त हैं,

[श्री यादव]

इस लिये अगर वह इस प्रकार की और सुविधायें न दें, तो अच्छा है—इस देश के लोगों के लिये भी और खास तौर से जो लोग रेल पर यात्रा करते हैं, उन के लिये भी बहुत सुखदायी होगा और मंत्री महोदय और कृपा न करे जैसे तो इस सदन में श्री जगजीवनराम का बहुमत है। वह इस नौ करोड़ की रकम को पास करा लेंगे, हम चाहें जो कुछ भी कहें और जितनी भी गम्भीर बातें हैं, जिन की तरफ सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिये उन की तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया जायगा।

पिछली बार जब रेलवे बजट पर बहस हो रही थी, तो मैंने कहा था कि ब्राज स्टेशनों पर पानी की सुविधा नहीं है। इस के उत्तर में हमारे डिप्टी मिनिस्टर महोदय ने कहा कि हर जगह पानी की सुविधा है। मैंने एक आध जगह की मिसाल भी दी थी। उस के बावजूद हम तरह की कमियां पाई जाती हैं और हम तरफ काई ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है। यह जरूर होना है कि कभी कोई मिनिस्टर—विशेषकर रेलवे मिनिस्टर—या डिप्टी मिनिस्टर जाते हैं और लोगों को पता चल जाता है—जैसा कि ब्राज तौर पर इत्तिला हो जाती है—ता स्टेशन पर बाकायदा स्टूल पर एक साफ-सुथरा बपड़ा बिछा कर उस पर तश्तरी में ग्लास रखा हुआ मिल जाता है और उस को देख कर मिनिस्टर साहब यह समझ जाते होंगे कि सब लोगों को यह सुविधा मिलती होगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा ही और सब लोगों को पानी की सुविधायें उपलब्ध हो, लेकिन यह कहा सम्भव है।

मैं जानता हूँ कि गाड़ियां क्यों लेट चला करती हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि बहुधा इस का कारण हमारे मिनिस्टर और डिप्टी मिनिस्टर खबैरह हुआ करते हैं। मुझे ज्ञात है कि बिल्सी-लखनऊ लाइन पर गजरोला टेशन पर हमारे मंत्री महोदय, श्री केशवदेव

मालवीय, के कारण एक बार गाड़ी लेट हो गई। वहां पर कोई शव घाने वाला था। मुझे उस सिलसिले में बड़ी हमदर्दी है, लेकिन यह तथ्य है कि उस के कारण गाड़ी चार छ-घंटे लेट हो गई और वकी रही और कितने ही लोगों को असुविधा हुई। एक शटल चला करती है, उस को रोक दिया जाता है। अगर कुछ विशेष अधिकारियों को कुछ विशेष सुविधायें दे कर यही कहा जाये कि रेलवे में बड़ी तरक्की हो रही है, तब तो मैं कहूंगा कि यह सही है, लेकिन यह सही नहीं है। एक दो आदमियों को सुविधा पहुंचती है, लेकिन जन-साधारण को बड़ा कष्ट भोगना पड़ता है तरह तरह की यातनायें झेलनी पड़ती हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय इस तरफ ध्यान दें।

जा नौ करोड़ की पूरव मांग ब्राज इम सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत है, उसे तो पास होना ही पड़ेगा। हम नहीं करेंगे, तो अपने बहुमत के बल पर करा ही नेंगे। लेकिन थोड़ा सा ध्यान आप उस समाज की ओर भी दें जिन के कंधों पर सवार हों कर आप इम सदन में विद्यमान हैं और जिम्मेदारी लिये हुये हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूंगा कि जिन जिन विषयों की ओर मैंने उनका ध्यान खींचा है, वह उन का सही सही जवाब दें और बतायें कि गाड़ियों में जो भीड़ होती है, रेलवे में लोगों के जानोमाल की सुरक्षा नहीं है, पानी की व्यवस्था नहीं है और ट्रेन्स की दुर्घटनाओं आदि के बारे में भविष्य में वह क्या विशेष कदम उठाने जा रहे हैं। वह यह भी बतायें कि प्राये दिन जो दुर्घटनायें होती हैं, उन को रोकने की कोशिश वह करेंगे या नहीं या ये दुर्घटनायें बढती ही जायेंगी और एक ऐसी हासल हो जायगी कि सोझ इस मामले में बात करना भी बन्द कर देंगे।

SHRI T. N. SINGH (Chandauli):
I feel it proper to intervene in this debate at this stage because I have had a feeling after listening to the debates here that somehow there was a tendency to confuse the debate on excess grants with the ordinary general debate on the railway's demands. It is something quite different.

15.58 hrs.

[SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTY in the
Chair]

As a matter of fact the procedure in the House is that whenever the appropriation accounts for a particular year are closed, certain excesses or savings are discovered. Then the Auditor-General goes into the full account of the excess as brought about in the Appropriation Accounts. According to an established convention, all those excesses are referred to for the consideration of the Public Accounts Committee of this very House. That Committee goes into the details of the expenditure because it is a serious thing. The House has voted certain grants. The executive has no right to exceed that. Yet experience has shown that not only in this country but in other countries as well, somehow excesses occur. It may not be possible for the whole House to scrutinise the reasons in great detail. Hence, the procedure of the Public Accounts Committee examining them and then making a recommendation to the House.

Please remember that all these grants which have now come before this House for sanction or approval have been scrutinised already by the Committee, your Committee. It has gone into all the details. They have, after fully cross-examining each officer responsible for the department concerned, come to certain conclusions. They are before you. We can assure you that we are very very critical about certain lapses on the part of the Administration in exceeding the voted amounts.

16 hrs.

What happens is this. This is a real problem. It is, probably, also inherent in the system of accounting, which is called the Government system of accounting. It so happens that when the year is closed there are a number of open accounts, suspense accounts etc. Also, inter-departmental debits and credits are raised when the accounts are closed. After all, whatever the departmental accounts, they must be closed on a particular date. In the case of the D.G.S.&D., in most cases—you must have examined the notes on the Excess Grants—you will find that the Supply Ministry or the Supply Office in England or America or in some other place raised debits in regard to those amounts at a particular time. It may be that those goods were supplied to the Railway Ministry even early in August, but the debits may be raised sometime towards the end of March and the goods may be there in transit from England to this place.

We have all been racking our heads as to how to improve the position. It is always open to the Government to come before the House for a Supplementary Grant. That is the procedure which should be done. If it is known, say, sometime early in March that a particular vote is likely to be exceeded, they should come before the House and ask for a Supplementary Grant. Somehow this has not been feasible in the system of accounting that is in vogue at present. It is also partly due—not only to the fault of the accounting system—to delays in offices and to certain, I would say, lack of imagination or failure to anticipate that a particular thing has to be communicated at a particular time. People sit tight, and when once an expenditure has been incurred by the Supply Ministry for a particular year, though it relates to the Railways, when the accounts are closed it will have to be debited to the Railway Accounts, it cannot remain the Supply Ministry Account. All this is happening due to the accounting system that is in vogue, and mostly it happens at the close of the year. As

[Shri T. N. Singh]

a matter of fact, all these excesses are discovered only after the year has ended, much after the year has ended, when all the book entries are being adjusted from one department or one Ministry to the other. That is the real position. But I can assure this House that wherever we find that there has been a deliberate defiance of the vote of this House, the Public Accounts Committee will never tolerate any such thing. They will simply refuse to recommend, and it will then be for the House to regularise.

In that case, Sir, it will create a very serious problem. An expenditure has been incurred. When an expenditure has been incurred, it is almost a *fait accompli*. If we say that we would not regularise, then what will be the position? Unfortunately, that is not yet clear to me. As a matter of fact,— I want to take this House into confidence—wherever we feel that the decisions and the wishes of the House have been ignored, all our recommendations have been unanimous; every party represented there is fully co-operative in reaching those recommendations. The Public Accounts Committee—that is your Committee—has already warned the Administration that if there is some such lapse they will not regularise those excesses or recommend regularisation of those excesses. What will happen then, that is another aspect. It can remain as an account under objection. According to law, as far as I know, the spending authority is responsible and the money can be realised from it. Here there are excesses to the extent of Rs. 8 crores or Rs. 10 crores. I am really worried about this part of the problem, and this aspect of the problem has to be considered. Who is the person in India—except probably one or two very special exceptions who may be capitalists—who can shell out Rs. 10 crores? The money will not be realised, and it cannot be realised. What is the procedure to be adopted in such cases.

What has been done in one or two cases in England is that the Committee

has recommended that such and such part of the money be realised from the officer concerned and the other part may be voted. That is one way. In another case they issue a warning and be done with it. There are various ways of dealing with such cases of excesses. On this question at least there is no disagreement. The Report has come before you. Every party of the House is agreed that these excesses be voted. Therefore, I do not think there is any disagreement on that aspect; at least that is what I anticipate from the proceedings in the Public Accounts Committee where every section of the House is fully represented.

I will tell you the reasons why in regard to these excesses we have not gone in for some stronger criticism. The fact is that most of these are due to what are called 'last minute adjustments'. Once the appropriation accounts are closed, debits and credits are being raised from this or that department. I would request the Members to look into the notes a little more carefully and in detail. It is not a question of trying to find the cause of this or that; that is not the stage now. It is all a question of accounting. Supposing the House has said that a particular department may construct a small house at a cost of Rs. 10,000, if the department constructs a bigger house, on a much bigger floor area and costing much more than the amount sanctioned, then the House is perfectly entitled to refuse to vote that excess. That is the kind of thing which we should emphasise and look into when we are considering these Excess Grants. That is one of my humble suggestions to my colleagues here, that whenever these Excess Grants come they should scrutinise the notes and other things from this point and see whether the wishes of the House in that particular case have been flouted or whether it is only a question of book adjustments, late accounting and all these things.

Coming to the question of late accounting, I must be permitted to ex-

press my strong disapproval of the delays in offices and the manner in which very important questions are handled in the administrative offices. Here, I wish the House had given a little more attention to the Fourth Report of the Public Accounts Committee—1957-58 on Railways. In the very introductory paragraph, paragraph 7, it is said:

"It is regretted that in the reports of the committee submitted in the past two years repeated reference had to be made to the long delays in the submission of notes, memoranda by the Ministry on points arising from the examination of the accounts. The experience of this Committee in the course of the preparation of this Report has been no better. Such delays result not only in dislocating the programme of business of the Committee, but due to lapse of time the criticisms and suggestions in respect of some of the vitally important procedural and financial issues lose much of their force."

Now, I would like the full support of this House in enforcing quick replies and quick response to queries made by the Public Accounts Committee. It is only through that we can get this support. If that process is set in motion, I think some of the delays that occur in adjustments will also gradually disappear. So, what is very important is, if there are certain things which are primarily your directive or the directive of one of your Committees, they should be attended to promptly and replied to promptly. That is very necessary. After all, what is this excess grant, it is also the directive of Parliament that they should spend so much on such and such an account. Now, if proper emphasis were given that Parliament's vote is such an important thing, that it cannot be violated in any circumstances, that you have got to do things in time and properly, I think most of these demands for excesses will not occur. That is one point.

Now, I think both the administration and others will be doing great service to our system of financial control and accounting if greater emphasis is laid on expeditious disposal of all outstanding accounts of a year. That is a very great problem with which the Public Accounts Committee has been faced in dealing with finance. I am not disclosing anything except whatever has been told by the Public Accounts Committee from time to time and again and again that there are queries made by either our Committee or the Estimates Committee which remain in the office for two, three, four or even six months. The House is pleased to give one year's life to each of these Committees. The Committee must finish its work within that year. That Committee is appointed sometime in the budget session. It starts getting into its stride in one or two months afterwards. Actually, nine to ten months is the time that the financial committees get. If six months are taken for reply to queries, how is it possible for these committees to work within that time and produce reports for the consideration of this august body. So, I would urge on the Government and the hon. Minister, particularly the Railway Minister who is here at present to listen to this debate, that great emphasis should be laid on the need for speedy disposal of any queries, points, etc., raised by this House or its Committees. That is very important. If once that process is set in motion, I am sure there will be improvement in the financial control and administration also.

There is another aspect to which I would like this House to apply its mind. There is this question of often recurring excess grants and also large savings. Large savings is a thing which again is not very desirable. After all, the House by giving certain sums expects the administration to spend all that and bring in results. If there is large saving, that should not be encouraged. So, both the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee have been very much exercised on the question of proper financial control.

[Shri T. N. Singh]

Exchequer control, financial control and all that should be improved upon very much.

As early as the year 1951, the Public Accounts Committee brought out a report on exchequer control I am sorry it has not attracted that much notice and attention which it should have. Probably it is too prosaic; maybe it is dull reading, but all the same, it is very important. All matters of figures are very dull. At times they are very, very annoying; so annoying to look into. Yet, the House which is the sole custodian of the nation's finances has to devote itself to this question. It cannot divest itself of this great responsibility, and therefore, I would in all humility, urge on this House that dull though these matters may be—of finance and accounting, especially accounting—they deserve very great consideration at its hands, because, without proper accounting and proper financial and exchequer control it is neither possible to meet the obligations in various cases nor is it feasible for the administration to run efficiently. It is only through financial control, by being what is called money-minded, that the administration can be efficiently run. I am all for giving all responsibility in financial matters,—expenditure, financial control, etc.—even to the administrative ministry concerned, provided it shows a real sense of responsibility. It is said that unless one is given the responsibility, one will not feel the responsibility. So, I am prepared personally to make that experiment, but, if the administration takes upon itself the responsibility of keeping its own accounts, having its own financial advise, etc., the House will rightly expect that they will be vigilant watchdogs of the expenditure; that they will be watching the progress of expenditure from day to day, from hour to hour, so that if a thing has been planned to cost Rs. 10, it will cost ultimately Rs. 8 or Rs. 9 only. That would be efficient administration.

Anyone can be efficient by spending crores of rupees, but the real efficiency

lies in enforcing efficiency and getting results, with the spending of Rs. 10 where it was planned to spend Rs. 12. That is efficiency. I would very strongly urge that we must develop this mentality. This House should insist, the Ministry should insist, and the administration should insist that this aspect should be borne in mind. Then only results will be achieved. Then only our five year plans will succeed one after the other.

I do not say anything about the detailed items in the grants. I would only urge on the House to leave all those details and bear the other aspects which I referred to. I can assure the House, and probably many are not aware how strong views are expressed and held in the Public Accounts Committee, and how on many occasions the Committee has taken responsible officers to task. It has not hesitated to censure or criticise anyone howsoever big he may be. Therefore, I would like this House to discuss the excess grants in the perspective which I have explained and not as if it were a mere supplementary grant or a general debate on the budget. That is the line which I would emphasise.

Shri Dasaratha Deb (Tripura): Mr. Chairman, I have a very little point to make here on this matter, but still, I consider it to be a very serious and vital point. It has been our experience that though there are some agreements between the Governments of Pakistan and India regarding trade, the Pakistan Government has been deliberately violating the agreements and creating a very difficult position in Tripura very often. Regarding transport, as the House is aware, Tripura has got no railway link directly with the rest of India. Now, very recently, as the Government of Pakistan has declared a sealing of the border, it has created a very difficult transport situation in our State and created a serious position of the economic life of Tripura. Thereby, all the essential goods have been stacked up and the prices of goods are now beyond the reach of the people. Thus

the urgency of having railway lines is being felt by us at every moment. So, I request the Railway Minister at least to take a very serious note of this matter.

This is important not only from the point of view of transport but for our defence purpose also. I request the Government at least to take up this case very seriously. Previously we have been told that some arrangement or some agreement has been made between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan to construct some railway line between Pakistan and Tripura, i.e. Railway sidings. But the situation is such that I do not find any possibility that that sort of arrangement would be feasible to make at this stage. So, I request the Railway Ministry to construct at least a line from Kalkalighat situated in Assam to Panisagar within Dharmanagar sub-division in Tripura State. The distance may be only 20 or 25 miles and it does not involve too much cost, because in between there is no big hill or mountain; it is plain land. If that is not done, the difficulties of the Tripura people would not be removed and our economy will gradually break down. Since 1952 we have been pleading our cause with the Government of India to construct that line, but we are sorry that the Government still, for what consideration I do not know, have not taken any action in the matter.

If this situation is allowed to continue then the misery and sufferings of our people will be aggravated more and more. So, I lastly appeal to the hon. Railway Minister that they should not wait for this for the working period of the Third Five Year Plan, but within the working period of the Second Five Year Plan the task of constructing this railway line should be taken.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: One point that has been made is that there have been abnormal delays in presenting the excess demands to the House. Perhaps there is some misapprehension in the minds of hon. Members or perhaps the Members are not aware

of the formalities that had to be gone through before we present the demands to the House. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee has briefly dealt with the matter. I would like to give some details to show why it takes so long a time before we can approach the House with these demands

In terms of rule 308(4) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Lok Sabha, the excesses of the amount granted by the House shall be examined by the P.A.C. before the excess demands in respect thereof are presented to the Parliament. So, before we present the demands to the Lok Sabha, the P.A.C. has to certify and before the P.A.C. certifies, certain procedures have to be gone through. Accordingly, the excess demands cannot be presented to Parliament till a recommendation is made by the P.A.C. in this respect. The Appropriation Accounts (Railways) for 1954-55 were finalised by the Railway Ministry in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General on 31st August, 1956. I do not think there was any unreasonable delay in that. Those accounts were, however, signed by the Comptroller and Auditor General on the 15th December, 1956 and presented to Parliament on 22nd December, 1956. Immediately after the presentation of the Appropriation Accounts (Railways), 1954-55 to the Parliament, explanatory notes regarding the excesses on the voted grants that had occurred during the year 1954-55 were prepared and sent to the P.A.C. on 20th March, 1957. The P.A.C. were, however, not satisfied with the explanations submitted to them and desired that more elaborate explanations should be given. Accordingly, the explanatory notes in respect of the excesses were revised and were sent to the P.A.C. on 24th June, 1957. The P.A.C. examined the Appropriation Accounts (Railways), 1954-55 in their sittings in August, 1957 and they were expected to submit their report in the same year. On this assumption, the Department of Parliamentary Affairs were requested by the Railway Ministry to arrange for the

[Shri Jagjivan Ram]

presentation of the demands for the excess grants for 1954-55 in the winter session of Parliament in November-December, 1957. However, as the recommendations of the P.A.C. on the excesses on the voted grants were not received even towards the close of the winter session of Parliament, this could not be presented in that session.

In February, 1958, again a date for the presentation of these demands was fixed, but the recommendations of the P.A.C. were not received by that date and the presentation had again to be postponed. The recommendations of the P.A.C. for regularisation of these excesses were made in para 5 of their fourth report on the Appropriation Accounts (Railways), 1954-55, which was presented to Parliament on 26th April, 1958. Accordingly the Department of Parliamentary Affairs were requested on 28th April—I request hon. Members to note these important dates—to fix a date for the presentation of the excess demands and the excess demands were actually presented to the Parliament on the 2nd May, 1958.

It will be noticed from the above that there was no delay on the part of Government in presenting the demands for excess grants. If the recommendations of the P.A.C. on these excesses had been received earlier, the demands could have been presented to the Parliament at an earlier date.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Is it necessary for the Ministry to wait for the P.A.C. report to present these demands?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Yes, this question was raised not with regard to Railways, but other Ministries on previous occasions also. I would like to remind hon. Members that during the autumn session of 1956 also, a serious view was taken by Parliament of the long interval between the incurrence of expenditure in excess of the grants and the presentation of the demands for the regularisation of the excess expenditure in regard to the Civil Ministries. Extracts from

Parliamentary debates are given below. I quote them with your permission:

“Mr. Speaker: So far as ordinary expenditure is concerned, we do not always vote to the last pice. We just vote on the approximate estimates placed before the House. But there also, if the amount is exceeded, we criticise. In the circumstances, I would think of an alternative procedure. It will be this way. Instead of waiting for an indefinite number of years, as soon as the Finance Ministry finds that an excess payment has been made, within 2 or 3 days, I will ask the P.A.C. to look into the matter and send us an interim report. Why should we wait for the general comprehensive report of the P.A.C.? We shall ask the P.A.C. to make an interim report on the particular items. Let them go into them: We shall be benefited by their advice. My whole object is not to wait till the entire process is finalised. At the same time, my object is to see to it that the P.A.C. goes into these matters and also the Auditor General looks into these matters as early as possible.

There should not be hiatus between one and the other.

Mr. M. C. Shah: We will prepare a note in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor-General. If there is any difficulty, we will bring that difficulty to your notice.”

The Ministry of Finance, after considering this question of regularisation of excess without much delay, in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor-General, made certain proposals to the Secretary of the Lok Sabha for consideration of the Speaker, and the Public Accounts Committee made certain suggestions in regard to the regularisation of the excesses in para 9 of the 21st Report, which reads as follows:

“The Committee trust that the Ministries of the Government on

their part should furnish to the Lok Sabha Secretariat, after a scrutiny by Audit" (it has to be noted that it is after scrutiny by Audit) "in the shortest time possible, but at any rate not exceeding four weeks from the presentation of the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of these excesses, the reason or circumstance that led to the excess under each grant or appropriation for being placed before the Committee."

The procedure laid down in the report of the Public Accounts Committee is invariably followed by this Ministry, the Railway Ministry, and it will be appreciated that the delay in the presentation of the excess demand under consideration was due to the circumstances beyond the control of the Railway Ministry.

Mr. Chairman: Will the hon. Minister explain the reason for the delay between December and May for presenting the excess demands to the Public Accounts Committee?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Madam, you will appreciate that we have to prepare exhaustive notes. So, some time is necessary, and the time taken here was short. In December it was finalised and in March we gave our comments to the Public Accounts Committee. The Public Accounts Committee wanted further explanation and elaboration on that. It did not take us even one month to send those comments. We sent them on the 20th of June. So, in this particular case, as far as we are concerned, there has not been much delay. But the procedure is such that the account has to be audited by the Auditor-General. There also it takes some time.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I point out to the hon. Minister that I am not referring only to this particular instance of excess demands? Regarding this instance I have to check up the various aspects that you have now raised. But I can assure this House that it is not only in regard to this small matter, on which you may have

sent a note soon, but generally we have recorded it in our report on the Railways itself and it is before the House—it has taken months and months for the railways to reply to our queries. We must remember that it is not only in this particular case we had to regularise excess expenditure.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister says that the note was submitted to the Public Accounts Committee in March. Then further information was required by the Public Accounts Committee from the Ministry and they submitted it within one month. Therefore, in this particular case, there does not seem to be any delay on their part.

Shri T. N. Singh: Whatever it is, it was submitted in May. This is August. It was at the end of the budget session that the whole thing was presented.

An Hon. Member: Of last year?

Shri T. N. Singh: This year.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: No, last year, 1957.

Shri T. N. Singh: They sent a reply in regard to the query about excess grant alone. But it may be related to various other points for which queries have been sent. As a matter of fact, this was to be taken as a whole along with other points which were under examination by the Public Accounts Committee. Now, the grievance of the Public Accounts Committee is this. In this particular case the reply may have been sent within four weeks. But in regard to other queries replies are not sent in time and without a proper consideration of that it is not possible for the Public Accounts Committee to make recommendations about excess grants, because we have to go into the question whether proper administrative control was exercised at every stage or not. It is only when the Public Accounts Committee is satisfied in that respect that it makes a recommendation. It is not an easy thing which can be done all of a sudden, because we are considering the question of the money spent in

[Shri T. N. Singh]

excess of the amount voted by the House. We are not concerned only with that particular query. I can quote hundreds of cases, if I am given the time. If the House is so pleased, tomorrow I can present a number of cases where much more than four weeks have been taken. What is four weeks after all? In cases generally it takes 2-3 months before replies are received from the Railway Ministry. There are thousands of queries which have been put to them and they are taking more time to reply to them.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am not here to answer to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. His learned exposition of the functions and duties of the Public Accounts Committee have been heard by the House. I cannot improve upon that. Whenever queries are put by the Public Accounts Committee, we always try to meet them. Our officers tremble while appearing before the Public Accounts Committee.

Shri T. N. Singh: Why so?

Mr. Chairman: Out of deference to the House.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I will only say that they also deserve some courtesy and consideration.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Who, Sir?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Officers.

Shri Ranga: What about Parliament?

Mr. Chairman: The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee has not shown any discourtesy. He has only raised the point for consideration of the House, because Public Accounts Committee is a Committee of the House. As such, if there is any discourtesy, that matter can certainly be raised; but not in regard to this matter.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am sorry, I have created that impression. I never meant there was anything discourteous.

Shri T. N. Singh: Public Accounts Committee is a Committee of Parliament and you have appointed me as the Chairman of that Committee. If, under my guidance, we have been discourteous, if that is the charge, I strongly repudiate that. I want to repudiate it here and now. After all, I am there as Chairman and the whole members of this House are responsible persons. They will not show any discourtesy on any occasion.

Mr. Chairman: I think I have made it clear that no discourtesy was meant. It is an important Committee of this House and it has been stated that no discourtesy has been shown by it to the officers. I do not think the Minister meant any discourtesy.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I did not mean any such thing. I said that generally. Not only in the Railway Ministry but in all the Ministries, the officers are very apprehensive. They are afraid of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Chairman: That is another matter.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am stating a fact. Officers of not only the Railway Ministry but all the other Ministries also are very much afraid of the Public Accounts Committee.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): Why should it be so?

Mr. Chairman: Because they are the watchdogs of the public exchequer and everybody should be afraid of them.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: Not unless there is something wrong.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I was going to say that we are trying our best to supply the information. I always impress upon my officers that whenever any queries are received from the Public Accounts Committee, we should try to give full details, much more than what the Public Accounts Committee will require, so that there should not be any occasion to feel that something is being kept away from them.

In regard to this particular demand, it might have been that when they were considering the accounts of the whole year and when they were asking for certain information, certain information was not readily available in the Railway Board. We had to collect this information from the railway administrations and they, in their turn, had to collect it from the district or divisional officers. So, it takes some time. I cannot say that on no occasion will there be delay on our part. When information has to be collected from districts or divisions it will take some time. But our effort is always to furnish as much information as possible to the Public Accounts Committee. In this case I have explained why there has been some delay. As a matter of fact, when this case came to me, I myself put the question why the excess demands of 1954-55 are to be presented this year. Then I was given these explanations which I have placed before the House.

Now, what is the magnitude of the excess? It is nearly Rs. 9 crores, which is less than 4 per cent. A variation up to 5 per cent. is regarded as a very reasonable variation. In all matters of public finance a variation up to 5 per cent. is regarded as a reasonable variation. Here, the variation is less than 4 per cent. Though the amount may appear to be Rs. 9 crores but if we compare it with the total budget of the Railway Ministry the variation is less than 4 per cent.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Come with greater variation next time. Make it 5 per cent.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Well, our effort will be to keep it as low as possible but there are circumstances . . .

Shri D. C. Sharma: Shri Bharucha does not want that.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: There are circumstances which have been explained by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee himself where in spite of our best efforts there will be excesses and I cannot give any assurance to the House that in years to

come there will be no excess demands for the Railways. If our system of accounting can be rationalised and any method or any system can be evolved by the Public Accounts Committee or other authorities who are experts in that matter, of course we will welcome that, but the method of accounting as it stands today is such that there are cases beyond our control which will lead us to the House asking for excess grants. On the Railways there are greater chances than in other Ministries and the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee is aware of that. He has mentioned that. In other Ministries they close their accounts finally on the 31st March. We carry it forward and include it in that. So, there is a greater chance of excess demands in the Railways than in other Ministries. Comparisons are invidious and I do not want to compare with other Ministries. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee can speak on that matter with greater authority than I can. We have been trying our best so far as it lies within our control to see that there is no occasion for such excess demands coming to the House.

Then it has also been said that we have not given fuller explanations. I agree that we could have given greater details but the reason for not doing so is that a Committee of the House on which all the parties of the House are represented has thoroughly gone through this.

16.43 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

They have examined it not on papers and memoranda and comments submitted by the Railway Ministry, but they have examined, where necessary, the officers of the Ministry also. After they have fully satisfied themselves they have recommended that these excess demands may be granted. That was one reason why we thought of not giving greater details to the hon. Members of this House.

As a matter of fact, Sir, I was feeling that this will be a very simple formal affair in the House. That was

[Shri Jagjivan Ram] my feeling. It has been remarked by some hon. Members that with the majority of the Government we will get this Demand passed. Well, that remark again was made because they were not aware of the procedure. The procedure is that all these demands have been scrutinised and examined in great detail by the Public Accounts Committee which is not a Committee on which only the Congress Party is represented, but which is a Committee of the whole House. After they have recommended then we have come to the House for the grant of these excess demands.

The debate has taken a turn as if we were discussing the General Budget of the Railways and various points have been raised...

Shri D. C. Sharma: ... including lines in our own constituencies.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: ... points like the welfare of labour and various other matters. We have been trying in our own modest way to do some welfare work among railway employees. I can say that we have done something for which the Railways deserve some appreciation. The incidence of T.B. is there among railway employees. That is a general question of the whole country, but if the hon. Member who has raised this question will go through the report that the Railway presented to the House he will find that every year we are increasing the number of beds for T.B. patients in sanatoria. Now, in the face of that to say that nothing is being done...

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I said about leave. I never said about beds.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Now, this question is a general question for the whole country and we on the Railways are trying not only by reserving beds in T.B. sanatoria but also by opening chest clinics in larger numbers so that we can take possible preventive measures also.

Lady doctors are necessary in our hospitals and during the course of the last two years the number of lady

doctors in our hospitals has increased to 65. There is some difficulty in getting doctors and I have authorised the General Managers of the various Railway Administrations to make direct recruitment of doctors if there is any difficulty and delay in getting the recruitment done through the Railway Services Commissions. That is only with a view to avoid delay and also to recruit the requisite number of doctors both male and female.

Shri Bharucha has raised the question about contributions to the two funds. I will briefly say and perhaps he is aware that the contribution to the Depreciation Fund is a fixed amount laid down by the Convention Committee. The amount to be credited to the Development Fund is variable depending upon the actual amount of the surplus as realised. The principles of allocation of expenditure charged to this Development Fund are as decided by the Convention Committee and the principles laid down by the last Committee in 1954 are already known to the hon. Member. I need not elucidate them. He can find it in the library of the House also. There we have these principles and we are proceeding according to that.

About coal, the hon. Member is aware that a committee has been set up. The committee has gone into great detail. We are expecting to receive their report during the course of this month.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Who are the members of that committee?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: As soon as the report of that committee is received, we will examine that and take proper action on the recommendations of the committee. I am myself anxious that something concrete should be done so far as the consumption of coal is concerned.

Shri D. C. Sharma: May I know who are the members of that committee?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: If the hon. Member will refer to the proceedings of the House, he will find that their names have been given therein.

Then about track renewal and the condition of the rolling stock. There is no doubt that we are in arrears so far as the question of track renewal is concerned, but I may assure the House that the condition of the tracks in the various sections is fairly good. Though there have been cases of derailment, we have been scrutinising the causes and I may say—it was only last evening that I was discussing this with the members of the Board—that derailments due to any defect in the track have shown some decrease and there has been no increase of that. I do not propose to deal with that subject in great detail, because I am thinking of presenting a review of the accidents on the Railways for the last 10-12 years to the hon. Members of the House during the course of this month. So it will give information to hon. Members as regards the number of accidents, major or minor, and the causes thereof, and what is the trend of these accidents during all these 10-12 years. From that hon. Members will perhaps be in a better position to judge what is the efficiency or otherwise of the Railways.

Shri Tangamani: Some safety organisations have been set up. Will they also be consulted in this connection?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: This is a factual presentation. What I am proposing will be just giving the facts in the last 10-12 years. So far as the safety organisations are concerned, they have just been organised on all the Railways. They are in addition to the normal supervising authority that we have on the Railways. But I may tell the House that the efforts of these safety organisations will be visible after a few months; we have just started. Whether these derailments or other types of accidents that are taking place are due to the defect of the track or the rolling stock or due to human failure or any other cause, it will perhaps be better

if hon. Members discuss that on any occasion after they have read the review that I propose to circulate to them.

One hon. Member remarked that we were giving greater attention to the decoration of stations and things like that. Perhaps he is not aware that it was at the Budget Session of last year that I said that I have stopped the construction of all prestige buildings, and since then no construction of stations on any big scale has been undertaken. Of course we will have to complete the construction of the stations which has been undertaken previously. So it will be wrong to say that we are spending more money on decoration of stations or on construction of prestige buildings.

Of course, minimum facilities will have to be provided, and I will not claim that the Railways have completed their programme of providing minimum amenities at all the seven or eight thousand stations in the country. There are many stations, even at present, where even the basic amenities are lacking. And it is our effort, by a phased programme, to provide the minimum amenities at all stations.

There is much to be desired on the Railways: there is overcrowding, at many places many facilities are lacking. The question of law and order is causing some anxiety. There have been instances where there have been some fatal cases in the railway compartments. One hon. Member quoted an incident which occurred near Tundla where some R. M. S. employees were murdered. (Shri S. M. Banerjee: And at Muttra). Well, in the first instance, howsoever much precaution the Railways may take, it will not be possible to guard every compartment and every passenger. But here in this case some interesting developments are likely to come out, because the police have arrested some people and the prosecution has started. Perhaps it will be better to wait and see what the outcome of that case is and who was responsible for that murder.

[Shri Jagjivan Ram]

But, as I said, there have been some thefts and looting in the quarters of railway employees at some wayside stations. At four or five stations between Delhi and Muttra itself a few instances have occurred. It is primarily a question of law and order, and no State Government will ever like the Central Government appropriating to itself the legitimate duties and functions of the State Governments. Law and order and providing protection to the citizens is the responsibility of the State Governments. There have been some instances; my officers have taken up that question with the State police concerned in those localities. I can only give this much of assurance to the employees concerned that the matter has been taken up with the State police and we may expect that the State police will take what steps are required in those matters.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Thank you Sir, may I just ask for one assurance from the hon Minister? This station-master who is on hunger strike, I can assure you, is going to give up his fast. But may I have one assurance, that he will not be victimised—only this much assurance that he will not be victimised because he has gone on fast? I am ready to send him a telegram here and now.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Perhaps some friends are obsessed with this word 'victimisation'. So far as my information goes, this station-master or assistant station-master who is on fast is attending to his duties, he has not absented himself. Therefore

Mr. Speaker: If he fasts at home and does his legitimate work . . .

Shri Jagjivan Ram: My information is that this gentleman who is on fast is attending to his normal duties. Therefore, the question of any action against him does not arise at all.

Mr. Speaker: I hope all others also will copy the same good example without causing inconvenience to the work!

Shri Jagjivan Ram: As I said, this is primarily a responsibility of the States, not of the Railways. We have more than a million employees scattered all over the country and serving the people even in the remotest corners, at times at places where normal amenities are not available. The staff of the Railways deserve the sympathy of all the people, and it is hoped that when they are engaged in essential services for the country even the unsocial elements will have consideration not to harm them. But, as I have said, the matter has been taken up with the State police and, if necessary, I will take it up with the State Governments concerned. More than that I cannot say at this stage.

I feel that I have briefly covered all the points that have been raised. I will assure the House that there was no intention on the part of the Railways to delay the presentation of these Demands to the House. As I have explained, the delay occurred due to causes beyond our control. Therefore, to impute anything that the Railway Ministry thought of showing scant courtesy or discourtesy to the House is far from the truth. I suggest that the Demands may be passed.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): May I just ask one question? If I have understood the Railway Minister correctly, he too is feeling unhappy about this delay. This delay of three years is due to the present procedure which is in vogue now. My question is whether the Railway Minister and the Government are satisfied with this procedure or should something be done to improve that procedure? The Demands of the year 1954-55 relating to the previous House to come up before this House in 1958 does look not very happy. If the procedure is not proper, should not something be done to correct it and rectify it?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am afraid the hon. Member did not follow me. I have extensively quoted what you

Sir, remarked on some occasion in 1956 regarding the delay in presenting these Excess Demands, and there you had suggested something. It will be for the Public Accounts Committee and the Comptroller and Auditor-General and the Lok Sabha to devise some method by which the delay can be obviated. We will simply welcome that.

17 hrs.

Shri Achar: I want something to be done in that direction.

Mr. Speaker: He has said that the Public Accounts Committee, the Auditor General and others will sit together and evolve some method. Year before last I remarked that this delay ought to be avoided. I suggested a remedy. That is being followed. We have come up to the year 1954-55. There are two or three years more and they will be covered as quickly as possible.

Which of the cut motions need I put to the House separately?

Some Hon. Members: None

Mr. Speaker: None. All the cut motions, I take it, are withdrawn.

The cut motions were, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective excess sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the Order Paper be granted to the President to make good the amounts spent during the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955, in respect of the following demands entered in the second column thereof.

Demands Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9A, 13, 17 and 18."

The motion was adopted.

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

DEMAND NO. 4—REVENUE WORKING EXPENSES—ADMINISTRATION

"That a sum of Rs. 9,79,263 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Administration' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

DEMAND NO. 5—REVENUE WORKING EXPENSES—REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE

"That a sum of Rs. 1,67,38,177 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Repairs and Maintenance' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

DEMAND NO. 6—REVENUE WORKING EXPENSES—OPERATING STAFF

"That a sum of Rs. 53,01,078 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Operating Staff' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

DEMAND NO. 7—REVENUE WORKING EXPENSES—OPERATION (FUEL)

"That a sum of Rs. 71,73,430 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Operation (Fuel)' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

DEMAND NO. 9A—REVENUE WORKING EXPENSES—LABOUR WELFARE

"That a sum of Rs. 2,11,315 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Revenue Working Expenses—Labour Welfare' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

DEMAND No. 13—APPROPRIATION TO
DEVELOPMENT FUND

"That a sum of Rs. 2,53,03,759 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Appropriation to Development Fund' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955"

DEMAND No 17—OPEN LINE WORKS—
REPLACEMENTS

"That a sum of Rs. 2,71,02,416 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Open Line Works—

Replacements' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955".

DEMAND No. 18—OPEN LINE WORKS—
DEVELOPMENT FUND

"That a sum of Rs 63,20,007 be granted to the President to make good an excess of the grant in respect of 'Open Line Works—Development Fund' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1955"

17.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 13th August, 1958.