

17-29 hrs.

RAILWAY PASSENGER FARES
(REPEAL) BILL—*contd.*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha on the 13th March, 1961, namely:—

“That the Bill to repeal the Railway Passenger Fares Act, 1957 and to make certain provisions consequential thereto, be taken into consideration.”

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha—

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give him time afterwards.

Shri Mahanty: My submission is that we should not proceed with the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We would not. Unless we hear the hon. Member and take a decision we will not proceed with it. But the Parliament should be seized of a thing and then only we can proceed.

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha): I have already said what I had to say. This is a very small Bill, and I have nothing more to say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Mahanty.

Shri Mahanty: I am constrained to move this point of order inasmuch as I feel that this Bill is violating the fundamental principles of articles 280 and 281 of the Constitution. I would like to make it clear that this is merely a procedural matter and I do not ask the Chair to give any verdict on the *ultra vires* or *intra vires* nature of the Bill. I am constrained to say that if the Finance Ministry had given more thought to this aspect of the question, we would not have been presented with this Bill.

You will kindly bear in mind that this Railway Passenger Fares (Repeal) Bill is relatable to Act 57 of 1957, namely, Estate Duty and Tax on Railway Passenger Fares (Distribution) Act, 1957. This Bill has got a very special genesis and is *sui generis*. It is not a Bill of the ordinary kind. The Finance Commission is appointed under the Constitution to lay down the principles of devolution of the Union taxes to the various States. If you will kindly look to article 280, sub-clause (3), of the Constitution, you will find the following:

“It shall be the duty of the Commission to make recommendations to the President as to—

- (a) the distribution between the Union and the States of the net proceeds of taxes which are to be, or may be, divided between them under this Chapter and the allocation between the States for the respective shares of such proceeds;

Sub-clause (b) of the same article reads as follows:

“the principles which should govern the grants-in-aid of the revenues of the States out of the Consolidated Fund of India;”

Inter alia, article 280 says in sub-clause (4) as follows:

“The Commission shall determine their procedure and shall have such powers in the performance of their functions as Parliament may by law confer on them.”

Article 281 says as follows:

“The President shall cause every recommendation made by the Finance Commission under the provisions of this Constitution together with an explanatory memorandum as to the action taken thereon to be laid before each House of Parliament”.

[Shri Mahanty]

The second Finance Commission was appointed under article 280 of the Constitution and the report of the second Finance Commission was laid on the Table of the House, indicating the action taken by the President, and in accordance with that, this Act has been passed.

I am sorry this is rather a lengthy point of order because of the issues involved. If you will look to page 65 of the report of the second Finance Commission, you will find the following in para 180:

"It is desirable that the States should know in advance the shares of revenue they are entitled to get. It is reasonable to work out the States' shares on the basis of the average of recent earnings and express these shares as fixed percentages applicable for five years from 1957-58".

Then, in para 182, they say as follows:

"While this recommendation may hold good for the period of five years ending 31st March, 1962, we suggest that steps be taken to investigate if the railways could not, without undue labour or expense, maintain State-wise statistics of route-mileage, traffic and earnings to facilitate the consideration of alternative methods of distribution".

In accordance with this recommendation, which was approved by the President, which was approved by this House, this Estate Duty and Tax on Railway Passenger Fares (Distribution) Act was passed by Parliament.

Now, if the Government say that they are coming to Parliament merely to repeal the Bill, I will have no objection; because Government can come at any point of time and say, we are seeking approval of Parliament for repealing a Bill. But I do not know if the President has given specific approval to amend the recom-

mendations of the Second Finance Commission and for repealing the Railway Passenger Fares Act. What the President has sanctioned is merely under clause (1) of article 117 and clause (1) of article 274 of the Constitution. The President's recommendation is confined only to certifying the fact that it is a Money Bill, and the taxes are going to be varied. I beg of the House to appreciate that the President's approval is necessary to make any substantive amendment to or deviation from the Finance Commission's recommendations.

Secondly—and that is more important—I am sure the Statement of Objects and Reasons is as much a part of the Bill as anything else, because this gives an insight into the basic pattern of the Bill. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is stated:

"The Railway Convention Committee, 1960 recommended *inter alia* that from the 1st of April 1961, the tax on Railway Passenger Fares at the existing rates should be merged with Railway fares and that in lieu of the net proceeds of the tax assignable to States, a fixed annual amount should be made available for distribution among them."

This is agreed that in lieu of the railway passenger fares, fixed amounts will be paid. But this Bill suffers from another vitiation or inadequacy, viz., this Bill does not indicate what should be the pattern of distribution.

The Railway Minister in his budget speech said in page 17:

"After the merger of passenger tax in passenger fares, a payment of Rs. 12.5 crores per annum in lieu will have to be made to the General Revenues."

I am sure these Rs. 12.5 crores are going to be distributed among the States of the Indian Union. But unless you lay down the pattern of distribution, you cannot come to the House with this repealing Bill saying, "We are going to repeal the Railway Passenger Fares Act and provide

Rs. 12.5 crores to the General Revenues", because the pattern of distribution is not known. My point is, who is the Government in this particular matter?

Ch. Randir Singh (Rohtak): Is that the point of order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us hear the hon. Member.

Shri Mahanty: I would expect a little seriousness. It concerns....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am all attention.

Shri Mahanty: I was saying with reference to such frivolities.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He need not make such extraneous observations.

Shri Mahanty: This is a serious matter. This relates to the very concept of the constitutional individuality of the States. Whatever the States get, they do not get as alms; they get it according to a particular procedure. For that, there are two authorities. The first is the Finance Commission, which derives its authority under the Constitution. The second authority in this matter is the President of India and the third is Parliament.

The sum up all that I have submitted, firstly, this Bill has not received the assent or approval of the President so as to be relatable to the requirements of article 281 of the Constitution, inasmuch as this Bill is going to make a substantive amendment to an Act which was passed under article 281 of the Constitution. My submission is, unless we receive the assent or approval from the President, we cannot proceed with this Bill.

Secondly,* this Bill does not lay the pattern or procedure of distribution of Rs. 12.5 crores, which is going to be paid to the States in lieu of the tax on railway passenger fares.

Lastly, my point of order is: when two bodies are conflicting in their recommendations, whose recommendation will be valid? The Railway Convention Committee was a committee appointed by the Parliament. With all respect to a parliamentary committee, I beg to submit that it cannot over-ride the status and personality of a committee which derives its status and sanction from the Constitution. To clarify the point, we have the Supreme Court, High Courts and the Public Service Commission, who derive their authority from the Constitution. Now, this House cannot appoint a committee to sit in appeal on the judgment of the Supreme Court. That cannot be done because our authority is confined to the four walls of Parliament and the Constitution. Therefore, my point is, even though I have got every respect for the Railway Convention Committee, its recommendations cannot override the recommendations of a committee which derives its status and authority from the Constitution. On these three counts my feeling is that this Bill is *ultra vires* and unless the President gives his specific approval to this particular Bill, we cannot proceed with it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is that all?

Shri Mahanty: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the Deputy Minister of Finance anything to say on this?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Would you like me to reply now or should I reply to this objection when I reply to some other points that will be raised during the discussion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Since this has been raised as a point of order, therefore, it is being given precedence. But I would like to put one or two questions to the hon. Member, if he be agreeable to answer them. There is no doubt, I feel that so far as a commission or a body appointed by

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

the Constitution is concerned its recommendations should have preference over any other body that is appointed by Parliament. One is the will of the people and the other is the will of the representatives of the people. Therefore, I would agree there. But that is not the question here. Here we have got an Act that was passed by this Parliament, now we are going to repeal that Act of Parliament and Parliament itself is proposing to repeal it. What it does is to be seen afterwards. The question that I want to put to the hon. Member is this. The Finance Commission has powers to distribute the revenues and not to levy any fresh taxes. It cannot raise revenues afresh. The revenues or taxes are levied by the will of Parliament alone. No tax can be levied without an Act of this Parliament. Passenger fares are a different thing altogether. But this was a clear tax that was levied and an Act had been passed here by this Parliament. Therefore, now what we are proposing to do is not, as the hon. Member has put it, to do away with the recommendations of the Finance Commission. They have only suggested the ways and means, how those revenues that are raised through taxation by Acts of Parliament—and this was one of those Acts, 57 of 1957—would be distributed among the States and the Centre. Here—I am just putting it to the hon. Member to reply—the proposal is that an Act of Parliament that had been passed here might be repealed. If there is no revenue on account of that tax, then where does the question of the distribution of the tax or revenue that would accrue from it come in? Firstly it is proposed that the Act might be repealed. So, there would be no revenue which can be distributed among the Centre and the States on account of that Act. Would it mean, as the hon. Member wants to put it, that we are doing away or taking away the authority of the Commission by what we are doing here? Because they have only recommended—and those recommen-

dations are placed before this Parliament—that the revenue arising out of that Act or as a consequence of that Act should be distributed in this manner. Now this Parliament is proposing to repeal that Act. If the revenue is not there, there would be nothing to be distributed. That is all what is being done. I would like the hon. Member to devote his attention to this point.

Shri Mahanty: You have been pleased to raise two points. No. 1, if I have understood you correctly, is that an Act was passed, it is now being repealed and, therefore, there can be nothing very sinister about it.

No. 2 is that the Finance Commission cannot impose a levy, it can only merely distribute certain resources. Now, I venture to submit that the very Act which is now being sought to be repealed, if you kindly look at its title, reads like this:

“An Act to provide for the distribution of the net proceeds of the estate duty and the tax on railway passenger fares among the States.....”.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I differ from the hon. Member that the Statement of Objects and Reasons is a part of the Act.

Shri Mahanty: That is not very much to my purpose.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This was the observation that he had made.

Shri Mahanty: I said that *ter alia*. You may take it out. What I am inviting your kind attention to is the heading which you will find in the annexure to this Bill. The heading of the Act which we are now going to amend is:

“An Act to provide for the distribution of the net proceeds of the estate duty and the tax on railway passenger fares among the States in pursuance of the principles of distribution.....”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is reading the heading of the Act which we passed last time?

Shri Mahanty: Yes. It is the Title of the Act which is now going to be amended. It is very material for my purpose because now I will make out that it is a very special Act and not an Act of the ordinary kind.

17.46 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Sir, the Title of the Act which we are now seeking to amend reads like this:

"An Act to provide for the distribution of the net proceeds of the estate duty and the tax on railway passenger fares among the States in pursuance of the principles of distribution formulated and the recommendations made by the Finance Commission in its report dated the 30th day of September, 1957."

(*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members must hear him. The hon. Minister is here. He may go on.

Shri Mahanty: Sir, I have raised a point of order.

Shri A. M. Tariq (Jammu and Kashmir): He was asked some questions by the Chair and he is answering them now.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I would like to satisfy the hon. Member. He has already raised those points.

Shri Mahanty: She may satisfy me later. Let me first satisfy the hon. Deputy-Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: He has already raised the point of order? May I request the hon. Deputy-Speaker to tell me what exactly had happened?

Sardar Hukam Singh (Bhatinda): The point of order that he has raised

is this. A Finance Commission was appointed and it had made certain recommendations. In pursuance of those recommendations made under articles 280 and 281 of the Constitution certain sums have been allotted to the States. The appointment of the Finance Commission is under article 280 and the President then causes those recommendations, with his own observations or recommendations, whatever they might be, to be placed before each House of Parliament. That is under article 281. Now Government have brought forward a Bill to repeal the Act of 1957 which enabled the States to get a certain portion of the revenues that were to be raised through the passenger fares tax. He has raised two objections. One is that though the Railway Convention Committee has made the recommendation that the railway passenger fares tax should be merged with railway fares, it did not have the authority or the superior power to override the directions or recommendations of the Finance Commission which was a statutory body. The President had forwarded those recommendations to this Parliament. The first point that he has raised is that even if the Railway Convention Committee has made that recommendation, it should not override the recommendation that had been made earlier by the Finance Commission which was a statutory body.

His second point is that when this has been done by a statute and when the States are entitled to get a fixed share, percentage or a portion of the revenues that are received, this Bill which has been brought to do away with all these provisions, facilities and benefits that the States are getting has no power and that this Bill would be *ultra vires* in the presence of the old statute that was passed in pursuance of those recommendations. These are the two points that he has put before the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: What does the Minister say?

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Vellore): The Deputy-Speaker had put some questions to the hon. Member.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I had put two questions to the hon. Member. One was that the Finance Commission had only to make recommendations as regards the method of distribution of revenues or taxes; the Finance Commission had no authority to raise any revenues or to levy a tax. That could be done only by Parliament, and Parliament had passed an Act in 1957 because the revenues were not there. Therefore, the Finance Commission took note of it. Otherwise, it was not within the initiative of the Finance Commission itself to say that such revenues should be raised. It could not make recommendations for levying of taxes or for raising of revenues. Whatever the revenues might be, there the Finance Commission can make recommendations, under article 280 of the Constitution, as to the method of distribution between the Centre and the States. So this revenue was raised by an Act of Parliament, and if Parliament is now passing another law to repeal that Act there is no harm in that. What is the objection of the hon. Member if this Parliament passes another Act to repeal the older Act which it has passed itself; and this is only repealing of an Act by Parliament. This was one question that I had put to him.

The second question was that it was only about the revenue to be distributed that the recommendation had been made. But if there were no revenues, the Finance Commission did not come in. The Act relating to the tax had been passed here and a certain amount was there which was to be distributed in a certain manner. Now this present Bill does away with that old Act, and therefore there would be no revenues under any Act. It would merge into the passenger fares, and that would be a different thing altogether.

Mr. Speaker: But the States would lose to that extent, if it is merged with the tax.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: They are not losing.

Sardar Hukam Singh: There is a definite sum given in its place.

Mr. Speaker: A definite sum¹ is given in its place.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I say something on this?

Mr. Speaker: I shall hear her.

What is the answer of the hon. Member to this?

Shri Mahanty: The hon. the Deputy-Speaker was good enough to put me two questions.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I am hearing them. Does he want to spend away the time? Let him come along and answer point by point. The Finance Commission may be a statutory body, but it is not stated in the Constitution that the Commission's finding is binding upon Parliament. What is the answer?

Shri Mahanty: The question, as I understood, was that an Act....

Mr. Speaker: Let him understand it now. The question is; how far the Finance Commission's recommendations are binding. The President accepts certain recommendations and places them before the House. Nowhere is it stated in the Constitution that the Finance Commission's recommendations are *ipso facto* binding on Parliament. What is the answer to that?

Shri Mahanty: Exactly. I am in perfect agreement with you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Then it is all right.

Shri Mahanty: You may kindly hear me out, Sir. This is a very important point. The Parliament can throw out the recommendations of the Finance Commission. There is nothing wrong in that. But, it must go through the particular procedure mentioned in article 281 of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker: What is it?

Shri Mahanty: Article 281 says:

"The President shall cause every recommendation made by the Finance Commission under the provisions of this Constitution together with an explanatory memorandum as the action taken thereon to be laid before each House of Parliament."

The President had also approved of it. It was laid on the Table of the House. If that is going to be amended, it must have the President's sanction under article 281.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know for information if there was a positive Resolution passed by this House?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: On the recommendations of the Finance Commission?

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: On this Convention, a positive Resolution was passed.

Mr. Speaker: On the Convention. Not on the Finance Commission's recommendations.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: No.

Shri Mahanty: No Resolution was passed.

Mr. Speaker: Was a Resolution passed accepting it?

Shri Mahanty: No. I will answer it in a minute. No resolution was passed, if I remember correctly. If you will kindly look at the Title of the Act 57 of 1957 it says,

"An Act to provide for the distribution of the net proceeds of the estate duty and the tax on railway passenger fares among the States in pursuance of the principles of distribution formulated and the recommendations made by the Finance Commission in its re-

port, dated the 30th day of September, 1957."

What is meant is, this Act was passed after it passed through all the formalities of article 281 of the Constitution. If the hon. Minister comes to this House after obtaining the sanction of the President under article 281, of course, I will be out of court.

An Hon. Member: Court?

Shri Mahanty: Yes; this is also a court. What I submit is, apart from the other points which are there, this suffers from this very great—what shall I say—imperfection inasmuch as the President has not been consulted in the matter. We do not know what are the President's reactions and views.

Mr. Speaker: Does it refer to the Passenger Fares Act?

Shri Mahanty: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Specifically?

Shri Mahanty: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Does it refer to merely allocation of percentage or does it say what are the sources which are to be distributed?

Shri Mahanty: The sources have to be distributed because that was a term of reference of the Finance Commission.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going into the terms of reference of the Finance Commission. What are the terms of the Act? Do they say Railway Passenger Fares Act?

Shri Mahanty: Yes. The title of the Act was: "The Estate Duty and Tax on Railway Passenger Fares (Distribution) Act, 1957". That Act has been....

Mr. Speaker: I have heard him.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: So far as article 281 is concerned, it does

[Shrimati Tarkeshwar Sinha]

not say anywhere that Parliament cannot overrule the recommendations of the Finance Commission. Article 281 only says:

"The President shall cause every recommendation made by the Finance Commission under the provisions of this Constitution together with an explanatory memorandum as to the action taken thereon to be laid before each House of Parliament."

That is the only provision which the hon. Member opposite is quoting.

The Bill as it stands today seeks to repeal the Railway Passenger Fares Act, which is a tax in which the States are interested, no doubt. Provisions of the Estate Duty Act, as the hon. Member has pointed out, are also being amended to omit reference therein to the Railway passenger fares tax. As required by article 117 (1) and article 274(1) of the Constitution, the recommendation of the President has been obtained. As regard the second point.....

Shri Mahanty: Article 274 is only with reference to taxes.

Shrimati Tarkeshwar Sinha: That is exactly what this Bill pertains to. The hon. Member will bear with me. That so far as distribution of the proceeds of the tax is concerned it is the responsibility of the Finance Commission, as the hon. Deputy-Speaker pointed out. If there is no tax, the Finance Commission will not distribute any tax at all. Therefore, when the tax is not there, the distribution of the tax by the Finance Commission does not arise at all. Parliament is now permitting the Railways to give as a general subvention an amount of Rs. 12.5 crores. Only when this amount is collected, the Finance Commission will have the responsibility of distributing it. Certainly, the Finance Commission will decide the way in which this sum of Rs. 12.5 crores will be distributed to the respective States.

So far as the point raised by the hon. Member that the States are losing is concerned, I do not agree with it, because, the figures that we have worked out represent the average collection of the tax from 1958-59 to 1959-60. These are the two years, on the basis of which we have based these figures of the amounts which were collected as passenger fares tax. And these years have been regarded as the average years for the distribution of the tax. Therefore, the question of the States losing any revenue because of the merger of this passenger fares tax with the passenger fares as such does not arise, because the States would be getting subventions at the same level as they have been getting before. But the only thing is that instead of allotment from the proceeds, they will get from the general collection of the passenger fares. That is exactly the proceeds that the States are going to get, and I do not think there should be any apprehension in the minds of the States that they are going to necessarily lose the revenue. It is only for railway purposes, namely that the railways should earn more, that this provision has been made elastic.

18 hrs.

Shri Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): There is one more aspect. The examination by the Finance Commission is a continuous process, and if one Finance Commission goes, another comes in, and at any time, the new Finance Commission can take the matter into its cognisance at the appropriate stage.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order has been raised. So far as the Finance Commission is concerned, it is clear that the Finance Commission makes recommendations, and those recommendations are placed on the Table of the House at the direction of the President. An Act was also passed, called the Estate Duty and Tax on Railway Passenger Fares (Distribu-

tion) Act, 1957, which refers pointedly to the net proceeds and says:

"...the net proceeds of the tax on railway passenger fares levied and collected during that financial year shall, after deducting therefrom a sum equal to one quarter per cent. of the said proceeds as being attributable to Union territories, be distributed among the States....".

The question now is that the States are also interested in the distribution of the proceeds. Under article 274 of the Constitution, wherever any Act has to be amended, in respect of which the States are also interested, the sanction of the President has to be obtained. That requirement has been satisfied here.

Now, the only point is whether when once a particular way of distribution recommended by a Finance Commission has been accepted, we must wait for another Finance Commission to change the way of distribution. That is the first point. The earlier Finance Commission contemplated some sources of money. The second point is whether those sources can be given up now.

Parliament is always powerful to act, to enact and to repeal. It is open to this Parliament to say that under the altered circumstances, we do not think that this is any longer applicable, and, therefore, we do not want to do as before. Then, the States that are interested in these sources may say that they want some more money and they are not satisfied with this; then, it is a matter which we can consider. But, there is nothing *ultra vires*. We can enact, and we can also repeal. It is not said anywhere that except with the Finance Commission's recommendations or proposals, we cannot do anything. We can say that even without the Finance Commission we are going to make such and such grant to the States.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): What is the percentage of the revenues which is going to be distributed to the various States? Where is that indicated? Take the case of the Finance Commission's recommendations on the estate duty.....

Mr. Speaker: What will happen is this. Under clause 3 of the Bill, section 5 of the Act which reads thus will be repealed:

"During each financial year commencing on and after the 1st day of April, 1957, the net proceeds of the tax on railway passenger fares levied and collected during that financial year shall, after deducting therefrom a sum equal to one quarter per cent. of the said proceeds as being attributable to Union territories, be distributed among the States..."

That is, the tax on railway passenger fares will not be distributed hereafter by the repeal of this. To that extent, the States suffer. To that extent, we are going in contravention of the recommendations of the Finance Commission.

What is the substitute for this? They have said that they are going to grant a lump sum. If the States are interested and are not satisfied with it, let them write to the President and then the President will allow another Bill to be introduced giving a bigger grant. Instead of going to State after State, under the Constitution, the President has been authorised to do it. Whenever a Bill is to be introduced wherein some proceeds of a tax are to be distributed, it is the President who is the competent authority to give sanction. He has now found that the alternative method, though this is repealed, does not affect the States injuriously. If the States are affected, then Parliament will always be ready to look into it. The President also, if he finds it necessary, will allow another Bill to be introduced. This is not *ultra vires* the Constitution.

Shri Tangamani: May I seek a clarification?

Shri A. M. Tariq: What about the half-hour discussion?

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): I have to make a few observations on this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Why not we dispose of this Bill? We will sit a few minutes more.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I expected that the hon. Deputy Minister, when she moved yesterday for the consideration of the Bill, would elaborate certain aspects of it.

Shri Mahanty: I want to speak on it:

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I was a member of the Railway Convention Committee.

Shri A. M. Tariq: There is a little difficulty so far as I am concerned. I have to go at 6.30 P.M. to break my Ramzan fast. So I cannot stay any longer.

Mr. Speaker: Then further discussion of the Bill will stand over till tomorrow.

I have disposed of the point of order. This Bill will be taken up and disposed of first tomorrow after the Question Hour and the preliminary work are over.

18.06 hrs.

'VISIT THE ORIENT' YEAR*

Mr. Speaker: We shall now have the half-an-hour discussion to be raised by Shri A. M. Tariq.

*Half-An-Hour Discussion.

श्री अ० नू० तारिक (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : मिस्टर स्पीकर, मैं ने यह आष घंटे का डिस्कशन उस जवाब के सिलसिले में उठाया है जोकि जनाब वजीर ने भरे स्टांड क्वेश्चन नम्बर ८०७ के बारे में २६ दिसम्बर सन् १९६० को लोक सभा में दिया था।

मैं इस हाफ और डिस्कशन के जरिये अपने वजीर साहब की तबज्जह इन जरूरी बात की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क में बाहर के सैयाहों के लिये इस कदर इन्तजाम नहीं है जिस कदर कि सैयाह हमारे मुल्क में आते हैं। यह हकीकत है कि जहाँ तक हमारी पब्लिसिटी का ताल्लुक है या जहाँ तक टूरिस्ट्स के हिन्दुस्तान आने का ताल्लुक है हम बहुत अच्छा काम करते हैं और इस बारे में मैं वजीर साहब की तबज्जह उस स्टेटमेंट को तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ जोकि २१ मम्बरा की एक ट्रिवल एजेन्स टीम ने जिस का कि अमेरिकन मोबाइटी ऑफ ट्रिवल एजेन्स ने स्वीयर किया है, दिया है। उन के लीडर जीन माटिन ने हिन्दुस्तान में टूरिस्ट्स फमिलिटीज के बारे में २३ अक्टूबर सन् १९६० के हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में यह लिखा है : -

"Indian publicity about tourism in the U.S. was excellent and more than adequate. But tourist facilities, excepting in Delhi and Srinagar, were quite inadequate, and even places like Bombay and Calcutta needed more hotels".

हाउस में बार बार इस बात की चर्चा की जाती है कि हमारे मुल्क में इस टूरिज्म के जरिए करोड़ों रुपये की आमदनी होती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर यह दुस्त हो और यह फिलवाक्या प्रोपेण्डा नहीं है और यह हकीकत है कि हम फीरेन टूरिस्ट्स के जरिए इस मुल्क में करोड़ों