

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा : लेकिन हमको वायदा किया है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The list was to be sent to each Member. Normally we don't allow any questions. And, as the questions were addressed to me, to get out of the procedure, that was the only procedure I adopted, and so I hope the questions addressed to me were also heard by the Minister. And, if he likes, he can also make his observations. That is the only way I can cover this.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I would like to clarify one point if you permit.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned for lunch to meet at 2 P.M.

13.05 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at six minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.*

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR in the Chair]

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE—Contd.

IMPORT TRADE CONTROL POLICY

THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Import Trade Control Policy for the year 1970-71. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3031/70].

14.07 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: CALCUTTA PORT (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE  
&  
CALCUTTA PORT (AMMENDMENT) BILL

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta's resolution regarding disapproval of the Calcutta Port (Amendment) Ordinance.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): I rise on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On what?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: On this particular motion, I have a point of order. Has he moved his motion or not? After he moves the motion, I have a submission to make.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : सभापति जी, मैं आपकी आज्ञा से निम्नलिखित प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत करता हूँ कि :

“यह सभा कलकत्ता पत्तन (संशोधन) अध्यादेश, 1970 (1970 का अध्यादेश संख्या 2) का, जो 2 फरवरी, 1970 को राष्ट्रपति द्वारा प्रख्यापित किया गया था, निरनुमोदन करती है।”

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I rise on a point of order. May I invite your kind attention to rule 340 which says that:

“At any time after a motion has been made, a member may move that the debate on the motion be adjourned.”?

I have received so many telegrams today from various places in UP, from the Central Government employees as well as, the State Government employees, in regard to the levy of professional tax from 1965.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Kindly hear me. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think that it is important enough for this kind of interruption.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I am moving the motion under rule 340.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I want that the Finance Minister should make a statement here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: This is a very important thing, and I also support him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not the occasion for it. This is not important enough for the interruption of the business of the House.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I have given it under rule 340. You can rule me out after hearing me, and I shall abide by your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have heard him sufficiently to understand that it is not important enough for the interruption of the normal business of the House.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: This matter relates to UP and professional tax has been levied on the Central Government as well as State Government employees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are many other occasions when he can raise it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Unless we raise it now, the mischief will be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary that the business of the House should be adjourned. It is an important point. But my point is that this is not important enough for the adjournment of the normal business of the House. I do not deny its importance. I only say that it is not important enough for the adjournment of the normal business of the House at this time of the day.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Let the House be adjourned for two hours.

श्री प्रकाश चौर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : सभापति जी, इनको यह कह दीजिए कि उत्तर प्रदेश में एक बड़ी समस्या सरकार है। उनको लिखें वह उनका समाधान कर दें।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: We have already written to the Chief Minister. I am not allergic to Shri Charan Singh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He may raise it on other occasions.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : सभापतिजी, बहुत महत्व की बात है, हजारों केन्द्रीय सरकारी कर्मचारियों पर यह प्रोफेशन टैक्स लगाया जा रहा है जो नहीं होना चाहिए। और पुराना पिछले चार, पांच साल का लगाया जा रहा है।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: There are all-India services also. How can this tax be levied on them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta speaking on his resolution or not?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: He is speaking on profession tax.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : सभापति जी, मैं कलकत्ता पोर्ट (संशोधन) अध्यादेश, 1970 का निरनुमोदन दो कारणों से करना चाहता हूँ। उसका एक कारण तो यह है कि लगभग आठ साल पहले एक मेजर पोर्ट ट्रस्ट एक्ट सरकार ने पास किया था और उसके तहत सरकार ने पोर्ट कमिश्नर्स को अधिकार दिए थे कि जो भी वह काम करना चाहें कर सकते हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि सात साल से जब से यह एक्ट पास है, सरकार ने कलकत्ता पोर्ट कमिश्नर को जो अधिकार देना चाहिए था वह क्यों नहीं दिया? यह जबर्दस्त भ्रमिशन है। सरकार सात साल तक क्यों सोती रही और कोई कार्रवाई नहीं की? हो सकता है कि कलकत्ता के भलावा और भी पोर्ट ऐसे हों देश में जहाँ के कमिश्नरों को इस प्रकार की पावर्स अभी तक नहीं हैं, लेकिन अच्छा यह होता कि या तो इस बिल को पास करते समय या उसके तुरन्त बाद सरकार यह पावर्स कमिश्नर को दे देती।

मेरी दूसरी आपत्ति यह है कि जब सदन मिलने जा रहा है तब सरकार की यह तो प्रवृत्ति है कि अध्यादेश जारी कर दे, यह बहुत गलत बात है। बास्तब में यह एक तरफ तो सदन का अपमान है और दूसरी तरफ पार्लियामेन्टी प्रेक्टिस, पार्लियामेन्टी डिकोरम

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्ता]

श्रीर पालियामेंट्री प्रोप्रायटी का भी क्लिअर बायोलेसन है। प्रच्छा यह होता कि सदन के सामने यह बिल आता श्रीर सदन इसको पास करता। प्रध्यादेश की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं थी। यह बिल किस लिए लाया गया है कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट कमिश्नर को यह अधिकार दिया जाय कि हुगली पर दूसरा पुल बनाया जाय। यह मामला कई सालों से चल रहा है, तब फिर इसको एकदम से लाने की जरूरत क्यों पड़ी? सरकार पहले से क्यों नहीं जगी? जब यह सरकार पहले बिल लाई थी तभी उसको यह चीज सामने रखनी चाहिए थी। उस समय यदि वह सदन के सामने आती तब यह पास हो जाता, इसमें कोई दिक्कत नहीं होती। लेकिन सरकार ने अपनी इनक्विटिविटी की वजह से, अपने प्रोमिशन ऐंड कमिशन की वजह से, अपनी क्रिमिनल नेगिजेंस की वजह से ऐसा नहीं किया। जो अधिकार सरकार को या राष्ट्रपति को दिए जाते हैं, जो कि बहुत कम इस्तेमाल किए जाने चाहिये, जिनको केवल इमर्जेंसी में इस्तेमाल किया जाना चाहिए, उनको छोटे-छोटे तरीकों से इस्तेमाल करके पालियामेंट्री डिक्ोरन, पालियामेंट्री प्रोप्रायटी की प्रवहेलना करती है। उसकी यह प्रवदत पड़ गई है कि जिन चीजों की ओर उसका ध्यान जाना चाहिए उनकी ओर ध्यान नहीं देती है। इसलिए मैंने यह डिसेम्ब्रवल का प्रस्ताव रक्खा है।

जहां तक इस बिल का सम्बन्ध है, मैं सरकार के साथ पूर्णतया सहमत हूँ। मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ और उसका कारण साफ है। समर्थन और स्वागत मैं इसलिए करता हूँ कि हुगली पर दूसरा पुल बनने से कलकत्ता की भीड़ में भी कमी होगी और कलकत्ता की जो तकलीफें हैं वह भी दूर हो जायेंगी। साथ ही जो कलकत्ता का पोर्ट है उसको भी काफी लाभ होगा। आपको मालूम है कि यू. पी., बिहार तथा उत्तर भारत के सभी

राज्यों का माल कलकत्ता पोर्ट पर जाता है, और जितना ही कलकत्ते का पोर्ट विकसित होगा उतना ही लाभ देश के इस भाग को बंगाल को होगा और देश की एकानामी के साथ वेस्ट बंगाल की एकानामी और उत्तर भारत की एकानामी काफ़ी निर्भर करती है कलकत्ता पोर्ट पर। इसलिए जरूरी है कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट को वेल डेवेलप्ड और माडर्न पोर्ट बनाया जाय। इसलिए हमको इस विधेयक का स्वागत करना ही चाहिए।

लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ मैं दो-एक बातें भी कहना चाहता हूँ। सरकार अभी तक कलकत्ता पोर्ट की सिल्टिंग को नहीं रोक पाई है, दूसरे उस पर करीब 7 करोड़ रुपये खर्च करती है, और यह चीज काफ़ी दिनों से चलती आई है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह बिल पास होने के बाद भी इसमें कोई फर्क पड़ने वाला है या उस पर 7 करोड़ रुपये ही खर्च होता रहेगा, जिस तरह से आज हो रहा है। इस 7 करोड़ रुपये की राशि को कम करने के लिए सरकार क्या व्यवस्था करने जा रही है? पहले इसका एस्टिमेट 7 करोड़ ६० था, उसके बाद 22 करोड़ ६० का एस्टिमेट बन गया। आखिर जो तीन गुना एस्टिमेट बढ़ा है तो यह क्यों हुआ, सरकार को इसकी जांच करनी चाहिए। कोई कहता है कि इस पुल को ऊंचा करने के कारण बढ़ा है ताकि जहाज उसके नीचे से निकल सकें। मेरा खयाल यह है कि अभी भी जो पुल है उसके नीचे से शायद जहाज नहीं निकल सकते हैं।

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता ( भलीपुर ) :  
जरूरत ही नहीं है निकलने की।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्ता : इसके बारे में मुझे ज्यादा मालूम नहीं है, मंत्री महोदय बतलायेंगे, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि जो यह 15 करोड़ ६० खर्च अधिक किया गया वह इसलिए किया गया कि अगर किन्हीं जहाजों को नीचे

से निकलने की जरूरत पड़े तो भी उसकी व्यवस्था हो सके। यह 15 करोड़ ६० लाख करने के बाद क्या जो कलकत्ता का पोर्ट है वह अच्छी तरह डेवेलप हो जाएगा और क्या वहां जहाजों के आने जाने की सुविधा ठीक प्रकार से होगी? इस सम्बन्ध में भी मंत्री महोदय से मैं पूछना चाहता हूं।

एक चीज जो मुझे खटक रही है वह यह कि फरवका वीराज बनने में पाकिस्तान के झगड़े की वजह से देर हो रही है। जैसा पहले खयाल था, और जैसा मंत्री महोदय ने यहां भी कहा था, कि शेडयूल्ड टाइम से पहले यह बंदर बन जाएगा। लेकिन अब सरकार यह कहती है कि इसमें कुछ देर होगी। अब अगर देर होगी तो कलकत्ते पोर्ट में उतना काम नहीं हो सकता जितना होना चाहिए। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इसके लिए सरकार ने क्या अल्टरनेटिव रखा है? अगर इसमें देर हुई तो कलकत्ता पोर्ट पर ज्यादा माल आ जा सके या जहाज आ जा सकें इसका ठीक इन्तजाम करने के लिए सरकार ने क्या अल्टरनेटिव रखा है?

मैं एक और चीज की ओर सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं। कलकत्ते में भी और जहां जहां बन्दरगाह हैं वहां सामान की चोरी बहुत होती है। जहां-जहां पर भी बन्दरगाह हैं, वहां आप शहरों में जाकर देखिए दुकानें लगी होती हैं और खुल्लमखुल्ला इम्पोर्टेड माल बिकता है। सरकार से बार बार कहने के बाद उसने कहा कि हमने एक कमेटी बना दी है, वह इसको रोक रही है। मेरा कहना यह है कि जो कदम सरकार ने उठाया वह ठीक नहीं था और अगर ठीक कदम उठाया है तो वह इतना नाकाफी है कि करोड़ों रुपये का माल बन्दरगाहों से बाजार में आता है और बिकता है। इसको रोकने की बहुत ज्यादा जरूरत है। यही नहीं कि इसमें नीचे के कर्मचारी शामिल हैं, बल्कि इसमें ऊपर से लेकर नीचे तक लोगों की स्मंगल्टी के साथ कांस्पिरेसी होती है। जब तक इस कांस्पिरेसी

को नहीं तोड़ा जाएगा तब तक यह चीज ठीक नहीं होगी। मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि वह कोई इस तरह की मशीनरी बनायें, कोई इंटेलिजेंस सेल बनायें, जिससे कि जो चोरी कलकत्ता पोर्ट या दूसरे बन्दरगाहों पर होती है उसको रोका जा सके और जो करोड़ों रुपयों का नुकसान होता है वह न हो।

मुझे पिछले महीने कलकत्ता जाने का मौका मिला था। मैं डाक को भी देखने गया। वहां मैंने देखा कि एक बहुत बड़ी बिल्डिंग खड़ी है जो कि कई मंजिली बिल्डिंग है और शायद स्टोरिंग के लिए बनाई गई थी। इतनी बड़ी बिल्डिंग शायद 5 या 6 करोड़ ६० से बनेगी। वह किस की है। वह डाक के पास ही है लेकिन पता यह लगा कि यह बिल्डिंग दो या तीन साल से बनी खड़ी है लेकिन उसका कोई इस्तेमाल नहीं हो रहा है। क्योंकि वह डिफेक्टिव है। समझ में नहीं आ सकता कि 5-6 करोड़ रुपये का वेस्टेज किसने किया और कौन इसके लिए जिम्मेदार है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि सरकार ने इसकी एन्वॉयरी की या नहीं। अगर की तो क्या मालूम हुआ? जिन लोगों ने यह बिल्डिंग डिफेक्टिव तरीके से बनाई उनको सजा दी गई या नहीं? मैं मांग करता हूं कि जो भी इसके लिए जिम्मेदार हों, ठेकेदार हों, काम करने वाले हों, सरकारी अफसर हों, जिन लोगों ने भी ऐसा काम किया है, उनको कड़ी सजा दी जाय। आपको या इस सरकार को या किसी एक व्यक्ति को इस बात का अधिकार नहीं है कि जो लोग पसीना बहा-बहा कर पैसा कमाते हैं उनकी मेहनत की कमाई को इस तरीके से पानी में मिला दें।

संसद् कार्य विभाग और नीबहन तथा परिवहन मंत्रालय में उपबंधी (श्री इकबाल सिंह) : कौन सी बिल्डिंग है?

श्री कौबर लाल गुप्त : डाक के पास है। मेरा खयाल है एक फरलांग पर होगी।

[श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त]

ज्यादा दूर नहीं है। वहां पर बंगलोज भी हैं जहां पर आपके पोर्ट पर काम करने वाले अपसर रहते हैं।

कलकत्ता पोर्ट को डिवेलेप करने के लिए सरकार को जल्दीसे जल्दीकदम उठाने चाहिये। इसको सबसे पहले प्रायोरिटी देनी चाहिए। पहला कारण तो यह है कि यह बोर्डर है और दूसरा यह कि इससे कलकत्ता की इकोनोमी भी अच्छी होगी। कलकत्ता शहर के बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि वस्ट स्लम है, दुनिया का सबसे खराब स्लम अगर कहीं है तो कलकत्ता में है। जब मैकनमारा कलकत्ता आए और बापिस यू० एस० ए० जाकर उन्होंने जो बयान दिया उसमें भी यही कहा कि दुनिया के बड़े शहरों में कलकत्ता शहर सबसे गंदा शहर है। कलकत्ता को अगर आप डिवेलेप करना चाहते हैं तो कलकत्ता पोर्ट को भी आपको डिवेलेप करना होगा। उसके लिए सरकार को शीघ्र ही कोई कदम उठाना चाहिए।

फरक्का बैरेज के बारे में मैंने पूछा है कि मास्टरनेटिव सरकार के पास क्या है, यह सरकार बताये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का तो समर्थन करता हूँ लेकिन जिस ढंग से यह विधेयक लाया गया है, उसका अनुमोदन मैं नहीं कर सकता।

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, AND THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI IQBAL SINGH): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Calcutta Port Act, 1890, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This is a small and simple Bill. It seeks to amend the Calcutta Port Act, 1890 with a view to confer powers on the Commissioners of Calcutta Port to undertake works or ser-

vices on behalf of other authorities, including the State Government. A similar provision exists in the Major Port Trusts Act, but that Act does not apply to Calcutta Port which is governed by its own Act.

The question was raised by the Mover of the Resolution why this had not been taken up earlier. Actually, when the Major Port Trusts Act was framed in 1963, the question was considered whether it should apply to Calcutta Port also, but because of the situation in Calcutta being different, we wanted to bring a new Act. For that purpose, the Major Ports Commission is sitting, and it is going to give its report in a few months and based on that report, we propose to amend all the Major ports Acts, including the Calcutta Port Act, comprehensively.

This amendment has assumed importance because the West Bengal Government is considering the construction of a second bridge on the river Hoogly. For that project they wanted to give some portion of the work to the Calcutta Port Commissioners, but the Commissioners cannot take up the job unless the Calcutta Port Act is amended.

In January 1969 it was decided to give a non-plan loan for a second bridge on the river Hoogly. Earlier the West Bengal Government wanted to pass the Hoogly River Bridge Act. At that time the President's rule came and that Act was passed by the Consultative Committee. But after the election the new Government wanted to make some amendment and they passed a new Act in replacement of the President's Act. When the new Act was passed and assented to by the President, certain consequential things arose. What will be the composition of the Bridge Commissioners? For that they asked us to amend the Calcutta Port Act. We had introduced a similar Bill in Rajya Sabha on the last day of the last session, 24th December, 1969. It could not be passed. We did not want to delay the work on the Second bridge on Hoogly. For that purpose the West Bengal Government has asked the Central Government to bring this Ordinance so that powers may be given to the Calcutta Port Commissioners and they could undertake this work. If there was no provision, they could not do it. That is why we brought this Ordinance.

There can be no two opinions on bringing forward an Ordinance for development purposes, for expediting the matter. The hon. Mover of the Resolution also said that it was a very important work and he agreed with the purpose of the Bill. An enabling clause had been put in this Bill so that all things done during that time may also be incorporated. Section 35 of that Act does not provide that the Port Commissioners can do any work on behalf of the State Government. We are giving that power to the Port Commissioner so that they can do any work on behalf of the State Government. It is a small and simple measure and I request the House to pass it.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:** What about the points raised by me?

**SHRI IQBAL SINGH:** He says, why we had not brought any amendment before. There was no necessity for this. The Second Hoogly bridge was sanctioned and the West Bengal Government wanted to construct that bridge. That is why the necessity has arisen. We do not want to amend every Act unnecessarily. When a contingency arises, we amend the Act. He says that Calcutta port should be modernised. That is what we are doing. The Farraka barrage is being constructed; more than Rs. 150 crores are provided so that water is there in the port for sufficient depth. In Haldia we are constructing a most modern port. Now Hoogly brings 12 million tonnes of silt every year and de-silting it is a problem. Some part of it is pushed out with the river force and some taken in by the sea force also. For desilting it we have provided one of the biggest dredger fleet and we have sanctioned one more big estuarian dredger. Still it is a fight against nature; and within the available resources we are trying to help them. About 12 millions tonnes of silt come to be removed annually Farraka barrage is being constructed for that purpose.

Then, the hon. Member has referred to pilferage. In this matter, we have taken steps not only in the Calcutta port but in other ports also. There is also some improvement. In Calcutta, we have appointed an anti-pilferage Committee, as also in other ports. They meet every month and take stock of the things and formulate measures as to how to stop pilferage, and whosoever

helps them, we also reward them: We have taken a definite step for preventing pilferage in the ports through anti-pilferage measures. With that, there is some improvement in the situation. I cannot say that there is a total improvement. Let us wait for some time more and see how this menace can be met.

Regarding the building, if he can write to me, giving me the name of the building, I shall look into it, because the Calcutta port has got a big area; it may be a private or government building. I will certainly look into it and see to it. If you can give me definite information.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:** Let him make enquiries; what else can I give; there is no name of the building. It is within a radius of four furlongs from the docks. This building is owned by the Shipping Department of the Government of India.

**SHRI IQBAL SINGH:** Perhaps in the radius of four furlongs, even the whole of the Dalhousie Square is situated. If he can write to me giving the particulars, I shall see.

Sir, these are the points which hon. Members have made and I have replied to them. I commend the Bill for the consideration of the House.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Both the resolution and the Bill are before the House. The discussion will be on both. The total time is two hours. I think for the first reading we may take an hour and a half, because there are only a very few amendments.

**SHRI M. S. MURTI (Anakapalli):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I commend the purpose of this Bill but I have certain doubts regarding the actual necessity for amending the Calcutta Port Act of 1890. I feel that the Government has asked these Port Commissioners to construct this bridge on their behalf. I do not quite understand the meaning of the words "The Commissioners may undertake to carry out on behalf of any person (including any State Government)" I do not know whether this Ministry wanted to convert the Port Commissioners into a contract building worker. The Port Commissioners have got their own work to do and they are notable to do it. They are not able to remove the silt from the river at the Calcutta port. The

[Shri M. S. Murti]

Calcutta Port Commissioner have not yet been able to cope with the silt problem. Even the World Bank has given them a loan. Even as long ago as 1964, it was pointed out that the Calcutta port should be improved and the construction should be improved. Ships with a draught of 36 feet can not get into the Calcutta port as such, and for obtaining this draught, big dredgers have to be brought there. All the silt has also to be removed. At present, there are only certain portions over which the ships can sail and enter the port. When there is enough work for the Calcutta Port Commissioners which they are not able to fulfil, I do not know why this work also is being entrusted to them.

There may be certain technical difficulties in constructing the second bridge on the Hoogly. I have no objection in that regard. It is very necessary, and even in 1964 the Estimates Committee had gone into the details of this work and they had recommended to this Government, but the Government have been sleeping over it all these days; and that is probably for want of finance. Now that the State Government has taken up the work, they can readily call for tenders and ask them to carry on the work. If there is anything technical and there is some difficulty, there must be some sort of understanding between the State Government and the Port Commissioners so that both of them can co-ordinate the work and conduct the work peacefully there. I do not know why this thing has been given to the Port Commissioners.

Pilferage has been referred to. As pointed out by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta, especially during the recent months, there has been an increase in pilferage cases. I request that this should be looked into. The Minister himself has agreed that there is pilferage at the Calcutta port and said that it has been reduced. It is not a question of reduction; it must be completely eliminated from there.

Then there is the wording "of any person" and "such person." If it is for a particular purpose, I can as well understand it, because it is part and parcel of their work also, and because ships have to go under this bridge. I can understand it in that case. But when you ask them to construct it, any such people to construct, I do not know how the Govern-

ment allows the Port Commissioners to take upon themselves this contract. The second bridge on the Hoogly is a work of public concern. It is an essential thing. I welcome the purpose for which this power is being given to the Port Commissioner, but I cannot understand the term "any person". That means, any private person also can ask the Port Commissioner to construct a building for him. In that case, the Port Commissioners will convert themselves into a contract business. That is why I object to the words "any person."

The improvement of the port as such should also be taken up. The Haldia port has not been completed up till now; it has been pending for so many years. Originally it was intended to be a lightening port and not a modern port. I do not know whether it has been revised. In an area of 80 miles from the mouth of the river up to the Calcutta port, the sand bars should be removed. Then only ships with 36 ft. Draft can come easily. In present day shipping, the DWT is increasing up to 1 lakh tonnes. Unless the sandbars are removed, and the port is modernised, we cannot bring in the ships there and carry on import-export business. I appreciate the amendment sought to be made, but I object to the words "any person". It should be specifically mentioned that for this purpose alone it should be done and not for any other private business. No private person should be brought into this thing.

SHRIMATI ILA PALCHOUDHURI (Krishnagar): Sir, I am glad that this amendment is being made, because it will enable the Commissioners to take up certain work which is very necessary to do. I would remind the House that Calcutta Port actually earns for the country Rs. 300 crores of foreign exchange every year. Through the Calcutta Port, nearly 42 per cent of our exports and 25 per cent of our imports take place. Therefore, the Calcutta port is very important. We want Haldia and we want a second bridge over the Hoogly. But the sand bars have to be dredged effectively. Quite often the dredgers, that have been provided, are not commissioned, because they go out of order. They are very specialised dredgers and I congratulate the minister for getting those dredgers. But sometimes, they are not able

to function. I hope they would have lesser periods of non-functioning and the sand bars will be quickly removed.

Coming to the pilots, piloting of the ships in the Hoogly is one of the most specialised jobs in the world and I hope the pilots would be kept satisfied in every way, because if they are not satisfied, the whole port cannot function. Therefore, I would plead that the grievances of the pilots should be removed as quickly as possible.

There is a commission going into the pay structure of all dock workers. Whether Calcutta port dock workers are going to be assimilated into that structure is yet to be settled. I hope the Calcutta port dock workers will get their full dues and the Calcutta port, with all its possibilities will be fully developed and be the pride of Calcutta and India.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi): Sir, the story of Calcutta is a sad one. Having been the first port in this country, it is now the fourth. Out of a total of 550 lakh tonnes of freight, Calcutta now has only 90 lakh tonnes while Bombay has 180 lakh tonnes. It is a matter for serious consideration for this ministry, which has a direct responsibility because the port commission is under it. The port commission of Calcutta was the first port commission and it should have deserved more attention than what the ministry has given to it.

Five causes can be isolated because of which we can say the ministry has not paid attention to Calcutta port. Calcutta port is congested with barges. There is no means yet discovered of reducing the time lost by the barges, which obstruct the steamers from coming into the berths. This is a long-standing complaint on which no action has been taken.

Secondly, there is the question of inadequate storage. Although the Calcutta dock freight has been going down, it happens that the storage provided is still inadequate and that much of the freight has to be exposed to the elements and is also subject to, as my hon. friend has mentioned, pilferage on a very large and almost organised scale.

Thirdly, there is the question of mechanised aids. Although Calcutta was the first

port in respect of establishment and in respect of size it is now the last port in the way of mechanised aids. You have no proper lifting arrangements, you have no cranes and there is such a woeful lack of these things that you have the position that steamers have to take on an average 2.6 days for berthing. This is the figure for 1966-67. I may mention here that so inefficient is this port that the latest report available in our library, received in December, 1969, is of the year 1966-67. We are no more up to date than that and the Ministry has not seen that the Annual Report is promptly sent every year. According to that report, you have this position that it takes 2.6 days for berthing, and each day lost means an expenditure of Rs. 11,000 to 12,000. This is increasing from day to day and the turn-round is becoming a serious burden due to the inefficiency of the Port Commission.

Fourthly, since my hon. friends are here I am glad to point out this, we have the worst kind of labour organisation and the most worst kind of labour troubles in Calcutta. I would like to give some figures. I have already mentioned that Calcutta handles only half the freight of Bombay. But the labour employed in Calcutta is 42,000 as against 30,000 in Bombay and 20,000 in Madras which handles 60 lakhs tonnes. There is no proportion in the work done and the labour employed in the port.

I am glad the lady Member raised the question of equating of salary of port workers in Calcutta with those obtaining in the rest of the country. But I wish they would also equate the return, the productivity of the labour of Calcutta, with those in the rest of the country.

SHRIMATI ILA PALCHOU DHURI: I was referring to equating the salaries of port workers with those of port and dock workers in other ports of India. Calcutta port workers do as good work as anybody else.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: Then, the biggest problem is that Calcutta is a sick river. I do not say the Province but the river.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Aizpore): Calcutta is not a river.

**SHRI LOBO PRABHU:** Calcutta port is on a sick river; I would like to amend it for the benefit of my hon. friend. Now this river has to be seen how revived.

I am glad my hon. friend has raised the question of the Farraka barrage, which is a relevant one. Why is it that this barrage, which was supposed to be completed this year, does not seem to be in the process of completion even for another two years. You have every reason to expedite the construction of this barrage because time only means accumulation of more objections from Pakistan. They claimed only 3 million cusecs earlier. Now they have gone up to 40 million cusecs. If you delay the physical construction you are likely to allow the accumulation of larger claims by Pakistan. So, I would like to enter a very strong plea here that whatever finance is required must be found so that the Farraka barrage is completed as quickly as we can. If we fail to do that, Bhagirathi river will not be able to flush the port and the Hooghli river will not be able to do its share work.

At the moment the port can take ships of only 26 feet draft and that only for a few months a year. Mention has been made of the 11 bars which exist. Then, there is continuous bore in this river unknown anywhere, which means this is the most hazardous port in the world and also the most expensive port in the world. Between 1946 and 1966-67 the freight has been raised ten times and the freight cost now is nearly double the freight cost of any other port in the world. You cannot expect this port to improve until you reduce the freight costs. Along with the Farrakka barrage you have to expedite also the work of Haldia port. This is a matter where again the Ministry has slipped up. The construction has been slow.

Thirdly I come to the subject of dredging. The Minister has informed us that there is a dredging job unit there. But we have to remember that 10 million tonnes of sand or earth has to be taken out every year.

Have you considered if you have that amount of dredging capacity?—not only the capacity of the vessels you engage but the capacity of those vessels as demonstrated and as it is brought into play? My information is that they do not dredge even 5 million

tonnes and the result is that the port every day is getting silted more and more. The subject of dredging is important not only here but to all ports in the country. It is my own calculations that it is inadequate I would like the Minister to consult his officials there and satisfy this House that it is adequate. You make the mistake of not providing enough dredgers. There is work now in Mangalore port, in Tuticorin port and in Paradeep for excavation of something like 25 million cubic ft. There are only two dredging vessels—MOT I & MOT II. You have placed an order for one dredger with the Garden Reach Workshops. Now that workshop has a record of taking 34 months to complete a dredger for Paradeep with the result that that port has almost become a total loss. This Garden Reach workshop promised that within 9 months of getting the plans, they will get this dredger. This is impossible. I would like you here now that you get a commitment from the Defence Ministry that they could complete that dredger. If not, you may buy a dredger from abroad as you proposed to do. You had a contract. You buy a dredger from Yugoslavia or some far-eastern country, which you cancelled because of the hope of getting this dredger from Garden Reach. Otherwise, there is a dredger available with the Madras port which may be available in the month of May at a lower cost than what they contracted five years ago. Now if you do not engage that dredger, what is going to be the result? Your work will come to a standstill.

I am speaking of Mangalore port. I have some knowledge of development of that port Mangalore requires an excavation of ten million tonnes of earth. They are providing one dredger only. Even that has not yet arrived although they said that it would arrive on 1st April. This dredger can only excavate 1.25 million tonnes of earth. The Garden Reach Cutter dredger may not be available for years and you have placed an order only for a hopper dredger. A hopper dredger does not arise now. We want a cutter dredger at once. If you fail to provide them a cutter dredger immediately, the result will be that the amount of Rs. 25 crores which is being spent on Mangalore will be an idle investment from 1972, the scheduled date. Just calculate the interest and see to yourself as to how you can say that two small dredgers and a hypothetical problematic dredger from

the Garden Reach workshop plus a hopper dredger can complete this work. These dredgers can only do, according to my calculation—I would like to be corrected if I am wrong—even if we include the Garden Reach workshop dredger, 5 million cubic feet of earth whereas you have a job of 25 million cubic feet. At this rate it will five years for you to complete the work of Tuticorin and at Mangalore which will mean in other words that you have to pay interest for 3 years amounting to perhaps 10 or 12 crores of rupees because you will not spend Rs. 3 crores and acquire a dredger here and now. Therefore, I warn you, I warn this country and this Government which has failed to anticipate the requirements of the ports. I might mention here that because the Madras port work was not taken up quickly and was not completed in 1968, the cost has arisen from Rs. 4.6 crores to Rs. 15 crores. It is one small work and that work is so bad that they have to employ tugs to take the ships into the port and these tugs are not going to be ready for 2 years. It means that instead of 1968 your port will be working only in 1973. This is a disgrace. This is almost something to condemn the Ministry, to condemn the Minister, not the particular Ministers, but the whole line of Ministers who have failed the country in anticipating the just requirements of our ports.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I admire Mr. Lobo Prabhu for the industriousness with which he has tried to study the problems of Calcutta port. *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI IQBAL SINGH:** He was talking more of Mangalore port than of Calcutta port.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** I cannot resist the temptation to just mention two points because I do not think he is aware of this, while I agree with what he has said. One is that the existing dredger fleet of Calcutta port has not been utilised to the maximum possible capacity apart from the question of acquiring new dredgers. There are reports of Estimates committee and other bodies which show that the existing dredgers are being wasted. Second thing I may tell Mr. Lobo Prabhu is that however many dredgers you acquire, there will not be much

of a qualitative improvement because the mud, the silt, which is taken out of the river by the dredger is put back into the river. This is not a new thing. This is a thing which I have been raising for last 15 years. The mud is taken out and it is put back into the river at another place. There is no arrangement by which you adopt modern methods for dumping this silt on the shore and use that for some other purpose. This is a perpetual vicious circle going on like this. However, this is not the purpose of this amending Bill on which I want to say a few words. The Minister has not given a convincing reply to Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta's objection as to why there has been a delay in bringing the ordinance. He has also taken objection to the ordinance being promulgated during inter-session. But I say there has been a great amount of delay in bringing forward this Bill because this Second Hooghly Bridge Act was passed by the West Bengal Government in July, 1969. It was enacted. Once that Act was passed, immediately it was necessary to amend this Bill so that the Bridge Commissioners could be appointed. In that case it would have very well been done in the last session of Parliament. There was no need of delay and in passing an ordinance and then this amending Bill. However, better late than never.

The only point I wish to deal with in a few minutes at my disposal is that the UF Government before appointing the Bridge Commissioners which was done only recently after the Ordinance was promulgated, had been carrying on a long dialogue and discussion with the Government of India regarding what type of bridge should be built. Two questions had been raised. The Port Commissioners were insisting for a long time and they are still insisting that the new bridge must be a high bridge, a bridge under which ocean-going steamers can pass. That means to say that it has to be a bridge of 125' above the river. The present Howrah bridge which many of you must have seen and crossed also is 35' above the water surface. The probable height will be, if the Calcutta Port Commissioners' plan is accepted, 120' and in terms of expenditure, this means the difference between building a high and a low bridge will be somewhere in the neighbourhood of between Rs. 8 to 10 crores. Why are the Port Commissioners insisting on a high bridge?

[Sbri Indrajit Gupta]

I do not know. If you are familiar with the topography of the river there, the bridge is to be built south of the Howrah bridge and between the existing Howrah bridge and the proposed new bridge there are what are known as jetties belonging to the Calcutta Port Commissioners which are not part of the docks proper but some old jetties which are there on the riverfront, which are used for loading and unloading of the ships. These jetties are very old—I don't know how many years old, probably, nearly 100 years old. They are in very bad shape. They are out of date. They badly require renovation. In fact, the expert view of engineers is that these jetties are obsolete now and they should be gradually dismantled. But the Port Commissioners have been insisting that because these jetties are being used and continue to be used, therefore, the new bridge, when it is built, must be high enough to allow the ocean going vessels which come up the river to cross under that bridge to go up to the jetties. The United Front Government had been arguing with them that the Port Commissioner's own report—they have got a term called projection report—upto the year 1980 showed that whatever work of loading and unloading and handling of cargo will be done by these jetties right up to 1980 would easily be accommodated in the King George's Dock. The King George's Dock which is in the Docks proper can accommodate that amount of work which the Port Commissioners themselves project as the capacity of the jetties right up to the year 1980. Still they go on insisting that those old obsolete jetties must be kept working and therefore there must be a high bridge and therefore the money of Rs. 8 to Rs. 10 crores extra must be found and West Bengal must be saddled with that burden. I could not understand this. If the Port Commissioners had their own plans for renovating and modernising the jetties then there would be some force in their arguments. They have got to such plan. They were asked to produce whatever plan they have got for renovating the jetties. They said, we have no plan. That means, these jetties will naturally be dismantled, have to be dismantled, and abandoned, but simply in the name of those jetties this 120' high bridge is being insisted upon and ultimately, Sir, I regret to say this,—I asked our own United Front Government Ministers: Why did you agree to this?

You should insist on a low bridge which is much cheaper. You can have two low bridges across the river for the price of one high bridge; and everybody knows from the traffic problems of Calcutta that only one more bridge is not what is required. For any city like Calcutta in other parts of the world they have half a dozen bridges across the river. They said that they found ultimately that if they did not agree, if they went on arguing and pressing for a low bridge ultimately this would become an excuse for the Government of India to shelve the whole thing altogether and no bridge would be built for another 10 or 20 years. The Minister in charge had come here last year at the time when Mr. Morarji Desai was still the Finance Minister. He came to discuss with him the question of sharing the expenses of this and when he raised then the question of the high bridge versus the low bridge—I heard it from himself—Mr. Morarji Desai immediately jumped at the idea and said: Oh, there is a controversy about high bridge and low bridge; very good, let us put the whole thing into cold storage and have a fresh survey. Then he hurriedly said; "All right, does not matter, let us have a high bridge; something is better than nothing. We cannot go on with that one Howrah bridge any more." Now, Sir, everybody knows, the Minister also knows, that the high bridge of 120' above the river water really requires a vast approach work. The bridge itself is not the problem. The problem is the approaches to the bridge. A 120 feet high bridge will require vast area on both sides of the bridge which would have to be taken over and developed as the approach to the bridge. And, the calculation is that out of 16.5 crores which is now the total estimate for the new bridge, only Rs. 4 crores will be spent on the bridge itself. The remaining amount of Rs. 12 crores or Rs. 11 1/2 crores will be required for all the approach work. It will become a bottleneck in traffic. It is not going to assist traffic at all. It will become a bottle-neck; but all this has been due to this obstinate interference by the Port Commissioners that they must have a bridge under which the vessels can reach those obsolete jetties which are going to be dismantled anyhow.

Therefore, Sir, my contention is that if you insist on having this high level bridge

because of the Port Commissioner's so-called expert advice then, the West Bengal budget should not be saddled with this burden.

Why should we be saddled with this? In that case you have agreed to give a loan towards the expenses of construction. I would demand and plead that instead of a loan, they should be given an outright grant if you are going to carry on with this scheme of the high-level bridge.

The other point is to mitigate to some extent the bottleneck which is going to be caused, this project is going to cause you more complications than anything else the way it is being designed. There is a point at the Howrah end of the proposed bridge. It is National Highway Number Six. That connection has to be made. Otherwise there is no point in having this bridge also. As the hon. Minister knows, there is a scheme which is pending for a long time, called the Kona Express Way. This Kona Express-way's total cost is Rs. 5 crores which can provide a link between the Howrah-end of the proposed bridge and the National Highway Number 6. So, my submission is that the Kona Express Way should not be seen in isolation as a separate project of its own but as part and parcel of this new project. The bridge is not something in isolation. It has to be connected with the whole surrounding traffic network. Otherwise, it makes no sense at all.

Therefore, I would request the Government to see that the cost of this Kona Express Way which is estimated at Rs. 5 crores to link the Howrah-end of the bridge with National Highway Number 6 should be taken up as part of the bridge project and that should also be financed by the Central Government because this is part of a National Highway and National artery which serves not only one Calcutta city but it has the outlet and inlet for the vast amount of trade and commerce which is of national importance. That is all I have got to say. I would once again—I do not know if it is too late—plead with you to please consult some other engineers—there are expert engineers in the world—apart from the Port Commissioner and ask them whether these high bridges are essential or not. Why should this huge expenditure be gone in for a high bridge? Two low bridges can be constructed at the same cost and those bridges would greatly assist the flow of tra-

ffic across the river from both directions and ease the congestion problems of the Calcutta City when there is no plan either to renovate the jetties or to scrap them by taking over their work to King George's Dock, otherwise the second bridge is going to prove a white elephant.

15.00 hrs.

श्री सिव खन्ना (मधुबनी) : मान्यवर, कलकत्ता पोर्ट की उपेक्षा अभी भी बहुत हो रही है जिसकी कि तस्वीर माननीय इन्द्रजीत गुप्ताजी ने पेश की। 1948 में मुझे कलकत्ता पोर्ट ही जाने का मौका नहीं मिला, बल्कि वहां से बाहर निकलने का भी मौका मिला। हम लोगों का जहाज एस० एस० ग्रंगोला था जो बहुत दूर पानी में रहा और पोर्ट से हम लोग छोटे जहाज पर गए। वह इतना बड़ा जहाज कलकत्ता पोर्ट में नहीं आ सकता, दूर ही रहता है। यह समस्या अभी भी है। कलकत्ता पोर्ट बहुत पुराना है, प्रथम श्रेणी का पोर्ट है, लेकिन समय का तकाजा है कि उसको मोडर्नाइज किया जाय। अभी चूंकि बड़े बड़े जहाज वहां नहीं आ सकते इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि माल की लोडिंग और अनलोडिंग में इन-एफिशियेंसी होती है और काम भी ठीक से नहीं चलता। माल ही नहीं बल्कि पैसेन्जर ट्रेफिक में भी कमी होती है।

मेरे पास "इंडियन शिपिंग" नाम की मैगज़ीन है जिसमें लिखा है कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट ट्रेफिक में भारत के सब पोर्टों से 17-18 साल पीछे है। कलकत्ता में 1951-52 में ट्रेफिक हैबलिंग 9.58 मिलियन टनेज का हुआ और 1968-69 में 7.95 मिलियन टनेज हुआ। बम्बई पोर्ट बड़ा है, मद्रास, कोचीन और बिषाखापटनम के पोर्ट बड़े हैं लेकिन कलकत्ता पोर्ट की प्रगति पीछे है। तो यह समस्या है जिसकी ओर सरकार का ध्यान नहीं जा रहा है। हालांकि इसके मुताबिक बहुत सी रिपोर्ट्स हैं। "रिसर्च बुक" साराभाई मैनेजमेंट कारपोरेशन ने भी कहा है, और यह लोग जो ऐनुअल कान्फ्रेंस करते हैं, मीटिंग करते हैं हार्बर बोर्ड की, जैसे 17 वीं कान्फ्रेंस

## [श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

नेशनल हार्बर बोर्ड की डा० राव की अध्यक्षता में बम्बई में हुई, उसमें भी कहा गया है कि लॉडिंग और अनलॉडिंग में इनऐंक्रिशियेंसी होती है। 18वीं कानफ्रेंस भुवनेश्वर में माननीय रघुरमैया की अध्यक्षता में हुई, उन्होंने भी वही बात कबूल की। लेकिन कोई सार्थक कदम नहीं उठाए जाते हैं।

इस कठिनाई को दूर करने के दो तरीके हैं। एक तरीका तो सैटलाइट पोर्ट का है जो कुछ हद तक ठीक है। लेकिन उसमें भी मुस्ती हो रही है। जैसे हल्दिया पोर्ट को बढ़ाने की रफ्तार कम हो रही है। इसी तरह से बम्बई में नवमिवा सैटलाइट पोर्ट की रफ्तार भी तेज नहीं हो रही है। अगर इन सैटलाइट पोर्ट्स को तेजी से डेवलप किया जाय तो उससे कलकत्ता पोर्ट का बोझ कम हो सकेगा। दूसरी बात यह है कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट के विकास के काम के लिए सरकार रकम भी ज्यादा नहीं दे रही है। जो बकिंग ग्रुप है यूनियन मिनिस्ट्री का उसने रिकमेन्ड किया कि 296.83 करोड़ रु० आने वाली चौथी प्लान में खर्च करना होगा। लेकिन प्लानिंग कमीशन ने उसको घटाकर 280 करोड़ रु० कर दिया है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि ऐसा क्यों कर दिया है। साथ ही यह भी नहीं मालूम कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट का कितना हिस्सा है, और किन किन महकमों का है। सिल्टिंग की बात उठाई गई, और ड्रजर को यहां से उठाकर वहां रख दिया जाता है जिसकी वजह से बड़े जहाज नहीं आ सकते हैं। जैटी भी वहां की प्राउट-स्टेड हैं जिनको डिस्पैटिल करना चाहिए। यह निर्विवाद है कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट की रकम औरों के मुकाबले में कम ही होगी।

प्राप लन्दन पोर्ट, हालीफ़ाक्स पोर्ट की बात छोड़ दीजिए। करांची पोर्ट को मैंने देखा है जो बहुत अच्छा पोर्ट है। हालांकि वह नैचुरल पोर्ट है लेकिन फिर भी करांची पोर्ट की जो बनावट है उसकी वजह से जैटी से लेकर

बड़े-बड़े जहाज नजदीक आने की बात को लेकर कलकत्ता पोर्ट से करांची पोर्ट की कहीं ज्यादा अच्छी हालत है। कलकत्ता पोर्ट इतना पुराना होते हुए और फ्रस्ट क्लास पोर्ट होते हुए भी सरकार उस पर ध्यान नहीं देती। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट की उपेक्षा जो हो रही है उसको सरकार खत्म करे और उसको मोडर्नाइज करने की कोशिश करे। दुनिया के और दूसरे पोर्टों पर गौर करें और किसी माननीय सदस्य ने ठीक ही कहा है कि दुनिया के जो और इंजीनियर्स हैं उनसे पूछा जाय कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट किस तरह का बनना चाहिए। तभी कलकत्ता पोर्ट, जो प्रॉजेक्टों के समय से ही बड़ा पोर्ट रहा है, उसका विकास हो सकेगा और साथ ही साथ कारगो और पैसेन्जर ट्रेफ़िक, दोनों में अधिक तरक्की होगी जिससे आपका ऐक्सपोर्ट बढ़ेगा और फ़ारेन ऐसचेन्ज भी आएगा तथा देश की अर्थव्यवस्था भी आगे बढ़ेगी।

मैं चाहूंगा कि चौथी योजना में जितना आप खर्च कर रहे हैं उसको अप्रूवेट बनाने के लिए हल्दिया सैटलाइट पोर्ट की तरक्की होनी चाहिए। इन सब बातों को सामने रख कर मंत्री महोदय जवाब दें।

श्री भगवान दास (प्रोसग्रांम) : सभापति जी, अभी सरकार जो कलकत्ता पोर्ट से संबंधित बिल हाउस के सामने लाई है और उसके द्वारा जो पोर्ट कमिश्नर को अधिकार दिए जा रहे हैं, उसका हम स्वागत करते हैं। यह बिल जो कि बहुत देर से आया, बहुत पहले ही आना चाहिए था।

कलकत्ता पोर्ट की हालत ऐसी है कि यह पोर्ट जो पहले दर्जे का था, जैसा माननीय शिव चन्द्र झा ने भी बताया, अब उसका स्थान चौथे नम्बर पर आ गया है। इसलिए आ गया है कि सरकार इस पोर्ट की तरफ़ ज्यादा ध्यान नहीं देती है। आप उचित ध्यान देते तो कलकत्ता ऐसे इम्पोर्टेंट सिटी और पोर्ट

की ऐसी हालत न होती। कलकत्ता बड़ा इम्पोर्टेंट पोर्ट है, अगर इसकी तरफ ध्यान दिया जाता तो सरकार को इससे ज्यादा भय होती, एक्सपोर्ट और इम्पोर्ट के जरिए। लेकिन सरकार ने उस तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया। अब जो उसके नवीनीकरण के बारे में सरकार विचार कर रही है, जैसा दूसरे साक्षियों ने बताया, उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। यह सरकार इस पोर्ट का माडर्नाइजेशन करने की सोच रही है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि वह इसको कब तक करेगी? जल्दी करेगी या नहीं।

हुगली नदी के ऊपर जो नया पुल बनने जा रहा है, जिसके लिए मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया कि जनवरी, 1968 में तय किया गया था कि बनाया जाएगा, उसको जितनी जल्दी हो सके पूरा किया जाना चाहिए।

मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस पुल को बनाने में सरकार का कितना खर्चा होगा और इस ब्रिज को शुरू करने के बाद कितने सालों में वह इस काम को खत्म कर लेगी?

इस संबंध में यह भी देखना होगा कि जो पोर्ट के वर्कर हैं, वहाँ जो आदमी काम करते हैं, उनकी मजदूरी बहुत कम है। उनकी मजदूरी कैसे बढ़े इस पर ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए।

सरकार से मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट पर साल में कितना खर्चा होता है? इसके लिए कितना प्रावधान किया गया है और यह एम्प्लेन्डिचर उससे ज्यादा है या कम है? इसकी क्या वजह है और इसको कम करने के लिए सरकार के पास क्या रास्ता है?

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North-East):** I am very grateful to you for having given me this opportunity, because I want to take advantage of it to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a matter

which I have previously tried to bring before the notice of his predecessors like Shri Raj Bahadur but in which nothing very much has been done.

I take it that Government are sincere in the assumption that the Calcutta port, in spite of the sickness and decay to which it has been subjected of late continues to play a very large part in the economy of our country and deserves to be protected and even expanded to the extent possible. But that brings into focus an idea of the future of the river.

I have my doubts in regard to even the Farakka barrage being an answer to the questions that beset this very difficult river. I remember having read in some technical dissertations how the nature of the river is such that at the mouth of the river—and there are so many branches and sub-branches of the mighty rivers which congeal so to speak on the Bay of Bengal at what is called the continental shelf of the Bay of Bengal—the currents operate in such a way that sand and silt accumulate and rush through the Hoogly and the Bhagirath unlike in the eastern part of the country; Pakistan is lucky in that regard. The continental shelf is such that the sand and the silt come to our part of the country and they rush inside whenever the flow-tide takes place. The Farakka barrage is not likely to be an adequate answer because the bed of the river has risen considerably and it is very uneven, with the result that the volume of water which is likely to be released by the Farakka barrage is not very likely to be able to counteract the pressure of sand and silt which the flow-tide brings from the Bay of Bengal into the river. And the result is that according to scientific dissertations, the remedy ought to be hydrological investigations at the continental shelf of the Bay of Bengal in order to make it impossible for that stupendous invasion of sand and silt into our river. Till this is done, not very much is likely to happen and the Calcutta port is not going to be saved.

Besides, there are other rivers like the Rupnarain, which are wide but which are not at all deep except perhaps in some areas. River training schemes are not there at all. Those rivers have to be narrowed so that the flow of the water can be very much quicker than it is.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

There are many other branches of rivers and sub-rivers which have not been trained and tamed at all, with the result that the flow of water with which we can counteract the rush of silt and sand from the ocean can be stronger than it is. This part of the subject is not discussed at all. We think of the Farakka Barrage as a sort of talisman, but this talisman may not work. Many of our engineers turn a blind eye on future difficulties; only they take hold of the problem of the present and try to get an *ad hoc* solution, which would be no solution at all. Just as in the case of the bridges, we know how the thing is going to be shelved. We know that the approach roads to a 120 ft. high bridge can never be manipulated out of the land which can be scooped out of that part of Calcutta. You cannot just get it even if you do away with the Calcutta Maidan which is the lungs of the city. You will never be able to have that kind of approach to the bridge if the bridge is going to be 120 ft. high.

So all these gimmickries, so to speak, on the part of our technicians and engineers do not appear to lead to some very tangible result. My suggestion to the Minister is that these things have to be considered very carefully. Certain things which need to be done at once must have priority, but let us not also forget some of the long-term aspects of the problem, and I do hope that if Calcutta port is to be saved, we do not depend entirely on the Farakka Barrage matter. That would not be a solution of the problem; other concomitant jobs have got to be taken hold of as soon as ever that is possible.

I thank you for the opportunity given to me to butt in to say a few words.

**SHRI S. KUNDU (Balasore):** I take the liberty to speak on certain matters connected with the port workers. There is a news in the press today that the Port and Dock Workers' Wage Board has given certain recommendations. When we think of port development, we should not forget that a vital part of it is connected with the living condition of port workers.

In these recommendations given after a prolonged period of four to five years. The Government have excepted with 'ifs' and 'buts'. One of the recommendations says

that it should be implemented with retrospective effect from 1st January, 1969. The Wage Board has been sitting for the last four years. In this one-clause Bill there is absolutely nothing about it. This would have been generally welcomed all over by the two lakh port and dock workers if retrospective effect had been given from the time the Board was constituted.

There is another snag so far as the port workers of Calcutta are concerned. The Govt. have said as follows, I quote "The question of the fitment of the dock workers at Calcutta port in the wage structure recommended by the Board will be examined separately with a view to ascertaining whether any adjustments need to be made in their case, and orders in this regard would be issued soon." I do not know how many years it will take for another inquiry to make these adjustments about their different salary and wage grades. They have been told they will continue to pay the house rent which they are paying now regarding the house which have been allotted to them by the port authorities, till a decision is taken in this regard. That decision also has been avoided in these recommendations.

Though belated, still I welcome the majority decisions of the Wage Board and urge Government not to sit over its 'ifs' and 'buts' but try to immediately implement it and help the 2 lakh port and dock workers

While speaking about Paradeep ports, naturally a reference to Paradeep which is the deepest port in India is irresistible.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I do not think that the Minister will be in a position to answer your point because we are concerned with a small point regarding Calcutta.

**SHRI S. KUNDU:** The Minister ought to know it thoroughly and let us hope he can answer.

**SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali):** That is what you think.

**SHRI S. KUNDU:** He will prove it, let us hope.

Paradeep is one of the deepest ports in India where the bottom is completely of soil content. That means that this port can be excavated to any depth and I am told that the experts have said that this port can be made one of the deepest ports in the world and big tankers up to two lakh tonnes can come to this port. But I am surprised to see that the Government is showing such a step-motherly attitude to this port and is not looking into its problem. I am told no serious study has been made. There has been development of other ports, but correspondingly the money which has been allotted to Paradeep is very small. Though recently the construction of a cargo berth was inaugurated, there ought to be several such berths constructed there so that the requirements of the port could be met. Orissa being a backward State, its industrial development depends on the quick progress of this port and other minor ports. Therefore, I would urge that the Minister, while replying, should give a specific assurance that he will take some definite steps to see that this port is developed and built quickly so as to catch up with the major ports of India because with its development it will become one of the biggest ports not only in India but in the world.

**SHRI IQBAL SINGH:** All the Members who have spoken on this Bill have supported the laudable objective of constructing the second bridge on the river Hoogly.

Some other points were also made. Most of the Members, especially Shri Indrajit Gupta and Prof. Mukerjee, have spoken about the high level and low level bridge. This question of the high level and low level bridge has been thoroughly sorted out in the last ten years and more. In 1964 the CMPO, their consultants, the West Bengal Government and all parties considered all the aspects, technical and non-technical. Not being a technical man I cannot say much. After that when the decision was taken, again the West Bengal Government asked us to re-think on this. We have again examined it in consultation with the technical people of the Roads Wing along with others and I can assure my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta that I have myself read the whole thing from A to Z and re-examined it from all aspects and how for it is going to affect Calcutta port by siltation. Not only is Calcutta a port

one of the most important institutions through which the trade and commerce of North Indian States passes, but for the development of Bengal and that part of the country there should be no hazard to this port. No other port has to encounter such natural hazards as the Calcutta port has to. There may be a saving of Rs. 5 crores today but tomorrow history will say that the persons who decided on those matters had not taken the wider interest into consideration. It was considered; we considered Outram ghat and Prince ghat also. With the flushing of the Hooghly by Farakka water we propose to solve some problems. We should not put impediments in that. It is practically accepted by every hydrological engineer that if we put it at a low level the piers will increase the silt. We are spending Rs. 150 crores for the solution of that problem. It is 4,000 feet from the main turning circle. If we put another big impediment, it is bound to increase silt.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Has the present Howrah bridge got any piers? You can build bridges without piers.

**SHRI IQBAL SINGH:** As I explained, it had been gone through. Mr. Lobo Prabhu pointed out that it takes 2.6 days to bring a ship from the main sea to Calcutta port. There must be holding capacity in Calcutta port; mooring must be there. We cannot take all the ships inside; we have to berth them at the outside moorings. 38 moorings out of the 85 moorings which Calcutta port has got will be beyond this bridge. This bridge will be about 4,000 feet from the main turning circle. When the ship is brought to the port, it is not done on its own force. You cannot apply the brakes and ask them to stop. This is not a big margin by international standards. Perhaps it is below the minimum. Our pilots are operating there. As I said, the ship is not moved on its own force; it is done by tugs. In these circumstances, should we increase their hazards? I had myself gone to Calcutta and consulted them and in fact cross-examined them: why are you objecting to a low level bridge when the State Government wanted it? After considering their explanation, I am convinced that it is in the interest of Bengal and Calcutta and also North-east India to do like this. The hon. Member said that we wanted to shelve it. We are the first persons to say that this will solve some problems. We have seen the pro-

[Shri Iqbal Singh]

blem from all angles. There was a big engineer who also supported that view. Not only our people in the Roads Wing but also the Calcutta Port Commissioner, their consultants, their hydraulic department, the Calcutta Metropolitan Organisation, all these have supported us. If the technical persons say something and I feel it is in the interest of Calcutta, should I agree to something else? Tomorrow if siltation increases, people will ask: why have you spent Rs. 150 crores and then put up another obstacle? That is the whole point. The hon. Member says we should also give a grant. I do not know where it will lead to. The loan which we have provided is outside the plan. We have provided for a loan of this size because that was a special problem. We cannot compare this problem with any other problem. Calcutta being a premier city, the biggest city of this country, it is our endeavour to find a solution to its problems. For that purpose, we have provided a loan.

Another point was made out. Mr. Indrajit Gupta has already informed us that in July, 1969, that Act was passed by the West Bengal Assembly. That Act was assented to. In the last session itself we had introduced this Bill, but we could not find time to take it up. It is entirely for this House, for the Business Advisory Committee; but this was introduced in the other House and passed. There was a delay of two months. Even if we were parties to the delay of two months, we have brought out the Ordinance so that Bridge Commissioners were appointed in order that they could start the work.

Regarding siltation in the Hoogly, it is quite a major problem; there is the problem of bore-tides and bars. I have seen them myself. I have taken the engineers with me and asked them what could be the solution. We are giving them all possible assistance. We have given to the Calcutta port one of the biggest estuarian dredgers, which is the biggest not only in this country but in this part of the world, so that these problems could be solved if not totally, at least, partially thus giving some relief.

There are 14 bars. Every bar is an obstacle, and every bar create a problem. Sometimes their behaviour changes. Sometimes when you deal with them in one way, the hydraulic

pressure acts in the other way. When we are taking away the silt from one place and are putting it in another place, we require some land. And after a long study, we are dealing with the silt problem in such a way that the silt does not return again to the same place. The experts have studied this problem and we have taken their advice also. Calcutta has got a number of dredgers, big, small and medium-sized. It has the biggest dredger fleet in India. But still the problem is great.

Reference was made that Calcutta port is not running at a profit. Shri Bhagaban Das made a point about it. We appointed the Bhattacharya Committee, and it gave us the report, and we have accepted most of its recommendations. We give 50 per cent of the cost for river maintenance and entire cost of Bhagirathi-Hooghly river training works amounting to Rs. 11 crores. All these problems are sought to be solved and these projects are going to help Calcutta port.

We are taking steps on our side also. It is not that we are simply not agreeing to the low level bridge. We are taking from our side also a big programme for helping the Calcutta port. Haldia is there, which is being appreciated by all. We are going to spend about Rs. 58 crores on it. We have taken it up on a priority basis; so that it may be completed and a satellite port may be created. I hope that with all these things, increasing the draught at Calcutta port, training of the rivers Hoogly and Bhagirathi, flushing of the waters from the Farakka, and with the increase in the dredging fleet at the Calcutta port, Calcutta port is bound to improve, and that all these improvement will have a good effect on the Calcutta port, and we hope to restore to it the old glory: it is one of the major ports, and a premier port of our country.

In the fourth Five Year Plan also, one-fifth of the amount for the ports is being spent for the Calcutta port and Haldia and these training works. There are eight major ports, and one-fifth is being spent on Calcutta. The problems are big; they require big assistance. Without that, there could be no solution.

Some Members asked why we are putting in these words, "any person." That is be-

cause a similar clause does exist in the major Port Trusts Acts. We have put in those words, because it is not only the State Government. The river Hoogly and Bagirathi, upto Farakka will be under the river regime, under the Port Commissioners. Suppose somebody wants to construct a small jetty. He will be doing the work in his own area. The Calcutta Port Commissioners do not want to become contractors. But in the river regime, it is proper that the Port Commissioners do the work and nobody else should be allowed to do the work. The work may be done for the Corporation, for the State Government or for an individual, but it should be done by the Port Commissioners. There is a similar provision in the Major Port Trusts Act. I hope those friends who were having some misapprehension on this point will be now satisfied.

Mr. Lobo Prabhu talked about Mangalore port. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether I should reply to that, but he is an ex-ICS man and he should give the figures rightly. In Mangalore, we are dredging only 11 million cubic metres. For that we are making all efforts. We have sorted out the problems of Mangalore and Paradeep also. We have sanctioned a new cargo berth for Paradeep. We have again restored the depth to 39' That is a big help. We employed contractors and restored it in 1½ years.

SHRI S. KUNDU: It is your duty to do it. What is the help?

SHRI IQBAL SINGH: I mean help to the port. I am not talking of the State Government. We did it in spite of the State Government not giving the land to us.

SHRI S. KUNDU: What about the rock free bottom port to which I referred?

SHRI IQBAL SINGH: This is the first time you have brought it to my notice. I am not an expert. I cannot reply to it off hand.

Sir, I have replied to most of the points and I move that the Bill may be taken into consideration.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : सभापति महोदय, अब मुझे कुछ विषय नहीं कहना है। मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि फ़रक्का बैराज के

बनाने में एक साल की देरी होगी। लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि इसमें और भी ज्यादा देर होगी। हो सकता है कि इसमें दो साल की देर हो जाए। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस इन्टरिम पीरियड में जो दिक्कतें आने वाली हैं, उनके सम्बन्ध में सरकार क्या कदम उठा रही है।

मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि पिलफ़्रेंज, चोरी, को रोकने के लिए एक कमेटी बना दी गई है। लेकिन उस कमेटी को बनाए जाने के बाद भी कोई सबस्टेंशियल इफ़ेक्ट नहीं पड़ा है और चोरी पहले की तरह जारी है।

15.38 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the chair]

मंत्री महोदय ने यह नहीं बताया है कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट को माडर्नाइज़ करने के लिए सरकार ने क्या कदम उठाए हैं। उन्होंने कहा है कि हलदिया पोर्ट बन रही है, यह हो रहा है, वह हो रहा है, वगैरह। इससे ज़रूर फ़र्क पड़ेगा, लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने पोर्ट के माडर्नाइज़ेशन के लिए क्या कदम उठाए हैं, ताकि कलकत्ता एक प्राइडियल पोर्ट बन सके और न सिर्फ़ बंगाल की इकोनोमी, बल्कि नार्थ इंडिया के दूसरे राज्यों की इकोनोमी भी सुधर सके।

मंत्री महोदय ने यह भी कहा है कि यह बिल दो साल से सरकार के पास पड़ा है, लेकिन इसको सदन में लाने के लिए समय नहीं मिला है। उन्होंने कहा है कि समय निकालने का काम इस सदन को, स्पीकर साहब को और बिज़नेस एडवाइज़री कमेटी को करना होता है। मंत्री महोदय को यह बात ध्यान में रखनी चाहिए कि सरकारी बिलों के लिए समय निकालने का काम सरकार, सम्बद्ध मंत्री और सरकार के चीफ़ क्लर्क का होता है। अगर यह सरकार दो सालों में इस बिल के लिए डेढ़ घंटे का समय भी नहीं निकाल सकी है, तो क्या वह निम्बा की पात्र नहीं है और क्या

[श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त]

इसके लिए मंत्री महोदय को कन्डेम नहीं करना चाहिए? मेरा खयाल है कि मंत्री महोदय यह मानेंगे कि उनकी गलती हुई है, सुस्ती हुई है और इस बिल को लाने में देर कौ गई है।

MR. SPEAKER: I will now have to put the Resolution to the vote of the House.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Sir, I am not against the Bill as such. So, I do not want to press my Resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his Statutory Resolution?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

*The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Calcutta Port Act, 1890, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER: We will now take up clause by clause consideration.

Clause 2—(Insertion of new section 35A in Bengal Act 3 of 1890)

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA (Madhubani): I beg to move:

Page 1, line 6,—

after "may" insert—

"after due and prompt intimation to the Union Government".(1)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक को यहां लाने में सरकार की तरफ से देरी हुई है, इस गलती को ये कबूल करेंगे, लेकिन जहां तक विधेयक का सवाल है, यह टालरेबिल है, इसमें ज्यादा विवाद नहीं हो सकता। फिर भी जहां तक मेरे संशोधन का सम्बन्ध है क्लॉज 2 में जहां लिखा है—

"The Commissioners may undertake to carry out on behalf of any person (including any State Government) any works or services or any class of works or services on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Commissioners and such person"

"कमिश्नर में" के पश्चात यह जोड़ दिया जाय—

"after due and prompt intimation to the Union Government."

मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि कमिश्नर केन्द्रीय सरकार के ही मातहत है और इन से खतोखिताबत करके, सलाह-मशविरा करके ही वह कोई काम करेगा और यह भी ठीक है वह उस काम की सूचना भी केन्द्रीय सरकार को देगा, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह लिखित रूप में वह सूचना दे—यह बात इस विधेयक में साफ हो जानी चाहिए। इनफोर्मली नहीं, बल्कि रिटन वह सूचना हैड आफिस को जाय कि मैं यह काम टेक-अप कर रहा हूँ।

इतना ही मेरा संशोधन है।

SHRI LOBO PRABHU: I beg to move:

Page 1, line 7,

for "person" substitute—  
"public authority" (2)

Page 1, line 9,—

for "person" substitute—

"public authority provided no liability arises to the finances of the Port" (3).

Sir, I have moved two amendments. The first one has been supported by Shri M. S. Murti and also by Shri Indrajit Gupta. I would compliment the Minister for his ability in avoiding all contentious points. He has the very gracious way of saying that he has himself been to Calcutta or he has himself read the file. But we would like to

be convinced of his reasons for coming to certain conclusions.

Shri Indrajit Gupta raised two vital points. Firstly, 120 ft. high bridge was considered necessary only to reach the jetties. It was pointed out that it was not necessary to have these jetties because the King George Dock could be expanded. You have not said a word on that. All that you have said is that for ten years from 1960 this has been pending, that certain engineers have given their concurrence and, therefore, this bridge should be 120 ft. high. You have to consider what it means to have a bridge of that height. The approach roads are going to be changed, the whole topography is going to be changed, the houses will go, the other roads will go and, as he pointed out, it is going to cost Rs. 12 crores for the approach roads. It can mean 12 years to complete that. In the meanwhile, this is going to be a bridge to be seen and not to be used. So, I would suggest, however competent your engineers are, however competent your port trust is, this is a matter on which second opinion, a world opinion, if necessary, be taken because it involves a big investment and it involves a very big risk.

Now, coming to Mr. Murti's support, and it is very necessary, we should amend this clause to restrict the powers that you are giving to the Calcutta Port Trust. I would like you to please read the provisions which you are making, that is that the Commissioner may undertake to carry out, on behalf of any person, including any State Government, any works or service or any class of works on such terms and conditions that may be agreed upon. I cannot think of anything more permissive. This is a kind of blanket power. Tomorrow, the Calcutta Port Commissioner can undertake to build house for me because "any State" is involved. Is it necessary for you to give all this power to the Calcutta Port Trust?

As I have already mentioned, they have 42,000 people employed and, in spite of being so over-staffed, they have paid in the year under review as much as Rs. 123 lakhs as overtime. Why are you giving them a blanket permission that they can do anything they like in this reckless manner? You have to consider, when you give this blanket

power, that you may be committing yourself to a very large expenditure. It is possible that they will take a contract by itself; it is possible that they will take mere supervision work. These are very large risks; there are different alternatives which can involve loss to the Port Trust. They have already incurred a loss of Rs. 3 crores last year. Do you want to add to it by taking over this construction? Please do something. Instead of "any person", at least, say, "any public authority". I do not think the port trust is competent to do this work. You also add, according to my second amendment, that whatever work they do should not involve a loss to the Port Trust. The Port Trust is a highly incompetent body; it is a highly indebted body to the Centre and it is a body which is not doing its own work.

Lastly, you have completely avoided the subject of dredging. That is very important for this country. I have said it very clearly that, according to the dredging capacity you have, if you work properly, it will take 5 years to do the work which is already on hand. You have not given a reply to this. I am not referring to Mangalore. You forget about Mangalore. What about Paradeep, Vizag, Kandla and Goa? What is your dredging capacity that you think you can complete the work with just one dredger that you are going to buy from abroad and the dredger that your Garden Reach workshop is going to make. You cannot avoid that issue. You are going to involve this country into a very large expenditure if a part of work that of dock is completed and the dredging is not done at the same time.

SHRI IQBAL SINGH: As far as the first point made by my hon. friend, Shri Shiv Chandra Jha, is concerned, as to why they are taking the contract, I may tell him one thing that even for any contract or anything or any work that is to be done by the Calcutta Port Commissioner, they must get the estimates approved by the Government if the value is more than Rs. 2 lakhs. Even if your amendment is not accepted, they will come to the Government and the Government will scrutinise it. According to Sec. 48 of the Calcutta Port Act Government will give them sanction. I do not think there is any need for this. That provision is already there. Actually people are asking the other

[Shri Iqbal Singh]

way round. They are asking that these are autonomous bodies and they may be given more freedom and may be given more autonomy. For Everything costing more than Rs. 2 lakhs they have to come to the Central Government.

Secondly, the budget of the Calcutta Port Commissioners comes to the Government for sanction. They cannot do anything without the permission. Regarding the second point Mr. Lobo Prabhu has made, as I explained there is a similar provision in the Major Port Trusts Act which applies to Mormugao Vizag, Paradeep, Cochin and Kanda. When nowhere it has been misused how can I presume that the Calcutta Port Commissioners will misuse it? There is another point. We are giving the powers so that they may be able to do the second Howrah Bridge work. For that power we have proposed a similar clause which was in the Major Port Trusts Act.

As I explained Calcutta Port regime is much more long. Suppose tomorrow they say that somebody wanted that this jetty might be put up this way, the Calcutta Port Commissioners will not allow him to put up that jetty in that way. They will put it up. They can do the work for anybody because there are so many other things in extending the regime. Tomorrow the Corporation can ask them. Some shipbuilding concern also may ask them 'You do this'. They cannot do that for anybody.

Regarding the dredging capacity, I have explained to the hon. House in detail. Calcutta modernisation problem is not the modernisation of the cranes. Calcutta has got enough cranes. Calcutta modernisation problem is increase in depth and in the draft for which we are spending large amounts. That is the biggest modernisation programme of Calcutta. Calcutta has got enough modern cranes. We are putting up a new satellite modern port in order to supplement the capacity of Calcutta. These are the bigger modernisation programmes. With these words I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam): My hon. friend has not explained as to what would

be the disadvantage if the simple amendment suggested by my hon. friend, Shri Lobo Prabhu, comes to be accepted by the House. He only said that in other acts there are similar provisions. Therefore, there is no harm in continuing. He has read out and he has made it clear that it is too wide and too drastic an authority to be given to them. On the other hand he wanted to circumscribe it in a very reasonable wording by saying 'public authority'. You get it done on behalf of any public authority provided no liability arises to the finances of the port. What is your answer? You did not give any answer. What is the harm in accepting this amendment. You simply said, 'What is the harm in going ahead without the amendment?'

SHRI IQBAL SINGH: May I say a few words regarding what is said by the learned professor? I explained that this provision is already in Major Ports Trusts Act. There was not a single instance of misuse. How can I presume that Calcutta Port Commissioners will misuse?

I explained that the Calcutta port has a regime of the river about 120 miles on one side and that will be increased on the other side. There can be so many other problems. Suppose tomorrow there is a problem. Calcutta Port Commissioners say that the regime has to be increased in that way for that purpose. There is the case of siltation. You want to put the silt material in a certain place. They do not have the power to put that silt material. They may say 'We cannot do the work for that person'. For all these things, it is more desirable to give this power to Calcutta Port authority. It is not being misused. I cannot accept the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: We have had enough discussion. We have to take up the next Bill also.

I will put the amendment of Shri Shiva Chandra Jha to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.*

MR. SPEAKER: I will now put Amendment No. 2 of Shri Lobo Prabhu to the vote of the House.

The question is:

Page 1, line 7,

for "person" substitute—  
"public authority" (2)*The Lok Sabha divided*

Division No. 20]

AYES

[16.01 hrs.

Abraham, Shri K. M.  
 Amat, Shri D.  
 Anjanappa, Shri B.  
 Bhagaban Das, Shri  
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri  
 Chakrapani, Shri C. K.  
 Dass, Shri C.  
 Deb, Shri D. N.  
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh  
 Dipa, Shri A.  
 Esthose, Shri P. P.  
 Goyal, Shri Shri Chand  
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit  
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal  
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan  
 Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra  
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand  
 Kandappan, Shri S.  
 Katham, Shri B. N.  
 Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali  
 Kushwah, Shri Yeshwant Singh  
 Menon, Shri Vishwanatha  
 Modak, Shri B. K.  
 Mody, Shri Piloo  
 Mohamed Imam, Shri J.  
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri  
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda

Murti, Shri M. S.  
 Naik, Shri R. V.  
 Nambiar, Shri  
 Nayar, Dr. Sushila  
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath  
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
 Patel, Shri J. H.  
 Patil Shri. S. K.  
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.  
 Ramamoorthy, Shri S. P.  
 Ramamurti, Shri P.  
 Ramani, Shri K  
 Ranga, Shri  
 Reddy, Shrimati Sudha V.  
 Satya Narain Singh, Shri  
 Sen, Shri P. G.  
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben  
 Shah, Shri T. P.  
 Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt  
 Sheo Narain, Shri  
 Supakar, Shri Sradhkar  
 Tapuria, Shri S. K.  
 Tyagi, Shri Om Prakash  
 Umanath, Shri  
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari  
 Vidyarthi, Shri Ram Swarup

NOES

Ahmed, Shri F. A.  
 Babunath Singh, Shri  
 Badrudduja, Shri  
 Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar  
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata  
 Barua, Shri Hem  
 Basu, Dr. Maitreyee  
 Bhandare, Shri R. D.  
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.  
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal  
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna  
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri  
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
 Choudhary, Shri Valmiki  
 Damani, Shri S. R.  
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas  
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.  
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.  
 Dinesh Singh, Shri  
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira  
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati

Gautam, Shri C. D.  
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram  
 Guha, Shri Samar  
 Hem Raj, Shri  
 Jadhav, Shri V. N.  
 Kesri, Shri Sitaram  
 Khan, Shri Latafat Ali  
 Khan, Shri M. A.  
 Kinder Lal, Shri  
 Kotoki, Shri Liladhar  
 Kushok Bakula, Shri  
 Laskar, Shri N. R.  
 Maharaj Singh, Shri  
 Mandal, Shri B. P.  
 Mandal, Dr. P.  
 Marandi, Shri  
 Master, Shri Bhola Nath  
 Mishra, Shri G. S.  
 Mondal, Shri Jugal  
 Oraon, Shri Kartik  
 Palchaudhuri, Shrimati Ila  
 Pant, Shri K. C.

Paokai Haokip, Shri  
Parthasarathy, Shri  
Patil, Shri Anantrao  
Pradhani, Shri K.  
Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi  
Radhabai, Shrimati B.  
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri  
Raj Deo Singh, Shri  
Ram, Shri T.  
Ram Dhan, Shri  
Ram Sewak, Shri  
Rana, Shri M. B.  
Randhir Singh, Shri  
Rao, Dr. K. L.  
Rao, Shri K. Narayana  
Reddi, Shri G. S.  
Reddy, Shri Surender  
Roy, Shri Bishwanath  
Roy, Shrimati Uma  
Sadhu Ram, Shri  
Saleem, Shri M. Yunus  
Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
Sayyad Ali, Shri  
Sen, Shri Dwaipayan  
Shambhu Nath, Shri  
Shankaranand, Shri B.  
Sharma, Shri Yogendra  
Shastri, Shri Sheopujan  
Shukla, Shri S. N.  
Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan  
Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri  
Sinha, Shri Mudrika  
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan  
Sonar, Dr. A. G.  
Sonavane, Shri  
Tiwary, Shri D. N.  
Tiwary, Shri K. N.  
Uikey, Shri M. G.  
Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra  
Virbhadra Singh, Shri  
Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti  
Yadab, Shri N. P.

MR. SPEAKER: The result\* of the division is: Ayes—53; Noes—86

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put amendment No. 3 of Shri Lobo Prabhu to Clause 2 to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 3 was put and negatived.*

MR. SPEAKER: The question is.

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

*Clauses 3, 4, 1 the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI IQBAL SINGH: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, I want to speak for a few minutes at the Third Reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, the argument put forward by the hon. Minister in favour of the high level bridge has nothing to do with the use or disuse of these jetties. His only argument was based on the advice of the engineers that if there is a low level bridge, then it will have to be built on piers and if that is done, it is likely to increase the siltation. I agree with him that if a bridge is built on piers in the Hoogly river, there is every likelihood of siltation being increased and that should be avoided. But what I fail to understand is this. Why assume that such a low level bridge should be constructed on piers? The existing Howrah bridge is only 35' above the river. It is not built on piers. The modern bridge building technique has developed so much that the question of piers does not arise. This is an old and outmoded technique. I do not know why the engineer has put the scare that if there is a low bridge built on piers the siltation will increase and therefore we must avoid it and therefore we must have a high bridge and therefore it must be 120' at a cost of Rs. 16 crores. This makes it impossible to build the approach roads. I would very much be obliged if you will kindly give a second look at the project because you have failed to convince us and tell us the reason for not having a low level bridge without piers.

\*The following members also recorded their votes for AYES: Sarveshri Shri Gopal Saboo, Arjun Singh Bhadoria, J. B. Singh and Lobo Prabhu.

That would be the real thing that would be required to-day for relieving the congestion problems.

That is all I want to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Samar Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Sir, I support this Bill for this reason. My concern is that any person may be a contractor but that contractor may be required to do something or he may be debarred to do some other thing. That is not my concern. My concern is that Calcutta is suffering from terrific problems of traffic movement. And it is the experience of everybody that whenever they pass through Howrah Bridge for hours together there is traffic jam. Almost everyday the traffic jam is found over the Howrah bridge. Mr. Chairman, I had given the figures when I had discussed at Calcutta about the terrific traffic problem. And there is frequent dislocation of traffic over the single bridge—Howrah bridge connecting Calcutta. I want to draw the attention of Government that nowhere in the case of big cities like London and elsewhere there is such a big river where there is only one single bridge. There are a number of bridges there. But Government have now agreed at least to have one more bridge. Actually the roads to Calcutta and Howrah cover the two industrial belts on either side of the Hoogly river and they go 40 or 50 miles upstream on the two sides of it. Therefore, one single bridge will be insufficient. There should be more of them. That is also the recommendation of the CMPO. But at least they have decided to have one more bridge. My main concern is how long it will take to be completed. We should consider this from all aspects, the traffic, trade, port facilities and strategic considerations. Calcutta port is so vital. It is known to everybody that Calcutta deals with 50 per cent of our oversea trade and nearly 40 per cent of the inland trade of the whole eastern region. What is the exact time by which this bridge is to be completed and will it be possible to see that the second bridge is built as early as possible? In building the second bridge, will it be ensured that the engineering and consultancy will be absolutely Indian and no foreign engineers or knowhow will be employed so that we provide full scope to our engineers in this. Again I ask whether the bridge will be completed

within the shortest possible time and what will be that period required, as it is a vital artery between Calcutta and Howrah and is essential for the survival of Calcutta port and city.

SHRI IQBAL SINGH: Shri Indrajit Gupta again raised the question of the high level bridge. I think I explained it in depth why we have agreed to a high level bridge. Then he said that I have not spoken about the Calcutta jetty. I have said in my earlier observations that it was agreed by us including the CMPO and their consulting engineers. Secondly, it will be hazardous for the bridge to have a low-level because siltation may increase.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Without piers also?

SHRI IQBAL SINGH: It will be a navigational hazard because the turning circle of the Calcutta port will be about 4,000 ft. from that bridge, if it is a low level bridge. I explained also that when ships are brought to port they are not on their own power but on tug power. That is also a navigational hazard. Calcutta port is of a special nature where the holding capacity must be maximum because it takes 2-3 days to come into and go out of the port. So that capacity has to be more than that of any other port. How can we afford not to utilise 41 per cent of our holding capacity?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: By expanding King George's Dock you can do it.

SHRI IQBAL SINGH: In Calcutta jetties are also required and we are making full use of them, and that will be in the interests of the port of Calcutta also. Considering all aspects, the jetties, the holding capacity, siltation and navigational hazards, I have explained that it is desirable to have a high level bridge. Besides, all the technical persons have agreed on this. Politicians may disagree, but not one technical person has told me that it will be more in the interests of the Calcutta port and Bengal to adopt this hazardous course which is being recommended and which is not desirable. I hope this will satisfy him.

Regarding the time that will be taken, it is the project of the West Bengal Govern-

[Shri Iqbal Singh]

ment. We will do only a part of the job. What the West Bengal Government and the Bridge Commissioners will say, whether they will require consultancy or not I do not know. It is not for me, it is for the West Bengal Government to decide, but they have told me that they will take at least five years and they will try to complete it within that time from the start of the work.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

16.11 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE, ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES (AMENDMENT) CONTINUANCE ORDINANCE; AND ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES (AMENDMENT) CONTINUANCE BILL

MR. SPEAKER: We take up the Resolution and the Bill. They will be discussed together as already intimated. The time allotted is two hours.

AN HON. MEMBER: The time may be extended.

MR. SPEAKER: This has been fixed by the Business Advisory Committee and approved by the House.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी आज्ञा से एसेन्शियल कमोडिटीज (अमेंडमेंट) कंतिनुएंस बिल, 1970 के डिसऐप्रूवल का प्रस्ताव, जिसके लिए सरकार ने अध्यादेश जारी किया था, इस सदन के सामने रखता हूँ। अगर इस बिल की बैकग्राउंड देखी जाय तो उसके सम्बन्ध में सन् 1964 में जो उस समय के प्रधानमंत्री थे उन्होंने कहा था कि देश में अनाज की बहुत कमी है, ब्लैक मार्केटिंग हो रही है, लोगों को अनाज नहीं मिल रहा है, इसको रोकने के लिए कोई ऐसा बिल धराना चाहिए, ऐसा

कानून बनाया जाना चाहिए जिसमें समरी ट्रायल की व्यवस्था हो और जल्दी ही कुसूरवार को सजा दी जा सके। इस चीज को सामने रखते हुए 1964 में यह बिल दो साल के लिए बनाया गया था, और यह विश्वास दिलाया गया था कि जब यह स्थिति हट जाएगी तब यह चीज समाप्त हो जाएगी। उसके बाद 1966 से 1968 तक यह चला और अब मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि यह कानून 1971 तक चलना चाहिए। यह एक गंभीर मामला है।

मेरा जो डिसऐप्रूवल का प्रस्ताव है उसके दो कारण हैं। एक तो यह कि अच्छा होता अगर इस अध्यादेश के बजाय यह सरकार यह बिल इस सदन के सामने लाती। जो पार्लियामेंट की प्रोप्रायटी है उसको तोड़कर, उसको परे छोड़कर सरकार छोटी-बड़ी हर एक चीज के लिए अध्यादेश जारी करती है, वह समय पर जगती नहीं। अगर सरकार को यह मालूम था कि इसका समय बीतता जा रहा है, और आज भी अगर उसकी आवश्यकता है तो सरकार का यह फर्ज था कि वह पहले जगती और इसको इस सदन के सामने लाती। कौन सा विधेयक और कौनसा प्रस्ताव इस सदन में कब धराना चाहिए, यह देखना सरकार के चीफ व्हिप का काम है और सरकार का काम है, उनको इसके लिए समय निकालना चाहिए। बड़े दुःख की बात है. . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप चीफ व्हिप पर बड़े मेहरबान हैं।

श्री कंबरलाल गुप्त : सरकार का सही। अगर यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विधेयक है तो इसके लिए सरकार ने दो या तीन घंटे का समय पहले क्यों नहीं निकाला? क्यों बैकडोर से इसके लिए अध्यादेश जारी किया। जिस प्रकार से सरकार ने काम किया है उसके लिए मैं उसकी निन्दा करना चाहता हूँ।

इस बिल में क्या है? इस बिल में जो हमारे