

[Mr. Speaker]

which I have just indicated. However, if the Home Minister has any facts to give to the House, he may make a short statement.

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I have only read this morning's papers and I have just read a statement issued by the Delhi authorities. In addition to those facts I have none in my possession. If I may say so, I invite attention to the suggestion made by you with respect to a short notice question being put. If that is put, I shall make it my business to give to the House as complete information as I possibly can. I may also add that so far as I know and I have received no information either up to this time that there is any further tension in the city.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

ARREST OF SHRI V. G. DESHPANDE

Mr. Speaker: I have received a letter of request from the hon. Member Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, who wishes to have my consent to raise a question of privilege upon the arrest of one of the Members of this House. The motion is that a breach of privilege of the House of the People has been committed by the arrest of Shri V. G. Deshpande, M.P. by the police in the early hours on the morning of the 27th May, when the House is in session and the House is deprived of the contribution that the said Member would have made by participating in the deliberations. Of course, we are not much concerned with the latter part of the motion but the substantive motion is that the House is in session and a Member of this House has been arrested by the executive government.

Instead therefore of going through the long procedure that is prescribed in the Rules of Procedure I would prefer to exercise my authority under rule 214 and refer the question raised in this notice to the Committee of Privileges, who will inquire into all the facts connected with this matter and also consider as to whether, on the facts as elicited by them, they constitute a breach of privilege of the House. So nothing further requires to be done and this matter will go now to the Committee of Privileges.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): May I respectfully submit to the hon. Home Minister through you, Sir, to see if he could make a statement as to under what rule and under what circumstances this hon. Member has been arrested, whether he is likely to be released soon, or whether he will

continue to be detained. If some information is given then we will be able to understand

Mr. Speaker: I do not think we need go into that at all. Hon. Members feel anxious about their colleague in this House and so does the Chair. That is why I am referring this question specially to the Committee of Privileges, which consists of hon. Members of this House who represent various parties. They will, in the committee, try to scan the evidence on the various facts that they will probe into and will come to proper conclusions. The matter will then come before this House for such disposal as the House may like.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): Sir, Mr. Deshpande has been detained under an executive fiat under section 3 of the Preventive Detention Act.....

Mr. Speaker: He need not give the information to the House but he may give it to the Committee of Privileges.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: May I make one suggestion. Under the rule under which you have exercised your prerogative would you kindly fix an early date for the report of the Committee to be submitted, so that the matter may be finalised and placed before the House.

Mr. Speaker: I shall ask them to finalise it as early as possible. After all the Committee will work in its own way and I will stress the urgency of the matter on the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: I have to announce that under sub-rule (1) of Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, the following Members will form the Committee on Petitions, namely:—

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava,
Shrimati Renu Chakravarty,
Shri Asim Krishna Dutt,
Shri Govindrao Dharmaji Vartak,
Prof. C. P. Mathew.

RAILWAY BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: We will now proceed with the further general discussion on the Railway Budget. I am just having a reference to the composite list of Members who want to speak. The list is pretty formidable—the names

suggested are 40. It is obviously impossible to accommodate the desire of all these forty gentlemen, but one thing can be done and that is we can accommodate at least 1½ times the number if we curtail the time from 15 to 10 minutes. So, if it is the desire of hon. Members to accommodate each other better, they may permit me to fix the shorter time limit. Of course I have got the right to do so, but I may have their consent for fixing the time limit at 10 minutes.

Some Hon. Members: Yes, Sir.

Some Hon. Members: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Then the other alternative is that a large number of Members must give up the idea of speaking.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): I may be permitted to withdraw my name from the list, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: That is a good proposal. However, as all the Members may not be agreeable to the curtailment of the time I will say generally ten minutes and if an hon. Member wishes particularly to have some more minutes he may go on for a couple of minutes more. But he must start with the determination that he places his point. The difficulty is that hon. Members take away a good deal of time in general dissertations and then they come to the points only at the end when about three or four minutes are left; when the warning bell is given the hon. Member generally requests for a minute more which usually does not consist of sixty seconds but a much longer time. So this may be borne in mind and we may now start.

Shri Barrow (Nominated—Anglo-Indian): I would humbly suggest, Sir, that although there is a list there the Members should be present so that they may catch your eye. Otherwise it may happen as it happened yesterday—the names were read out and the Members were not present, and we were getting a series of unrelated speeches; we were not actually having a debate because Members timed their arrival in the chamber with the time of their speeches.

Mr. Speaker: There is force in that argument, and therefore I am binding myself neither to the list nor to the order given in the list. It is not possible to do that. A Member is expected to be called any time or not to be called at all and he has to be present in the House all through. So, we will try to follow that.

Shri Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): But have the Members to catch your eye or you will call them, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: The Members have to attempt slightly so that I may know. The difficulty is that it is not possible for me to know, at least for the present, who is who in this House completely; I know a good number but not the entire number, and if I do not go by the list I may call upon several Members belonging to one group to the neglect of the others, which I do not propose doing. All the different ideologies and groups must have some fair opportunity at least of expressing themselves.

We will now proceed with the debate, and the general time limit will be ten minutes. Mr. Venkataraman.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): It used to be my privilege in this House to espouse the cause of railway labour from time to time, but now I find, Sir, that some of my friends on the other side have really stolen the thunder from me. They have only stolen the thunder but not the light as was clear from the speech which my hon. friend the Member from Mayuram made yesterday. He made a number of points and exaggerated them to such an extent that I am afraid he has lost the case which he had very dear to his heart. He said that the Railway finances have been mortgaged to the General Revenues, that Rs. 34 crores have been transferred to the General Revenues, that it is all bad. And he was backed by another hon. Member who used the expression that the Railway Finances were being used as the handmaid of the General Revenues of this country. We all know that the Railway finances are loans which have been borrowed by the Government and it has to pay interest on those loans; even at the current market rate of interest 31 per cent. will have to be paid. Therefore, the contribution the Railway finances make to the General Revenues, namely lending at 4 per cent. cannot be regarded by any person as something extraordinary or something very great or as something which is very likely to cause great harm either to the Railway finances or to the people employed in the Railways or to the people of the country.

We may also look at another aspect of this question, namely that though the capital at charge is only Rs. 860 crores the current market value of the capital at charge must be anything up to Rs. 2000 crores. The

[Shri Venkataraman]

Railways were integrated and the present system consists of many. . .

An Hon. Member: The air-conditioning system is not working and it is very hot to sit here.

Mr. Speaker: I know that. I made enquiries and find that the machine is being set in order, but it takes its own time.

Shri B. Das (Jaipur-Keonjhar) : May I suggest that the fans here need not be removed so that they may serve as an alternative in case of breakdown of the air-conditioning system?

Mr. Speaker: The question was duly considered and the fans were removed in the interest of having much larger space available for sitting and for passages. We are now not the old number of 140 nor the later number of 200 and odd but we are 500 now and it requires more passage room and all that. That was why the fans were removed.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East): All the 500 are perspiring!

Mr. Speaker: Good. The hon. Member may continue.

Shri Venkataraman: I was referring to the integration of the State Railways. When the State Railways were taken over by the Government we had not paid the market value thereof but only the book value and 4 per cent. of the book value which is very much written down is not a very great contribution to the General Finances. Then, Sir, let us test the correctness of the proposition from another angle. If instead of the state running the Railways we had a corporation, then that corporation would have had to pay income-tax on all the revenue it got. Today as a state department the Railways are not paying any income-tax and there cannot be any complaint that the General Revenues are affected. On the contrary, I am afraid people may say that the boot is on the other leg and when the general discussion of the Budget takes place they may say that the Railway Finances are pampered and that due contributions to the General Revenues are not got from the Railways. Therefore, I see no very great point in the criticism that Rs. 34 crores are being transferred from the railway to the general finances.

Then, Sir, my hon. friend referred to the condition of labour and spoke

with considerable heat. He said that the officers were drawing Rs. 4,000 as salary while the worker was getting only Rs. 70 and that the whole system was thoroughly rotten. I have looked into the figures of 1939, treating that as a base year, and compared them with the figures for 1951 and this is what I find. In 1938-39 the number of Class I and II officers, that is, superior service officers, was 1,784 in the whole of India. In 1950-51 this number has increased to 2,079. In 1938-39 they were paid Rs. 3 crores and 6 lakhs and odd, while in 1950-51 with an increase in the number of Class I and II officers the salary bill was only Rs. 2 crores and 87 thousand and odd, that is, the officers were drawing a reduced sum. Therefore, we were really on the right track. I am one with my hon. friend that there should be as little disparity as possible between the maximum and the minimum, and the sooner we strive to achieve this reduction in the disparity the greater chance will there be for the prosperity of all people in the country. At the same time, we have to take note of the steps that are being taken by the administration and not criticise it merely for the sake of criticism. Now, let us compare the figures of wages in respect of Class IV employees. The number of employees has increased from 5 lakhs, 3 thousand and odd in 1938-39 to 6 lakhs, 54 thousand and odd in 1950-51. The wage bill in 1938-39 was Rs. 13 crores and 75 lakhs whereas in 1950-51 it was Rs. 62 crores and 14 lakhs. Now, the increase per capita comes to 845 in the case of unskilled labour and 1,201 in the case of mechanical workmen in class IV. I am very happy to find that the increase in wages for class IV servants has not merely been keeping pace with the rise in the cost of living index but it has really materially added to their standard of living by a very small fraction. The cost of living has gone up by 3½ times while the wage bill has gone up by four and odd times. Therefore, it is a very healthy sign that the Class IV employees' lot in our railways has improved and unlike most of the employees and workmen in other industries who are struggling to keep pace with the rising cost of living, the railway employees have done a little better and have improved their condition from what it was in 1939.

Then, Sir, it may be said as is usual in trade union platforms that if we reduce the number of officers and their salaries we may be able to improve the lot of the poorer classes

of workmen. I am afraid that that argument will not hold good. Even if you reduce by one-half the entire salaries of Class I and II officers, the net saving would be of the order of Rs. 1 crore and 43 lakhs and the wage bill of Rs. 62 crores in respect of workers is not going to be very materially affected by this small contribution. I was further surprised when in the same breath my neighbour Shri Nambiar said that the rates and freights have also been increased, and he criticised that. I would have liked my hon. friend to choose one of these two points. Either ask for higher wages and say it should be laid down that every worker should get at least Rs. 100, and say that the people should pay more for their travel; or conversely, ask that the rates should be reduced and the freight should be reduced, and agree to a freeze in wages. It is impossible to ask for both at the same time. If you want increased amenities and if you want, as I do want, better conditions of living for the working classes, we people representing trade unions should not say that the rates and freights are very high. In my opinion, they are not high at all in this country.

May I submit, Sir, that three or four minutes were consumed in the discussion about the air conditioning arrangement in the House?

Mr. Speaker: Taking that into account, I have given the warning. Anyhow, he may proceed.

Shri Venkataraman: When we compare the freights and rates in the manner I have suggested, then we see that they are a little over what they were in 1939. Supposing we reduce the rates and freights from what they were in 1951-52 to what they were in 1939 in terms of the purchasing power of the money, then it comes to hardly two pies, because the cost of living and the price level have all gone up by not less than three times and six pies reduced three times comes to two pies only. Therefore, let us adopt one stand. Let us either say that the people will have to pay more in order that our workmen will be able to maintain a better standard of living, or let us say that the people must get the benefit out of the increased earnings in the railways and therefore, we will agree to a wage freeze, so that the benefit that accrues out of it will go towards the reduction in freights and rates.

Then, Sir, there are a number of points on which I wanted to speak

but in view of the limitation of time that you have imposed, I would refer to only one or two things. Firstly, there are a number of mis-statements made by my hon. friend Shri Vittal Rao from Hyderabad. He told the House that the diet was charged for nowadays whereas it was not charged for previously. I have made representations myself to the Railway Ministry and I do not think this statement is correct. The diet is not charged for those persons who are drawing less than Rs. 60. In respect of temporary staff also, we have made repeated representations to the Railway Ministry that the temporary staff should be absorbed as early as possible and we were told that the number of temporary staff now in existence is about 90,000 out of a total of nearly one million workmen.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Question. It is 2 lakhs.

Shri Venkataraman: I shall be very grateful if the Minister who furnished me with this information in reply to my letter would answer the question posed by my hon. friend. Now, out of these 90,000, 60,000 would in any event be casual labour. Anyone who is connected with factory administration knows that there must be some little margin for casual labour but it should not be according to me, the same persons. If a person had put in nearly twelve months of continuous service, then he should become a permanent workman, and the other temporary workman should be promoted in that place.

In the end, I want to refer to only one more important matter, and that is the improvement that has taken place in the matter of punctuality of ordinary trains. My hon. friend Mr. Anthony who is really a master of crisp phrases once said that the O.T. Railway is the "out of time" Railway. It never used to keep time, but when the Vice-President recently travelled by train, it arrived ahead of schedule! These are the features of our railway administration about which we should be glad. The Railways are the greatest and the grandest national asset and we should be manfully proud of our performance.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): The hon. the Railway Minister described himself as the custodian of the largest nationalised undertaking in the country. We should like to congratulate him on this title which he claims. Certainly, the Railway is the biggest national undertaking. At the same time, you ought to see that the evils of State capitalism do not come into

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

play. You ought to see that justice and fairplay are done all around. Look at the figures which the hon. Minister has given in his Budget estimates. Look at the colossal profit which the railway undertaking is making year after year. The gross traffic receipts are Rs. 282 crores and 16 lakhs. The working expenses amount to Rs. 217 crores and 93 lakhs. The net traffic receipts therefore are Rs. 64 crores and 23 lakhs. Take therefrom miscellaneous expenditure—Rs. 6 crores and 75 lakhs. What is the position? The net railway revenue is Rs. 57 crores, 48 lakhs. Now with this Rs. 57 crores and 48 lakhs net railway revenue what are you going to do? You may not like communism; you may hate bolshevism. But the Prime Minister of India himself has admitted, after visiting some of the railway colonies, that they are possibly the worst slums and that they are a disgrace to the country. Now what are you doing? Deep down in the back-ground of these slums is spreading the flames which ought to be extinguished. If we do not do our duty and fail to provide real type of amenities and fail to uplift labour which we employ as the biggest employer of labour, we shall not do our part in the national interest and the flames which are allowed to spread may lead to an ultimate conflagration.

I am glad the hon. Minister recognises this. He is not in the habit of his predecessor—giving a certificate to himself. The hon. Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar, I find, struck a note of optimism. His words are, "there should be a recognition of practical Indian statesmanship at the top-level." I am glad to find that our Railway Minister has behaved better and is not in the habit of showering compliments on himself.

But I want to know what is the plan, what are the concrete suggestions for uplifting labour. It is no good simply saying that we have done a lot at Chittaranjan, that we have given them model housing and our plan is to have that as the standard. What are you going to do this year or in the near future? It is no use showing large surpluses; it is no use being self-complacent about the buoyancy of the railway finance and rest on our oars. You must show that you are doing your duty. Listen to the railway travelling public as also the employees of the railways. Now what has been done for improving the amenities of the third class passengers? They are contributing Rs. 99 crores and over,

nearly Rs. 100 crores, and they ought to get a fair deal out of it.

Also a lot of comment has been made regarding the rates. I am not going into details, but it is our duty as the biggest employer of labour to see that justice is done both to the public, especially to the poorer sections of the public, and also to the railway staff all round.

Now, Sir, I have got to address this House on one important matter—that is railway regrouping. I suspect, Sir, there is something like an innuendo in the hon. Minister's speech when he said that we should be animated by the desire of having one united India and he pleads for solidarity and prosperity of the nation as a whole. He asked this House to rise above narrow parochial, provincial, sentiments and prejudices. My charge is this, Sir, that in the railway regrouping business the late Minister in charge of Railways succumbed to provincial sentiments and prejudices. He did not do what was fair. I have in my hand the Railway Board's memorandum. Every hon. Member of this House should read it. This memorandum was prepared on the question of the formation of the Northern, North-Eastern and Eastern Zones. That has been circulated to the hon. Members of this House along with the summary of the proceedings of the Central Advisory Council for Railways. Now, Sir, the greatest experts, after years of deliberation, gave their considered and final verdict. What is their verdict? I will read, Sir, one passage, that is paragraph 55. It is now suggested, insinuated, alleged, that we from Bengal are demanding that Calcutta should be the headquarters of the North-Eastern Railway out of parochial sentiments. This is absolutely untrue, Sir. We repudiate this charge. The Railway Board's biggest experts, after years of scrutiny, give their verdict in these words. I am reading from paragraph 55, page 14, of the memorandum of the Railway Board.

"It is necessary to bear in mind that the jute and tea industries located in Calcutta are dependent for almost all their supplies of raw materials on regions of North-Eastern Zone. Similarly practically all the imported goods, including food-grains for all these areas are received in the Calcutta Port. North-Eastern Railway will ensure for all the regions of the zone direct access to the port of Calcutta under one railway system"

And, therefore, they said, having regard to business interests, having regard to the basic principles of regional regrouping, in the clearest possible language that Calcutta should be the headquarters of the North-Eastern Zone.

They proceed further:

"Calcutta has not only many jute mills, but also the head offices of the managing agents of numerous Assam and North-Bengal tea gardens are in Calcutta. The location of the headquarters of the North-Eastern zone in Calcutta will afford facilities to business and trading interests."

I demand from the present Railway Minister some cogent argument as to why this considered advice of the Railway Board has been jettisoned?

Take, for instance, the demand of business. You know, Sir, there is complete solidarity and unanimity of opinion on this question in Bengal. You cannot wipe out Bengal from the map of India. You cannot forget that Calcutta is still the biggest port. You cannot possibly place Gorakhpur on the same pedestal as Calcutta. It is absurd. I have no fight with Uttar Pradesh. There is absolutely no question of any inter-provincial jealousy or animosity. I want to know why this Government has disregarded the clear-cut opinion recorded in January 1952 of its best experts that having regard to the importance of Calcutta, having regard to the fact that the jute mills have to take their supplies of raw materials from regions of the North-Eastern zone, having regard to the fact that the tea-growers have their managing agency concerns in the City of Calcutta, it is in the interest of trade, it is in the interest of the economy of the country that Calcutta should be the headquarters of the North-Eastern Zone.

What are the arguments put forward? It is no use standing up and saying that we want solidarity. I take it as a reflection on the experts who drafted this memorandum; it is a reflection on the patriotism of the people who know this affair. They took into account all these considerations. With the fullest knowledge of the state of things they have done it.

The *hartal* which we had in Calcutta was, Sir, a genuine expression of public feeling on this question. It is not a question of any sectarian feeling; it is not a question of communal feeling; it is not a question of provincial

sentiments. If you read the proceedings of the Local Advisory Council held in Calcutta, you will find English merchants, Indian merchants, commercial men, all possible interests, representatives of the Bengal legislature and other public men, Members of this Parliament, protested against any revision of this Railway Board's memorandum. They said: "For heaven's sake do not give a go-by to this considered verdict." We do not know, Sir, what happened. Dr. Mookerjee has told you how it happened. I am not going to indulge in any language of declamation, but the fact remains that while on the 27th of February when the Central Advisory Council met the hon. Minister had stuck to the opinion that this was the ideal state of affairs, on the 7th March, in deference to the request of the U.P. Government this verdict was negated. Is this democracy? Is this fair-play? For the first time in the history of India, seventeen crores of people have returned us to this Parliament. Are you not flouting this Parliament, are you not insulting this House?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: In what way?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: In what way? Do you not realize? In February you arrive at a decision and a few days afterwards you completely take a somersault. Could you not wait till the Parliament met on the 13th of May? Was it not in accordance with the fundamental canons of democracy that you should place the matter before Parliament and convince them not only that justice is done but that justice is being done in the interests of all concerned? Is it not a cardinal principle of upright democracy that justice is not only done but that it must be shown that justice is being done? On this matter the Government of West Bengal is backed by all sections of public opinion. It is not a provincial or a parochial question. In the interests of justice, fairplay and national solidarity, I give this warning to the House: if you stick to this unwise decision a good bit of the North Bengal traffic may go to Pakistan and the port of exit will no longer be Calcutta but Chittagong. Pakistan is anxiously watching whether you are going to reverse the decision. If it is not done there will be great diversion of Indian traffic. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: That will have serious consequences. Unfortunately Dr. Deshmukh does not know my part of the country as well as I do. If this unwise decision is not reversed soon, it may be disastrous to the economy of the country.

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I do not propose to tell the Government their own story. But certainly I feel a bit unhappy when I think of the decision that the Railway Ministry has made subsequently. I am particularly unhappy over the fact that the Sealdah Division, which had all along been considered as an integral part of the metre gauge system on the northern side of the river Ganges, has suddenly been taken out of that system. The Ministry itself had supported it all along, and I do not know why it changed its mind. I would respectfully request the hon. Minister to give further consideration to this matter, and with that object in view I shall place one or two additional circumstances and facts before him.

Sir, it is a fact well known to this House that after partition this Sealdah Division, which was an integral part of the system in the traffic towards North Bengal and Assam, had been cut off. It was after the 15th August, 1947 that this part of the system had lost its connection. Previously it was part and parcel of the E. B. Railway, then it became part and parcel of the A. B. Railway. It was after the partition of Bengal that it was absolutely cut off and tacked on to the E. I. Railway. Even then, the Ministry itself, in the memorandum that has been circulated to us, admits that though this system has been working as a part of the E. I. Railway after partition, still the circumstances and incidence are such that it cannot be fully integrated in all matters. Besides, though it was separated by Pakistan, yet this Division namely the Sealdah Division was working solely 10 A.M. for the transit of goods and also passengers towards and from North Bengal, Assam and North Bihar. Now, I do not know the reasons why this connecting link of the whole North Eastern system with Calcutta has been suddenly cut off. The Ministry might argue: never mind, it is an all-India system. I place before you, Sir, that once these six zones are constituted and once this Eastern Zone is treated as a separate entity from the North Eastern Zone, the same difficulty that existed before between one Railway and another will arise and continue. We know that when goods are carried by the same railway there is less chance of loss, theft and damage during transit. But when goods are transmitted through different railway systems the extent of loss, damage etc. in transit is much greater. It is no consolation to the consignee to be told "If you lose your goods, you

can certainly file a suit or inform the Ministry, and you can be compensated". You can no doubt get compensation after a laborious process. But your immediate loss cannot be made good or recouped by this consolation.

[**SHRI M. A. AYYANGAR** in the Chair]

I come from North Bengal and I know what is the feeling there. There is a Director of Movements posted at Calcutta. Of course, so far as the big industrialists or influential concerns like the D.P.A. and the I.T.P.A. etc. are concerned, they will have their demands adequately met with the help of this Director of Movements. But what about the thousands of small traders and consignees? They will find the greatest difficulty. Even though the Director of Movements may try his best, it is the biggest consignees whose claims will be met first and the others will be left in the lurch. That is our difficulty.

In addition to that, I may place one other factor for the consideration of the hon. Minister. The present system that has been carrying goods, I mean the Assam Rail link, has been newly constructed and it carries only a part of the traffic towards North Bengal and Assam. Of course, North Bihar has got this only route. But so far as North Bengal and Assam are concerned, it is absolutely inadequate. I pressed from the very beginning, when this Rail Link was being constructed, before the hon. Minister that for the safety of India, in the interest of the defence of our Eastern Region, which spreads over thousands of miles of our frontier, and for the sake of the transit of goods and passengers in that Region, the line should be doubled or that it should at least be made a broad gauge line. Of course it cannot be done overnight, and we are waiting. But what is the present position? Of about 60 lakh maunds of tea that is transmitted from Assam and North Bengal only 12 lakh maunds are carried by this Rail route. 48 lakh maunds have to come via Pakistan by the river route and 50,000 tons of food for Assam (for the tea garden consumption) have to be sent by this river route. So also 120 lakh tons of coal to the tea gardens are transmitted by this river route. 220,000 tons of jute are sent towards Calcutta from North Bengal and Assam by this river route. Now I ask the hon. Minister: do they want to continue this sort of uncomfortable position? The other day my hon. friend, Mr. Chaudhuri from Assam complained that their salt which was going from

Calcutta to Assam had been stopped in Pakistan and for several days the Assam people did not get that salt. I would specially ask the hon. Minister to divert his department's attention towards this great problem. It is not a question of commerce and industry but it is a bigger problem of defence. I need not mention the details of it, because the hon. Minister knows everything as to how during the second World War some 4 or 5 railway lines were so engrossed in transit of war materials that even at the time when the Bengal famine was impending, and we could procure rice from Orissa which was ready for moving it, the Government could not provide us with the railway wagons and that was one of the immediate reasons why the onrush of the famine could not be averted. In these circumstances, this link will have to be strengthened. Once that is established, I can say—though I do not know the particulars—that the Sealdah division will be more than over-worked in order to serve the entire North Bengal, North Bihar and Assam in the matter of transit of goods and passenger traffic. On these grounds, we feel strongly we would have to consider what we can do in order to give us some satisfaction. We are very much worried about this matter.

Mr. Chairman: For the convenience of hon. Members—so that they may go out, if necessary and come in—I will read out the names; I will call out in the following order. I have got a separate list of Members, Congress and non-congress.

Non-congress members—

Dr. Krishnaswami, Dr. Jaisooriya, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, Shri T. K. Chaudhuri, Shri Rajabhoj, Sardar Hukam Singh, Shri Frank Anthony.

Congress members—

Shri C. R. Narasimhan, Shrimati Uma Nehru, Shri Pataskar.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): As I was listening to the Railway Minister's speech the other day, I wondered for a moment whether we were listening to a popular Minister or to a sun-dried bureaucrat interested in matters of routine administration, concerned with mere detail, and concerned, if I might say so, with only very, very incidental matters relating to railway transport. I have taken some trouble to examine the Railway Budget, to master the White Paper that has been presented to Parliament and to analyse the various detailed schemes that have been worked out in other

documents presented to Parliament. But before I consider some of those details, I should like to make an incidental observation which springs from the Railway Minister's speech; he seems to attach far too much importance to regrouping and to the fact of Government having saved a certain amount of money by minimising book-keeping devices. Of course, the Rs. 16.72 crores which have been lessened both from the receipt side and the expenditure side is merely an accounting device; but taking into account our railways as they are, I do not know whether it is not a matter of some significance to know how inter-railway accounts have been operated, because we might have an idea of the expenses incurred, of the outputs that society receives and the inputs we make into one of our great public enterprises.

I want this House to realise that Railways are a socialised enterprise and when once you consider them to be a socialized enterprise, the criteria that you have to apply in respect of rates and freights, the criteria that you have to apply in respect of new investment, are different from the criteria that a capitalist enterprise takes into account. It is from this simple point of view that I want to ask my hon. friend, the Railway Minister to consider the Railway Convention that was recently arrived at and consider. I shall go into the details of the Budget in another minute or two—whether the present system of allocation of funds as between different purposes is satisfactory or whether the present system of expenditure, the tests that are taken into account for railway development purposes are sensible. We are told, that after having made a guaranteed payment of about 4.25 per cent. each year to the general exchequer, we would have a certain amount reserved for the Railway Development Fund and one of the purposes of that Railway Development Fund would be to extend unremunerative lines in different parts of the country. The test of remunerativeness is that new line must yield at least 4.2 per cent. on the expenditure incurred. Now, I think this is a high rate, particularly when you are considering development through a socialised enterprise. A private Railway, for instance, which undertakes new investment will take into account the direct return which it gets on its capital, whereas a socialized enterprise will have to consider not only the direct returns on the capital invested, but also the indirect returns that accrue to the State from taxes levied on new factories, industries and other enterprises which come into

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

being as a result of railway development. Let us not make the mistake of thinking that the Railways are owned by two different authorities. For purposes of better administration we have two budgets and from the point of view of the community, the Railways are owned as much by the community as the general exchequer. I feel that this 4.2 per cent. is a narrow test, because if we examine the great developments that have taken place in other countries, you will find that when you consider unremunerative enterprises, they are unremunerative from the strictly financial point of view, but when you make allowances for the indirect social effects that spring up from developing many under-developed areas, by penetrating into the hinterland, and linking up centres of production and consumption, you will find that the total return to the exchequer will be in the region of five per cent. or thereabout. What you are now laying down in effect is that unless we obtain a total return of about 7½ to 9 per cent. we cannot embark on any enterprise. It is tragic fact that our railway system of accounting is archaic. I want to make this observation in the hope that the new Railway Minister who is fresh to his job and blessed according to his friends with energy, will apply himself to the task of re-organizing the system of accounting. What is the method of accounting that we follow in our Railway Budget? One would have thought that accounting procedure is something which is recognized as useful and desirable in all countries where socialized enterprises are operated. Why, Sir, only the other day I read Mr. Sawell Bray's analysis of accounting, in which he points out that from the twin standpoints of economic efficiency and accounting desirability an enterprise whether it is community owned or private owned should follow the same accounting procedure. The first essential insisted upon is that an enterprise should prepare a balance sheet which presents a still picture of assets and liabilities and a profit and loss account for a period. In the one case, you would have an idea of what exactly your assets and liabilities are. In the other instance, you know how expenditure has been incurred, what outputs you get and where you incur a greater amount of expenditure to produce the same output. In certain cases, even if losses are incurred, the community, who as the shareholders, have the right to determine the policy of the Railways, will have an opportunity through Parliament of placing before the Railway Minister the

reasons and the purpose for subsidising certain unremunerative items of expenditure. As it is, by the new fangled re-grouping, we do not know where we stand. The Railway finances are in a very confused state, anything may happen, wastes may occur and the community may ultimately subsidise regions on no definite principle.

Take this very simple matter of the Chittaranjan locomotive workshops. We have had its praises sung to us. We have been told that many locomotives would be turned out every year. But, surely we would like to know to which particular lines those locomotives would be allocated, and what principles would be taken into account in determining such allocation. It would not be possible, in future, to find out how such matters would be determined. One would have thought that our great Railway public utility system would have been broken into half-a-dozen corporations, or preferably more, each of these corporations representing sizable operational units and enjoined by statute as in England to present a balance sheet and a profit and loss account to Parliament. We would then have been in a position to know which particular section of the community we should subsidise, which may require development, which lines yield an output commensurate with the input of expenditure incurred, and lastly we would be in a position to exercise a check on wasteful expenditure incurred possibly by the new satraps of railway administration.

One word more, Sir, and I have done. Reading the White Paper, I came across an extraordinary suggestion by the gentleman who had drafted it, that the increase in freight rates and passenger rates had not seriously affected the flow of passenger traffic and to support this conclusion he relied on the fact of the average passenger mile not having appreciably declined. Now the average passenger mile has, as any one familiar with Railway Economics knows, its own value and its purposes. Through time, average passenger mile is bound to fall because local passenger traffic necessarily tend to increase more than distant passenger traffic. Whereas the average ton mile increases, the average passenger mile declines. This is a factor which weighs with those who embark upon large scale schemes of electrification of railways for suburban development. It cannot be used to support absence of a fall in passenger traffic consequent upon the rise in passenger rates. The argument that

freight rates should be increased as the freight rates for coal and other commodities as they have been uneconomic, is unsound. Now, I would like to put before my friends another point of view argued with equal vigour and passion only two years ago. Two years ago, when we devalued the currency, we were asked, and many injunctions were issued to coal producers to cut down their prices by about 10 or 15 per cent. as it would contribute a great deal towards lessening inflationary trends. We were also asked to preserve high grade coal in the national interest. What has happened to all these arguments? Have they all gone by the wind? To-day we have increased freight rates by 30 per cent. The result is that we are adding increases in freight rates to the cost of coal. We are told however that the increase in burden on private enterprise is only about 3.62 crores. But, 3.62 crores is sufficient if you take into account all the various ancillary and multiplier effects to promote an inflationary spurt and are we in a position to raise the costs to different enterprises?

We have not dealt with labour problems in this budget sufficiently because we do not in many instances realise what labour problems are important in this huge leviathan regrouped system of Railways. No one knows where we stand with respect to labour, because all labour questions are lumped into one big category. Anything can take place. Anything can be presented and can pass muster for sound finance. The time has arrived when we should certainly break up this account into discrete parts so that we may be in a position to understand what exactly the profit and loss is, so that the community as the shareholders, may be in a position to determine where it should subsidise, how it should subsidise, which particular service it should subsidise, and make the Railways a really national asset. It is not enough to own the Railways; we ought also operate Railways in the social interest.

Shri S. A. Khan (Ibrahimpattam): I am grateful to you, Sir, for having given me this opportunity today to say something on the Railway Budget in this august Assembly.

There have been many criticisms of the Railway Administration; not all of them have been fair. In fact, I feel that some of the hon. Members in this House, while arguing out their cases, have developed what the Railway people call the "hot axle" and were completely off the rails. The fact of

the matter is that looking back over the span of years that separates us to-day from those unhappy days of partition, when we were faced with national calamities of the first magnitude, it is no wonder that the Railway system in this country was faced with enormous problems, which it did its very best to solve, and I sincerely feel that the Administration deserves all praise and credit for the work of rehabilitation which it has been doing during these past five critical years.

I do not wish to juggle with figures because figures are not always enough to prove a case. Those who are well acquainted with the trick of the trade can prove or disprove anything by quoting mere figures. The fact is that we should survey the achievements of this Administration in terms of human endeavour and not merely by figures. All the same I should like to say, and I am sure that this House will support me, that the figures supplied to us, copious and vast as they are, show a revenue and expenditure to the tune of 286 crores on each side. I hope that this vast sum of money, every rupee, every anna, every pie of it, will be spent wisely, not only on the welfare of the railway employees, but also on the advancement of the Indian Railways.

We have no cause for complacency. Much has been done; much remains yet to be accomplished. We are still depending on foreign countries for our essential needs, such as wagons, coaches, rails and locomotives. How long, might I ask, are we to depend on the sweet will and pleasure of foreign countries? It is imperative that we not only maintain the present efficiency of the railways but also try to enhance it. At the same time we should build up our basic heavy industries, for without them we will be helpless in a hostile world.

Whatever people might say on the opposite side—and I cannot help feeling that they do so in a sheer spirit of criticism—the fact is that what the Government have done is a step in the right direction and it has proved successful.

In this country we are short of steel, which is a basic raw material. We need all the steel we can get. Therefore in the circumstances it would be wise if the Government did not spend money needlessly on building new tracks, new railways and opening up new areas in the country. At present we can hardly afford this luxury. If you want to open up new areas, it would be in the interests of the country

[Shri S. A. Khan]

to wait for another few years, because just now it would be the height of folly to throw our money about.

Similarly, there is great need for economy in the purchase of Stores and I for one welcome the idea of the creation of a Central Agency of Stores Purchase and I hope that the Administration will do its best towards perfecting the accounting of Stores.

While on this subject of economy, may I point out that the money which the Administration proposes to spend on a new railway station at New Delhi is a sheer waste. Why do you want a new station in Delhi just now? It is a kind of luxury though it may be from the point of view of architecture a fine thing to commemorate the glory of our railways but the time has not yet come. We are going to spend 35 lakhs on the new railway station, 48 lakhs on new lines and 28 lakhs, on the purchase of the Tapti Valley Railway. This money can very well be saved and spent later or even now for providing amenities for third class passengers or on housing the families of railwaymen, which is a problem which deserves the utmost sympathy of the House.

So much has been said by so many about third class passengers to so few in this House who travel third. It is a good sign indeed and I hope that the Government will do all it can to ease the difficulties in the way of the unfortunate people who are forced to travel third in this country over vast distances.

May I now plead for the first class passenger especially one who travels in a coupé like Mr. Gadgil did some time ago. I say something must be done for the security of the lives of these passengers. If they are three or four in a compartment together it is all right but, if like me one travels first in a coupé and happens to be alone, he has to spend two sleepless nights, travelling to Delhi from Hyderabad and undergo the risk of having his throat cut, all for Rs. 147, an exorbitant price to pay. I hope the hon. Minister will do something about this matter.

Dr. Jaisoorya (Medak): You have given me ten minutes to fight a huge organisation like the Railway Administration and the Railway Board, which has a body too big to be kicked and no soul to be damned. Taking it factually, here we have three factors. One is the huge railway organisation which we have received as a legacy from the British; that was the house that Jack

built; we did not build it ourselves. Then the second part of the triangle is the amateur Government that has just taken power, as Sardar Patel said. The third part of the triangle again is a legacy of the British, that huge bureaucracy, as Isaiah Bowman said, "the bureaucracy in India has been centralised and developed to a very high degree of inefficiency." Let us be clear about it. This is the biggest organisation in India, the biggest single asset in fact. The railway administration is a government by itself and it is ruled by the Railway Board. During the British times the British were the *bada laal sahebs* and the Indian bureaucracy was the *chota laal sahebs*. Now the *chota laal sahebs* are true to the steel frame of the railway, a steel frame which is pure Sheffield steel, and it has not yet been broken, so that the Railway Board *chota laal sahebs* have become the *bada laal sahebs* of the steel frame, the same steel frame that controls the railways.

Historically the Railways were started by the British for three purposes, first strategic, secondly to open up markets and thirdly and incidentally to be useful to the people of India. So the primary objective of the legacy was revenue, which is beyond doubt the first objective of the Government.

It is rather tragic that in a few days we have to go through a maze of figures. You cannot find out what they are saying. For instance, in the accounts it will be written "towards electrical fittings for cooling water." Looking at it I will not know what it is unless I am connected with the railway. The figures are correct, the purchases have been correct and the vouchers are correct but I will not know what it is unless I go behind it and find out that this water-cooling plant was ordered against better tenders by the General Manager, say, because his brother-in-law was the agent of the cooling plant. The point is we require specialised knowledge and as you are aware the specialist is a man who knows more and more of less and less and the Railway Board is built up of specialists on one side and on the other of sons, son-in-law and nephews of very important persons as dropes to occupy high offices, so that efficiency is not always the same.

On the other hand this body of specialists has to guide the Minister or try to impose upon him. Luckily Mr. Gopalaswami, I must say to his credit, was himself such an old dried up bureaucrat of vast experience, that

he would not easily be imposed upon. Yet it was Mr. Gopalaswami who himself admitted in a letter, "I am being swamped on all sides by specialists so that I cannot form an opinion of my own." Looking at the frail, delicate figure of the present Railway Minister and his innocence I am wondering how long it will take this experienced body of specialists to swallow him up alive. Now, the point is this: let us look at it factually. Here is a big organisation with the biggest investment in India, Rs. 864 crores. It is the money spinner, it is up till now a commercial transaction, a commercial enterprise. Under the changed circumstances is it possible for it to have a new ideology, what we call the sociological outlook, namely from an earning organisation, purely commercial organisation, is it going to become an instrument of what we call public utility? The conception of a public utility organisation is that revenue is not the primary objective. But here we find that on the capital investment of Rs. 864 crores Mr. Gopalaswami has removed the word "interest" and called it "4 per cent. consolidated dividend"—it makes no difference. Now the question arises: If this "dividend" is obligatory, that is, "You must pay me whether the organisation pays me or not", then it is no longer, from the standpoint of public utility, an instrument of social welfare. Another question arises: Supposing now we say, "No, we do not pay you that 4 per cent. dividend", what will happen to poor Mr. Deshmukh? That is another question. So, these are practical points. How far are you steering an organisation which is there, the lifeline of the country, as an instrument of social welfare? This is a question which we have got to decide.

Now, if I had depended mainly upon the infallibility of specialists I would have retired—I am getting old now—and have gone and studied the philosophy of Mr. K. M. Munshi on the ultimate and penultimate, but unfortunately I have no faith in our specialists here. For instance, I will give you only one statistics which they have not got—they can have it from me—to show how stupid sometimes very learned men can be. For instance, here is the N. S. Railway which has 1360 miles. We will also take G.I.P., B.B. & C.I., and M.S.M. Railways—they are much bigger, that is 3 to 3½ times the size of the N.S. Railway. The number of employees in the N.S. Railway is about 20,000, in the G.I.P. it is 1,35,000. The number of

patients treated on the N.S. Railway which is one-third the size of the G.I.P. is—

In-patients.

N. S. Railway	4,525
G. I. P. Rly. (which is 3 times the size)	6,220
M. S. M. Rly.	5,744
B. B. & C. I. Rly.	4,095

Total attendance of out-patients.

N. S. Rly.	52,408
M. S. M. Rly. (thrice the size)	40,000 (Less)
B. B. & C. I. Rly. Do. Do.	50,000 "
G. I. P. Do. Do.	23,000 "

No. of patients per mile of the rail system.

N. S. Rly.	386
M. S. M. Rly.	139
B. B. & C. I. Rly.	147
G. I. P. Rly.	60

No. of out-patients to number of employees.

N. S. Rly.	26.5
M. S. M. Rly.	7.5
B. B. & C. I. Rly.	6.6
G. I. P. Rly.	1.6

Pandit L. K. Maitra (Nabadwip): We could not follow the figures.

Dr. Jaisooraya: It is a technical point.

Pandit L. K. Maitra: Is it the hon. Member's case that the number of out-patients should be in proportion to the number of employees?

Dr. Jaisooraya: Being a doctor I know how many patients should fall ill.

Pandit L. K. Maitra: Oh, I see.

Dr. Jaisooraya: Now, Sir, if only these specialists knew these facts! They have gone and were so absurd, after having swallowed the little N.S.R. up, to make class I officers class III without knowing the statistics. So, I want to tell you: I would certainly vote for everything, take more if you like provided you can infuse some confidence in me, you can infuse some confidence in the people. For instance, where will the danger come in? You have got such an enormous sum of money for purchase. After studying the Shroff Report on the railway stores I feel very very diffident as to the intelligence of the gentlemen who are doing the purchases so that I would like our new Minister, who is very open minded, not

[Dr. Jaisooraya]

yet a sun-dried bureaucrat, to certainly look into these matters. And remember one thing that however stupid a bureaucracy may be, it has horse sense, namely it knows whether the rider who is riding on top of it knows how to hold the reins or not.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): The Indian Railways as we see in the various reports and from the facts and figures given to us are making rapid progress, are progressing with great strides. No one can pretend not to see it. Many would remember that during the pre-independence days many a battle used to be waged on the floors of legislatures of those times for the setting up of locomotive factories and such other things. Mr. Santhanam used to plead for it very strongly and in those days it used to be a distant dream. Today we find that in fact there is a locomotive factory at Chittaranjan near Calcutta which is producing locomotives. There are also plants intended to make the country self-sufficient in the course of the next three or four years in the matter of carriages and wagons. Therefore it is a matter over which we should salute the workers and the planners of the Indian Railways. I am sure my fellow Members join me in this.

During the war in order to further the war effort some railway lines were dismantled. I think they were 26 in number. When they were dismantled, the citizens of the areas concerned had no opportunity to give their views. That was a dictatorial regime. The number of railways dismantled in this way were, I gather, 26 in all and the total number of miles about 800 or 900. It is now nearly ten years since the dismantling took place and yet the programme of restoration has not been completed. Some of the dismantled lines were called "unremunerative", but I am glad to see that in the new policy regarding restoration of dismantled lines they do not insist on the lines being remunerative. It is a very generous spirit and I appreciate it as one who comes from an area where quite a long line has been removed.

May I submit that out of a total length of 800 miles dismantled in the whole of India, nearly 100 miles fell in my district. That was the contribution of my district—nearly one-eighth. In executing the restoration policy, I would request the Railway Administration to remember such areas as the one I represent, which have suffered very badly. Due to the absence of these 100 miles of railway line, the transport facilities have considerably

suffered. While I welcome the laying down of new lines, I suggest that along with that, Government should accelerate the process of restoration of dismantled ones.

The particular Railway with which I am concerned has got two branch lines: Morappur—Hosur and Krishnagiri to Tirupattur in Salem district involving a length of 100 miles. This line was installed in 1905 whereas the cess was collected from 1872. In the area covered by this dismantled line, there are lakhs of people who depend upon handlooms, cattle breeding etc. Salem has one of the oldest and biggest cattle breeding centres in India and it is being improved and will be further improved. In addition, it is one of the biggest granaries for *ragi* and supplies this millet to 11 districts. That being so, it is a pity that this area should be deprived of railway facilities. In view of these considerations, I request the hon. Minister of Railways to see that while framing the schedule for restoration of dismantled lines he includes these two branch lines.

With these few words, I beg to close my speech.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): As the air conditioning apparatus is not operating, an added responsibility devolves upon me not to import any additional heat into the atmosphere of this House. (An Hon. Member: Air conditioning has begun to function again.) I am assisted in doing so by the fact that the railways of our country are really and truly a national asset of which we should be proud, and we are proud of this national asset because our people have paid with their blood for every foot of railway track laid in this country. I am sure that if we look back to the early days of railway construction we shall find out how loans were floated in England and interest was guaranteed and extravagant expenditure was incurred with impunity only in order that the bloated capitalists of Britain would have an opportunity of having their money bags even more inflated than they had been before. Today, therefore, we are proud of this national asset and that is why we want the Government of this country to treat the Railways in the spirit in which they deserve to be treated. But I find from the speech of the Railway Minister as well as that of the outgoing Minister, whose speeches and pronouncements make such very interesting reading and study, that the Government has not really taken upon itself the responsibility of running the railways in this country in the way they should be run,

and the result is that the railways are—I may quote the words of the Wedgwood Committee Report which was confirmed and sort of seconded by the Kunzru Committee Report—perhaps “the most unpopular” institution in this country. There is no reason why they should be so unpopular, but as a matter of fact, they are. Perhaps the hon. Minister is trying to make up for it by holding a *tamasha* in this city in celebration of the centenary of the setting up of railway tracks in this country. I am reminded of the degenerate days of Rome when the Government wanted to keep itself in power by providing for the people bread and circuses. The Government of my country cannot provide bread, but they are providing a few circuses of the sort which we are promised will happen in Delhi in the next few months or so.

I would say that in regard to railway administration the Budget shows an utter lack of sensitiveness to the demands of the people. Here is a national institution and it has a responsibility to the workers who are under its aegis. It has a serious responsibility in regard to the passengers. It has a very serious responsibility in regard to the contribution which it should make towards the economic development of the country, and therefore the regulation of freight rates and that sort of thing ought to come in for very serious consideration. As far as I can find out from the Budget which has been presented here, this responsibility has been lost sight of completely. As far as the passengers are concerned, we know how the third-class passengers fare. It is they who really make the contribution to the exchequer about which we are so very proud, but in spite of their subsidising whatever little comforts the upper class passengers get, the amenities for third-class passengers are so very bad and so very unspeakable that there is no need to refer to them, particularly in view of the time-limit that you, Sir, have imposed upon us.

In regard to the Inter-Class passengers, we know they are neither fish nor flesh. They are lumped together under the category of upper class passengers in the calculations made in the Budget. For them again, the amenities are non-existent. If any Member of the Railway Board really tries to find out the condition of the passengers particularly when they have to travel over long distances, then I am sure they will discover the kind of straits to which our railways have reduced the condition of the people.

As far as the workers are concerned, I find that there is a total disregard of their interests. The workers have shown what they feel about this matter. Perhaps, you will permit me, Sir, to refer to the last General Elections, where Mr. Santhanam, the Deputy Minister—or is it Minister of State?: I do not know—there are so many nomenclatures in this House—anyhow, the Minister of State for Railways was defeated in his own home town by my hon. friend Mr. Nambiar who opened the debate on this side of the House. The lion was defeated in its own den by a person who did not belong to that place.

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): What about other lions?

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur Dist.): How is it relevant, Sir, to the present debate?

Dr. Keskar: What about the other lions who were defeated in Madras?

Shri Venkataraman: They were wicked lambs.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): On a point of order. Can an hon. Minister who usually sits in the Treasury Benches take part in the discussion while he is sitting in some other bench? The hon. Minister Shri Keskar...

Mr. Chairman: That is no point of order. You are only making the hon. Member who is on his legs lose valuable time.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Now, Sir, the position of the workers, who have shown their mind during the general elections, is jeopardised and this budget does not appear to take real note of their circumstances. A speaker on the other side said that if you reduce the salaries of the higher officers you would make a very minor saving. Now the point is not that you reduce the salary of the higher officers and make a saving. The point is if you can make a gesture to the country, if you can show to the people that all the employees of the railways which are a national system are going to work in circumstances which do not display a very glaring discrimination in pay and conditions of life then the whole temper and atmosphere of the working of the railways would change.

I would like to refer to certain figures which have been supplied to us, which show this discrimination in a very cruel light. I find, for example, in providing for 56 officers who need flats at Colaba, Rs. 10-13 lakhs are being spent this year. But for providing 50 units of A type quarters for

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Class III and 83 similar units A type quarters for class IV essential staff at Bombay only Rs. 1 lakh is being spent. Now, housing is a point which the hon. Minister for Railways has mentioned as something which goes in favour of this Budget. But actually, I would say, as the Kunzru Report has said, that housing is entirely inadequate. As far as workers are concerned, they suffer under these disabilities and many others.

Besides, lately there has been a more liberal exercise of certain rights vested in authority in order to suspend and then discharge workers and employees on the ground of so-called danger to national security. I had the fortune or the misfortune of having been in detention along with a certain number of railway employees and I found out that almost in every case all those employees who were with me in detention at the same time were suspended and then they were discharged, a sort of charge-sheet was preferred against them and a kind of mock-trial, so to speak was held and they were pushed out of their jobs. This kind of thing is happening all over the place and the workers do feel that they are not getting a fair deal at all.

As far as freight rates are concerned, I shall not go into the details of the matter. But we have already heard in this House opinions expressed by commercial interests how they feel that the freight rates policy of the Government has not been properly delineated. Now I shall refer to another matter on which we on this side—not only we, but hon. Members on the other side also do—feel very strongly and that is the question of regrouping. We are not opposed to regrouping on principle. As a matter of fact we would prefer to see that our country's railways are reconstituted on a basis of regrouping. But there is no reason why there should be such unseemly hurry and such frivolous disrespect for the rules of propriety in pushing through a regrouping system which has been opposed by so many interests. I should say that we should try to re-examine the regrouping which has happened, for example, in the South. I hear that dismissals are happening, transfers are taking place, in spite of the assurances to the contrary and the natural desire of certain regions of our country to have regrouped zones suited to their requirements has not been taken notice of.

In regard to regrouping which has been announced about Northern, North-Eastern and Eastern Zones, the House has been told repeatedly how till the 27th of February a certain set of facts, a certain set of arguments, were presented before the public, which were reiterated at a meeting of the Central Advisory Council held on the 6th of March. Then suddenly the whole thing was changed. We have been supplied with certain proceedings of the meetings of the Central Advisory Council for Railways. The proceedings of the meeting of the 6th of March deal with an important matter. They say that four Members, including at least one hon. Member of this House who has been associated with the Railway administration for more than two decades wanted to defer this question. I have been told—and I have seen in the press also certain reports—that there was a minute of dissent which was recorded by one of these four persons who wanted deferment of the question. There is no reference at all to this in these papers and the cryptic note is so vague that we can only imagine certain mystic arguments for the change of certain proposals which had earlier been propounded with so much care, with so much logic and skill.

11 A.M.

Now, Sir, I have personally participated in a very considerable agitation in Calcutta against the regrouping. Now, we did not take on any single occasion a provincial stand. All the time we have been saying that if you take into account the interests of national economy, if you are going to maintain the operational efficiency of our railway systems, if you are going to satisfy the desire of the people who live in different regions of our country, then the kind of regrouping which has been suggested in a hurried fashion, in a frivolous fashion, is so hazardous an experimentation that we cannot risk it.

We have heard from the Prime Minister as well as from the Railway Minister assurances that the workers would not be affected, that the workers would not have to face transfer. But actually these assurances do not apply to the lower grade workers, the class IV workers, to the non-ministerial staff. In the Southern Zone already these assurances have been thrown to the winds. We have had too much experience of these assurances. The Prime Minister had assured the country and especially

the railwaymen in 1949 that periodic re-examination of the dearness allowance rate would be made in order that the dearness allowance rate might keep pace with the change in the cost of living. But that sort of assurance has not been kept up to. In view of this, we can no longer trust these assurances. These assurances are there in plenty, but I am sure the railwaymen's experience since 1946 has been such that every time they come forward with genuine grievances they are fobbed off with certain assurances. These assurances have been repeated over and over again; they are coming again this time, but I am sure we cannot accept these assurances, at their face value.

Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar in his last speech referred, for example to the fact that he found that there was a certain amount of discontent as far as the railway workers were concerned, but the railwaymen and their leaders were very considerate and therefore he could usually reach an agreement with them. He also said that there was a threat of another strike even this year which is hardly six months old. If that is so, if in spite of the undoubted patriotism of the railwaymen and their leaders, which Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar admits, they are to go on giving threats of strike from time to time, there must be something in it. People do not go on strike just for the love of it. It is not a luxury which poor people can indulge in and the fact that people do have to go to that extreme and give strike notices to the Government shows that the workers are very highly discontented and that discontent will be accentuated a hundredfold if the regrouping measure of the type proposed is going to be pushed through. I would, therefore, make a personal suggestion to the hon. Minister from this side of the House. We have tried to put it before him and Members on his side of the House have also made representations to him. Do not for heaven's sake push on with this regrouping business with the unseemly speed which, for heaven knows what reason, you have adopted. As far as we are concerned, we are prepared to meet you round a table, and discuss every point so that this matter may be referred, not merely to experts in whom I am not prepared to place my entire trust, but to a committee consisting of experts as well as people representing different aspects of life. It may as well perhaps be a committee of parliamentary Members, with certain people co-opted from outside,

44PSD.

and if the whole matter could be gone through carefully and regrouping delayed a little, I am sure the heavens will not fall. On the other hand, I am sure the economic reconstruction of this country will be really and truly assisted.

Mr. Chairman: I am informed by the Leader of the House that Government is prepared to allot the 29th also for the continuation of the discussion on the Railway Budget, in place of discussion of the General Budget which will be put off by a day. There are a number of Members interested in the Railway Budget. The time is short. To give sufficient opportunity to a number of Members I will continue with the ten minutes time-limit.

So far as tomorrow is concerned, the Bills—that is, the Tariff Bill etc.—will be taken up and discussed.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I wholeheartedly welcome the present incumbent in the office of the Minister in-charge of Railways, and I am sure that in spite of his small size the work that he will accomplish would be greater than what anybody in the House expects. My friend Dr. Jaisooria naturally took the opportunity of introducing some humour at the cost of the size of the hon. Minister. He also paid the compliment of 'resolute obstinacy' so far as the Railway Board was concerned. The trend of the arguments, especially of those hon. Members of the House who do not like the present regrouping in West Bengal, is that for once they admit that the technicians and experts in the Railway Board are sometimes right! Whereas, on the one hand, they are prepared to pay compliments to them as regards the correct attitude they had taken once upon a time, on the other they are not prepared to credit them with the same wisdom and expert knowledge when they unanimously and after considering all the pros and cons of the whole issue have come to a different conclusion. I will refer to that point a little later.

This is the first Budget which has been presented to this House by the hon. Minister, although most of it was prepared by his predecessor. His predecessor had been called upon to make two final speeches in this House. Once he said he was taking leave of the House, and yet he was called upon to make another Railway Budget speech. It is with regret we find that he is not here to present to us another budget. But we also know that he was called off to look after another portfolio and so his services

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh]

could not be spared for this House. I am sure, Sir, that his strong common-sense and intimate knowledge so far as public welfare is concerned will help the hon. Minister who has taken charge of this important portfolio recently to steer this big national undertaking successfully.

It is true that time and again, every time the Railway Budget is presented, we ask for various things. And we have not departed from the past. We have only repeated the various items on which we have dwelt at length in the past. We want more lines, more passenger coaches, quicker restoration of the dismantled lines, accelerated rate of building houses for our railway personnel, better arrangements for supply of water, speeding up of trains etc. And may I say in this connection that while asking for speeding up of trains we must remember the maxim that it is better to kill time than to kill men? If our present coaches or locomotives or rails are unable to bear all the weight and speed, it is better to go a little slower rather than speed up and allow accidents to happen. So, all these things we ask for, and I myself have tabled a number of cut motions trying to ventilate the grievances, local or otherwise, so far as the public at large is concerned. My hon friends who have come to this House to oppose the Government have merely reiterated, sometimes with an increased vehemence of language, more or less the same demands that we ourselves have been voicing on behalf of the people.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): So you are changing now!

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I have not changed at all. And if I have changed I have indicated what change has come about. The change was merely to tell and instruct the hon. Members sitting opposite the good things that the Government has been doing and has done.

One single item which seems to agitate Members more than any other seems to be this question of regrouping. Fortunately or unfortunately, only the opponents of this regrouping seem to have got the floor. But there is much to be said on the other side. Apart from the fact that nobody could influence such an administrator and impartial person like Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar to do a wrong thing, there are many considerations which justify the step the Government have taken. My friend Mr. Chatterjee, who pursues the same

profession as I do, I think, overdid his case and incidentally did damage to it by referring to things which were not very pertinent. He tried to show as if something very grave has happened and asserted that democracy was flouted. I could not understand his words. If hon. Members opposite try to use words which are not adequate for the purpose, much of the force in the point that they want to impress upon the House would be lost. I would like to give this caution to them. Mr. Chatterjee alleged that this decision about regrouping was flouting the wishes of the House, was anti-democratic, that there was scant respect for democracy, etc. I do not know what he was talking about. The Central Advisory Council of Railways had adopted this decision, though there was a minority which was not in its favour. This matter was never brought to Parliament. So there is no question of a decision of Parliament having been flouted. I do not know what he means when he says that democracy is being flouted.

Shri A. C. Guha (Santipur): May I say that this matter came up before Parliament at the time of the Budget? The Budget which was thoroughly discussed in the House was on the basis of the regrouping. Both the Railway Ministers defended the original plan of regrouping and Parliament passed the Budget on that basis.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Even if we concede what my friend has just said, it is coming up before Parliament afresh. We shall see what result it will have. It is not as if this has been done by the back-door. Hon. Members have tabled cut motions and have spoken. Let us see what this Parliament thinks. If hon. Members maintain that this Parliament is more representative, if the more representative Parliament determines that this regrouping is correct and should stay, I think there is an end of the matter. Democracy has not been violated or swamped or in any way curtailed or adversely affected. So it is not correct to say that it is undemocratic and all that. The allegation that the Government has been bamboozled by U.P. into taking this decision is absolutely wrong. It is not correct that it is only to please the Ministers or the Members from U.P. that the decision has been changed. I do not come from U.P. and I do not hold any brief for the U.P. Members. But I must say that there was not, as is being hinted, any sort of undue influence. People have been trying to

make a sort of personal allegation against certain Members in the Cabinet. I think it has no foundation whatsoever. It is not only U.P. that is concerned, but there are two big Provinces namely Bihar and Assam which are concerned over this matter. I do not want to defend or to go against the wishes of the West Bengal Ministry and I do not want to suggest that this should be absolutely final and that there should be no change. All I say is: do you expect the present Minister who has taken over from Shri Gopalswami Ayyangar so recently to change overnight a decision which has been taken and which has been put into force? Is that the way you are going to treat the decisions of your predecessors? Is that the way you are going to govern this country and act up to the wishes of the people. What has happened? It is alleged that the decision of experts has been suddenly altered. They say so because it suits them to support the experts in this particular instance and not because they have much respect for them. They complain that grave injustice is being done, because once they thought in one way and they are now changing. Actually those very experts who were in favour of the first proposal have wholeheartedly supported the change. They have done so on grounds among other of public demand. The hon. Minister I am sure would be prepared, after it works for a sufficiently long time, to see and examine if there is any truth in the allegations and if the fears and apprehensions of hon. Members, who have voiced these feelings are well-founded. There will be sufficient time for him to modify or change it or abolish it. I do not think that the present is the occasion when my hon. friends can expect a reversal of decision.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): What about the expense of this costly experiment? You want to change this now?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: If hon. Members would kindly read through the proceedings and papers that had been supplied to them, they will find that it was not the mere sweet will of the hon. Minister for Railways, Shri Gopalswami Ayyangar that he took this decision; he did it after consultation, after conferences where all the representatives of the various provinces concerned and the interests were present. The matter was discussed threadbare and it was only after that that a decision was taken. Even after that decision was taken, I am sure, in response to the wishes and protests

of the various Members, the hon. Minister would be prepared to examine in due course if there are any hardships. The only hardship that was contemplated was in connection with the staff and the possibility of retrenchment. With regard to that a categorical assurance has been given in the speech of the hon. Minister. After that, I do not think there will be any fear in the minds of hon. Members. Of course, it is open to hon. Members not to believe in these assurances. I do not think that hon. Members can point out any instance, so far as the Railway administration is concerned, where the assurances have not been respected. I, therefore, think that no Member of the House can really say that the assurances are hollow and I have not the slightest doubt that an assurance given on the floor of the House would be respected. I am sure that if this regrouping, which at one stage had the consent of the West Bengal Government, leads to any grave hardship it can be modified. After all, what do my friends from West Bengal want? They want something which is not absolutely reasonable. The proposal is not to remove the headquarters from Calcutta altogether. What they want is to have the headquarters of 2 zones in Calcutta. If the case was that they did not have any headquarters in Calcutta, that could have been understood and appreciated. I could have put forward the plea, coming as I do from Madhya Pradesh that the zonal headquarters of the B. N. Railway should be in Nagpur. Why should I be torn between Bombay taking two and Calcutta taking one and Gorakhpur one, but I feel that this matter should not be argued or approached in this way. Then the slight change in the headquarters is not going to make any difference, because in the history of the Indian Railways, this is the first time that it is welded into one system and we are going to have one administration. It does not matter whether there is a deputy director or an assistant Director incharge in a particular place. The whole thing will be worked and administered as one system and one organization and hence I hope hon. Members who are agitated about this question will have no doubts with regard to the success of the Scheme. If it leads to any great hardship, Government will be the first to consider these things and modify the scheme if and where necessary.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indian): I am glad that at last I have been able through a new and rather tortuous procedure to catch your eye and through a paper list.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

In his opening remarks the hon. Minister for Railways expressed his conviction that the House would join with him in paying a tribute to his predecessor, Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar. As one who has had a great deal, and continues to have a great deal to do with the problems of railwaymen and who also has had a great deal to do with Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, I heartily endorse that sentiment. When I heard that Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar was being transported to the Ministry for Railways.....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. May I ask if the hon. Member used the word 'torturous' or 'tortuous'?

Shri Frank Anthony: I said tortuous. When I heard that Shri Gopalaswami was being brought to the Railway Ministry, I was not without some qualms, because he was a very experienced administrator and I thought that the railwaymen would have just another experience of a hardened bureaucrat but I was pleasantly surprised to find that Shri Gopalaswami's outlook was anything but bureaucratic. I am sorry that he is not in the House and I do not wish to apply any unnecessary function to his soul or mine—but I must say that in my dealings with him, I found that in spite of an exterior which I might describe as dour-cum-puckish—I do not want to say Punchish—I found in him a readiness to deal with the problems of railwaymen, not only promptly, but with the maximum of sympathy and understanding and I underline this fact, that I was particularly pleased to find that he cut through red tape. He never hesitated to reverse decisions, if he was convinced that they were wrong and from whatever sources those decisions emerged whether the decisions were made by the Railway Board or by the General Managers, he never hesitated to reverse them. I deeply regret that he should have been taken away from this Ministry. At the same time, I welcome his successor and in welcoming him, may I sound a friendly note of advice—I hope he will accept it in the spirit in which it is given—and that is, that the railwaymen are not difficult people to deal with, provided he keeps in mind one dominant principle, the need to deal with the railwaymen with a human touch, to approach their problems rationally, first-hand, and to give them the maximum of his personal sympathy and understanding. Except for Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar—I know comparisons are odious—in my opinion, all his predecessors of the Ministry were failures, 'failures' for this rea-

son, because after a short time, they allowed themselves to be absorbed, to be overrun by the bureaucracy, and that has been the curse of the railway administration for decades—its rigid bureaucratic structure. The fact is, that although individually they are estimable people, the railway bureaucrat has sought to rule the railway administration, not by sympathy, not by understanding but by the method of the big stick that has been the curse of the Railway Administration. I find that railway minister after railway minister, after a short tenure of office was absorbed completely to this bureaucratic system, to set his thumb impression blindly on everything that emanates from officialdom. That is why I have sounded this note of friendly warning. As I say, if railwaymen are made to understand from the beginning by the hon. Railway Minister that he is prepared to approach their problems, without being overborne by officialdom, he will in his time attract the confidence and the respect, which I feel, he wants to attract.

In another part of his speech the Minister has made an observation that the formation of these railway zones had secured the general support of the country, that this formation or regrouping, as it is popularly referred to, was welcomed by the State Governments, by labour and by the public. I do not wish to elaborate this: the system of regrouping is now an accomplished fact, but for the purposes of record, I think it should be underlined that this system of regrouping did not gain the support of the country. I do not think that it can be claimed legitimately that regrouping has the general support of the country. I, for one, as a Member of the Central Advisory Council, as the President of the oldest union in this country, over and over again in an unqualified manner opposed regrouping. I opposed it, but not in principle. I conceded the fact that integration was absolutely necessary, and necessary immediately in certain respects. I felt that the path of wisdom lay in assimilating what was formerly known as the Native State Railways with the main Railway systems. I only pleaded for a postponement for five years of this hashing and rehashing of the main Railway systems. Apparently, mine was a lone voice, crying in the wilderness. The Administration thought differently and the whole scheme has been brought into operation. As I see it today, I do not see how we are going to unscramble this vast scrambled egg. I deplore any attempt to make politi-

cal capital out of what has already been done. When I was opposing this scheme and its complete implementation at once, I found little support in this House. Today, I find that people who, when this question of re-grouping was on the anvil, under consideration, took no part in the discussion—perhaps they did not understand railway matters and did not understand what it was all about—today in a Rip Van Winkle role, suddenly get up and thunder against its evils. But, it is too late. What I say is this. We may modify the scheme here and there. There seems to be some grievance—I do not want to point my finger at any one—there seems to be some complex of an inter-provincial character. There may be some modifications. I say this to the railwaymen. This is a radical and sweeping measure and the Government is committed to it. I feel that the interests of the country and the railwaymen require that the railwaymen ought to bend all their energies to make this regrouping a success. If, God forbid, this radical scheme fails, the repercussions will be disastrous not only for the country, but for the railwaymen themselves. That is why I say to the railwaymen, that in their own interests, they must do everything possible to make this scheme a success.

While I say this, I want to sound a note of warning to the Railway Minister. I plead with him not to approach this problem of re-grouping in any spirit of complacency. In his speech, the Minister has referred in fine phrases to increased operational efficiency, saving in financial matters. These are at present only fine, empty, meaningless phrases. If the Railway Ministry allows itself to be lulled into a false sense of security, it will be heading for serious disaster for itself and for the railwaymen. The plan looks good; it looks symmetrical; but do not take the beginning for the end. As I warned him in the beginning, this regrouping will create vast anomalies, vast perhaps insoluble problems. The next five years will prove whether this scheme is going to be a success. It is in this spirit that I ask the Railway Minister to approach the whole problem. I was glad to hear his assurance that the rights, and privileges, and prospects of the class III and IV staff will be maintained. But, I would ask him to remember that any assurance by itself is not enough. When I opposed re-grouping, I was particularly anxious about the problems that regrouping would create in respect of class III and class IV staff. For instance, I have not been able to elicit

anything categorically in this matter. It is all very well and easy to indulge in facile generalisations that everything is good. Everything is not going to be all right. I am dealing literally with hundreds of cases of anomalies and grievances that have already been precipitated by this re-grouping. Here are some questions that will illustrate my fears in this matter. On the Eastern Railway, for instance, we have the old B.N. Railway and a major portion of the old E.I. Railway integrated. How are you going to get a uniformity in the scales of emoluments? Take the system of mileage. On the E.I. Railway you had one system of calculating mileage. Mileage was calculated on the basis of mileage plus time. On the B.N. Railway, mileage was only calculated on the number of miles covered. What is going to happen now? An E.I.R. man in the same cadre, doing the same job, occupying the same status, gets more than the B.N.R. man. Now, they will be working in the same zone. Will you upgrade the B.N.R. man or downgrade the E.I.R. man, or continue the anomaly and give different scales to men doing the same work, in the same zonal administration?

I am particularly anxious about the problem of supersession. This is one of the vexed problems of the Railways. How are you going to deal with this problem of supersession? No two Railway systems had the same procedure in respect of confirming people. Let me give an example. The Railways calculate seniority on the basis of confirmation in a particular cadre. For instance, on the old B.A. Railway, there was the pernicious and unheard of system of a man never being confirmed. A man, for instance, was recruited as a fireman. He would work for 20 years, go through all grades of promotion and become a district or divisional officer. His substantive cadre, in spite of the fact that he has the rank of a divisional officer, would be that of a fireman. How will you place him vis-a-vis a man from another Railway, who, after 3 or 4 years of service, has passed from grade to grade and got his confirmation? It is not as easy matter. I have been informed—I do not know how far it is true—that in anticipation of this scheme of re-grouping many Railways adopted, I say so subject to correction, the practice of accelerated promotion, and confirmation. I am speaking subject to correction. I am told that in the Nizam State Railway, accelerated confirmation was given. Now, the Nizam State Railway has been integrated with the

[Shri Frank Anthony]

G.I.P. Railway. What is going to happen? Will a man in the N.S. Railway, who has been confirmed after three years of service, take precedence over a man on the G.I.P. Railway who has not been confirmed, and who is working in the same cadre for 10 years? I would particularly ask.....

Dr. Jaisoorya: It is the other way round. Confirmations were stopped for the last two years in the Nizam State Railway.

Shri Frank Anthony: I say I am speaking subject to correction. That is a rather sweeping statement. Confirmations had been stopped in Class II; but they were not stopped in other categories.

What I would ask the Railway Minister is to appoint an *ad hoc* committee to deal with the hundreds and perhaps thousands of anomalies that are going to arise with regard to Class III and IV staff. I would particularly ask him, when he is dealing with railwaymen not to be overborne by political considerations. I ask him—this is as a very special matter—not to give any concessions to certain Unions merely because they happen to be under aegis of the Congress party. I say this with all due respect. Approach the railwaymen in a spirit of sympathy and treat them equally, irrespective of the union to which they belong, irrespective of the political character of the union to which they belong, absolutely impartially and fairly.

One word more and I have done. The Railway Minister has said that the provision already made for labour, particularly for housing has been substantially increased. As far as I can make out, the provision has been increased to the extent of 1.15 crores. I have pleaded earnestly, passionately and repeatedly in this House that this problem of housing be given the highest priority. In the figures given in Appendix II, I find certain sums earmarked for the Central and Southern Railway for housing. In the particulars given,—I am talking of page 15 of the Explanatory Memorandum—no details, as to whether any new units are to be built for the Central or Southern Railway are given. I am aware from personal knowledge that this problem has assumed not only an acute but a hyper-acute form, particularly in the Southern Railway. I am always getting complaints. Men have been transferred without any provision, whatsoever, being made for their accommodation. Only two days ago

I got a pathetic telegram and I am going to send it to the hon. Minister. He has been transferred from Adra. His aged, crippled mother, wife and children are living on the platform. How do you expect your railwaymen to give loyal service; more than that, how do you expect them to give any kind of service at all if such transfers are effected? I say that often transfers are made without any sense of coordination. Over and over again I have gone to Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar and pointed out the effects of these transfers gratuitously made without any coordination. There is no need for subjecting these people to undue hardships. Has the Railway any right to transfer people in this way, where the man has had to leave his aged, crippled mother, wife and children on the platform? I know of cases where disused bogies have been used as houses; I have heard that even disused latrines have been used as houses. There is such a sense of acute hardship in this matter. Now, what will be the reaction of this man? It is one of frustration and bitterness. More than that, his reaction is going to be something like incipient hatred towards the administration that has put him to this trouble. I have asked that this matter be given urgent priority. I do not mind your indulging in expenditure on window dressing, such as Rs. 45 lakhs on the New Delhi station, etc. But, first things must come first. You must make some provision for the workers if you want a modicum of service. I can say very little for this provision of 356 lakhs for housing. Out of that, funds have been earmarked for officers' quarters. I have no quarrel with the officers, my relations with the officers have been of the most friendly character. But, by and large, when I come to this problem of housing, I find that the Railway officer is a pampered and mollycoddled individual. We know that physically and unfortunately mentally too they often live in a state of air-conditioned isolation; we are told that aeration is not good for the brain for excessive aeration may lead to the untimely consequence of a predominance of air in the cranial cavity.

I want the Railway Minister to tell us categorically what he is doing with regard to this problem of housing. From this budget we can gather nothing. We do not know how many units are required on the Southern or Central Railway. This provision here of 356 lakhs is only tinkering with this problem like a nervous hesitant spinster. I want to know categorically from

the hon. Minister how many units are required before he can achieve self-sufficiency with regard to housing in respect of the class III and class IV staff. How long is he going to take?

Will he take longer than to achieve the target of self-sufficiency in food or will he take less time? I would request him to tell us these in terms of figures. How many units are required? Why is it that you cannot give this matter priority on a war-time basis? There are over 20 crores as surplus. Why should not ten crores be spent to liquidate this most urgent problem?

There are many other matters which I would like to refer to, for I am bristling with grievances. But I will take the opportunity of referring to them on the cut motions. I would however ask the hon. Minister to take what I have said in the spirit in which I have offered my criticism. He has been called to a Ministry which bristles with responsibilities but may I also tell him that he has tremendous opportunities? He is dealing with people who are essentially warm-hearted and it will depend on him, on his manner of approach, whether he continues the high traditions set by Shri Gopalaswami and whether he will prove to be the success that his predecessor was.

Shri Pataskar (Jalgaon): So far as the working of the railways is concerned one thing will have to be admitted by all sections, that during the war the railway transport system was very much crippled and after the attainment of our freedom there has been marked improvement in the working of the railway system. Those that remember those days during the war will know that our railway system was handicapped on account of several factors, to which I need not refer now here. Today the trains are running regularly: more engines are being imported and generally the whole system has improved, so that even Dr. Mookerjee had to pay a compliment that as compared with all the departments, there has been considerable improvement in the working of the railways as such after 1948.

Though there is general agreement with respect to the satisfactory working of the railways, yet this regrouping of the railways seems to have created a storm in many quarters, more particularly in the North-East section of India.

I was not present at the time when the last discussion took place with respect to regrouping but after going through whatever papers have been forwarded to us I find that the main objection of the opposition seems to be the fact that at first there was a certain amount of agreement with respect to regrouping so far as the North-East section is concerned, and that subsequently there has been some sudden change. To my mind that alone does not mean anything either way.

I have scrupulously tried to understand the problems created by the change but unfortunately I have not been able to comprehend what the serious difficulties are likely to be experienced by the employees in those places.

We are told that the regrouping was necessitated by the fact that there has been integration of railways. Most of the railways are state railways today. Formerly there was the G.I.P., the BCCI and other companies. When there is integration of the railways, naturally there should be proper regional regrouping on the basis of administrative convenience and working efficiency. The only question therefore is whether the regrouping will contribute to it or not. It is rather too early to prophesy whether it will all be successful or result in failure. But after all a change has to be made and it has been made.

Even with respect to regrouping, so far as the Central Railway is concerned I find that there is not so much complaint as on the eastern side. I am one of those who feel that in the regrouping the natural course has not been followed in many sectors. Take for instance Bombay. We had formerly the GIP and the BCCI with their two principal stations in two parts of Bombay—Bombay Victoria Terminus and Bombay Central. There was duplication of the machinery and in every way the expenditure was high. Naturally when both the railways become state-owned I fail to understand why there should not be one principal station serving the line from the West to the North and the line going to the north from the Eastern side, because it is a matter of convenience. In Delhi there is only one station, though there have been two railways. In Bombay simply because there were the GIP and BCCI company Railways there were two main stations causing an amount of inconvenience. When regrouping is made on a regional basis all this can

[Shri Pataskar]

be avoided. For instance, the Central Railways could very well comprise that portion of the railway from Bombay to Surat and Surat to Jalgaon. If that had been done there would be no necessity to have two headquarters in one city like Bombay. If a man has to book some goods to some part of Thana or Surat he has to visit different offices. All these factors have not been taken into consideration at the time when regrouping was made and there has been complaint on that ground. If we want to have proper regrouping the best thing the Government should have done was to have it on such a basis as to avoid and remove all these anomalies and expensive duplication.

Another difficulty to my mind is this. So far as passenger traffic is concerned there has been considerable improvement. But at the same time so far as the position of wagons is concerned in spite of the best efforts of Government it is not what it should be. Not that there is lack of enthusiasm on the part of Government or that proper and adequate steps are not taken by them but there has been a colossal increase in traffic during the last few years and in spite of the large number of engines, rolling stock and wagons imported or manufactured in our workshops, the fact remains that there is wagon shortage in the country. This situation cannot be remedied overnight. But there are also other matters which demand the attention of the department concerned.

For instance, I come from East Khandesh which produces an enormous quantity of plantains and which are transported to Delhi. They require about 5,000 wagons in the season and I find that the position of wagons is such that if no wagons are available in time, the whole of the production at times goes waste. Because plantains are things which get rotten very soon. Then I find—I do not know whether it will continue under the new system—that wagons which start from Bhusawal or Chalisgaon or Jalgaon for Delhi somehow or other come to be detached at Itarsi for one reason or another and those that do business in plantains have to keep their men at Itarsi to see that the wagons proceed to Delhi without interruption. I think all these things also need a little more attention at the hands of the Department concerned.

I have to make one or two suggestions. There is the Barsi Light Railway in my part of the State. This Barsi Light Railway, I am told, is not working satisfactorily and we have been hearing so many complaints about it. Probably the term of the contract expires in 1953 or 1954 and I would like Government to take early steps to take over the management of this Railway from the company which is managing it and integrate it with the rest of the Indian Railway system.

Another problem which is a peculiar problem is the crowding in all the local trains in Bombay. The population of Bombay has greatly increased during the last few years and in spite of the fact that there has been additional local trains introduced somehow it has failed to cope with the increase in traffic which is necessitated by the increase in the population and I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister and his Department to that question also. Even now if you go to Bombay you will find on the local trains people still travelling on the foot boards etc.

Then during the last fifty years or so no new line has been constructed in that part of the country and in a part of the country like Konkan, that is beyond the Sahyadri mountains and between the sea and Sahyadri mountains. I think that particular part has been clamouring for a railway connection for many years past. I am told some sort of survey also was carried out but no steps have been taken so far to connect that area with the rest of Bombay State by Railway. I hope this matter also will be looked into by the hon. Minister.

The main complaint from the traders is with respect to the position of wagons: not only on account of the shortage of wagons but on account of the non-availability of wagons. I find there is enormous difficulty and the working of that part of the Department needs to be looked into with a little more attention than is being done at present. I have got complaints from people saying that unless they make certain moves it is impossible for them to get a wagon for any number of days, at times extending to fifteen days, and as I said, in the case of perishable articles like plantains if wagons are not easily available then there is so much loss. I therefore want that the hon. Minister should look into this matter. I know Government has made the utmost effort to get as many wagons as they could but at the same time we

should see that whatever we have got is put to the maximum use in the matter of transport of at least necessary articles like food etc.

I think so far as the working of the Railways is concerned there is general satisfaction in spite of the fact that there are local grievances which are bound to continue for all time to come. The general feeling is that of all the Departments of Government the only Department that has, after the war, revived and revived satisfactorily is the Department of Railways which goes to the credit of the late Railway Ministers, Mr. Gopalaswami and Mr. Santhanam.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I was wondering with what justification we could go on slashing at the lapses and lacunae in the Budget which was presented the other day before this House by the hon. Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri. Admittedly, Mr. Shastri took over the Budget and the policy completely ready-made from his predecessor in office the ex-knight, Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, and Shri Gopalaswami is in the real sense the architect of the whole policy. And what is that policy, Sir? That policy is one of unadulterated monopoly capitalism. As one hon. Member remarked some time ago in this House, the Railways are looked upon as nothing other than a money-spinning machine. It was not a nationalised public utility service and for that reason the Budget that has been placed before us has been nothing but a Budget of monopoly-capitalism talking in the name of public utility service.

There was a time, not very long ago, when the present party in power had not become the party in power, and they had other ideals with regard to transport services even in those days. I have before me the report of the Transport Services Sub-Committee of the National Planning Committee of the Indian National Congress. It laid down a criterion for the National Government to pursue when it comes to power. The Sub-Committee says:

"The problem involves the question whether the railway rates and fares should be a price for service rendered or a tax levied by the sovereign authority for its general use. In the larger interests of the country and taking a long range point of view the railways must be normally regarded and paid for as a price for services rendered."

But unfortunately on coming to power the Congress Party found that after all the strain that the Railways had undergone, all the dilapidation that the Railways had undergone, it was still a fine money-spinner and they wanted to utilise the Railways that way. And they found the man who could run the railway services in that fashion, and the ex-knight Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar was put in charge of it.

Within the time at my disposal I cannot go into the details of the Budget but, Sir, whenever there is a demand from the side of the community at large or from the side of the common travelling public the unfortunate third class passengers, or the still more unfortunate railway employees by whose labour, sweat and toil the railways run, we have the same stereotyped answer: lack of funds. I was trying to find out through the maze of figures that have been laid before us what were the opening and closing balances in the different reserve funds that had been instituted since Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar came into office and even before. I have added up all the figures and I find that after deducting the Depreciation Reserve Fund, the Railway Reserve Fund and the Development Reserve Fund, we started with an opening balance of Rs. 139 crores and 11 lakhs and according to the Budget figures the closing balance will be Rs. 173 crores and 54 lakhs in the coming year. You must remember that these closing and opening balances are the figures that we get after deducting all the appropriations that have been made. Yet we are always told that there is "lack of funds". In spite of this stereotyped answer, the Railway Ministry has the cheek to present us with various pamphlets. They want to demonstrate what wonderful things they are doing for the railway employees and the common passengers. Here in my hands is a booklet entitled "TOWARDS BETTER CONDITIONS OF TRAVEL". I will read from the Preface. It says:

"In order to relieve overcrowding in trains, particularly 3rd class passengers,".....

our Government are so very solicitous of the interests of third-class passengers—

"...caused by the enormous increase in traffic, additional trains have been introduced as far as possible..."

We are told further on that 186 new passenger trains have been introduced.

[Shri T. K. Chaudhuri]

I tried to look into the figures relating to the E. I. Railway. So far as Bengal is concerned, there are 24 trains. 8 of them are Sunday specials. They have arranged for my district a big service in their scheme. I do not know whether my hon. friend Shri Mohammad Khuda Baksh is here. He will testify that they have a new train service from Krishnapur to Lalgola covering a distance of one mile only! Four trains are included on this account and this is how they relieve congestion! I do not have the time to go into other details. There are many such things and if occasion arises and if we get opportunity, we shall raise them in connection with cut motions. For the present, I seek your indulgence only for a few minutes more in order to deal with this vexed question of re-grouping.

I was astounded to hear from Dr. Deshmukh that Members from West Bengal supported the view of experts only when it served their purpose, but with regard to the regrouping of the Northern, Eastern and North Eastern Railways, the Railway Minister Shri K. Santhanam himself admitted at a Press Conference on March, 21st last that if "we had proceeded purely on railway operational considerations, we might have stuck to our original plan." Unfortunately, our senior colleague Dr. Punjabrao Deshmukh is not here, but I would ask this House to remember these words of the Railway Minister, namely, that they did not proceed on purely railway operational considerations and there were other considerations. Sir, when this matter was discussed in the provisional Parliament last February, it was said by some Members from the Uttar Pradesh that if the views of that State were not consulted there would be satyagraha. Is it a question which can be decided by satyagraha and forging mass sanctions outside this House? If that is so, and if that is the attitude, then I would say on behalf of the people of Bengal that we are ready to take up the challenge and we shall see in the end who wins.

12 Noon

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla): The first duty that I owe is to you Sir, and I wish to express to you my gratitude for the opportunity you have given me to offer my comments on this occasion. The facts as disclosed in the Railway Budget would be received by a judicious-minded critic with supreme satisfaction and with a feeling of full faith and confi-

dence in the foresight and wisdom of those who are running the railway administration today. The role of a critic, according to my mind, is most laudable provided criticism emanates after cool and dispassionate analysis; after duly weighing the pros and cons of the matter; after reviewing the whole issue, and not from any narrow-minded or parochial point of view but from the point of view of offering constructive suggestions. Some of my hon friends have endeavoured to raise, if I may be pardoned for saying so, a "dust storm" in the hope that in the haze that they will so create the important issues may be hidden. If the criticism that had been advanced had been a little less censorious but more substantial: if it had been a little less carping but more constructive, then the contribution of those Members would have been extremely useful. Jaundice is a terrible affliction, whether it turns out to be political jaundice, provincial jaundice or any other kind of mental jaundice, because it prevents one from an examination of things in their proper perspective. Regrouping and reorganisation of the railways seem to be a major irritant with some of the hon. Members. They seem to imagine that regrouping was ill considered. One hon. Member alluded to it as done in an "unseemly hurry". He seemed to suggest that it was conceived overnight and produced the next morning. That is not so. It has had a long period of gestation. More than thirty years ago, it was conceived. If I mistake not, the amalgamation of the South Indian Railways was examined as early as 1904. Three decades ago, the Acworth Committee recommended the regrouping of the entire railway system in the country. At that time, the territories of India included areas which now form parts of Pakistan and Burma. That scheme was that the railway system of the entire country should be divided into three divisions. A little later in 1922 and 23 the Inchcape Committee gave its blessings to the regrouping system and they advocated that there should be five regions instead of three. The Pope Committee in 1933 and 1934 thought that the economies available through amalgamation of the railways into groups were evident and recommended a detailed investigation. In 1937 the Wedgewood Committee endorsed the same suggestion. Extraordinary conditions had prevailed in our country in 1947 when the Kunzru Committee approached the question and because of certain dislocations, because of certain emergencies arising in the country, it recommended

that the question of regrouping should be deferred by five years. The five years are over now. The proposal of regrouping has been endorsed by a succession of Ministers for Transport and Railways. It has been recommended by Chambers of Commerce and also by different trade interests. When this proposal was examined those in charge of its investigation had the benefit of the experience gained from Great Britain, Canada and France, where a similar regrouping had recently taken place. Therefore, to say, Sir, that there has been "unseemly hurry" in evolving the system, is a travesty of truth.

The country has been divided into six zones or railway systems. It is interesting that the Southern Zone which was inaugurated on the 14th of April 1951 came up for no criticism at all. (An Hon. Member: Question.) Similarly, the Central Railway, inaugurated on the 5th of November 1951, with its headquarters at Bombay, amalgamating the four railway systems, did not appear to be the target of any criticism. The same is virtually true of the Western Zone and the Northern Zone. So far as the Northern Railway is concerned, I have reason to express my gratitude to the administration because railway men located in Delhi are mostly refugees from the West Punjab and if the headquarters had been shifted from Delhi to some other part they would have been uprooted and faced with another rehabilitation problem. The main feature of the Northern railway was a fusion of the four railway systems—three of them in their entirety. As regards the fourth, three divisions of the East Indian Railway were absorbed in the Northern Railway and the remaining five divisions were absorbed in the other railway system in the East.

There has been a certain amount of distasteful criticism. Some hon. Members, if I may say so, Sir, are suffering from parochial myopia, and have gone to the length of suggesting that the foundations of democracy are going to be shaken if Calcutta is not going to be made the headquarters of two railway systems. So far as the North-Eastern Railway system is concerned, I speak subject to correction, it is almost wholly a metre gauge system. So far as I am aware no metre gauge gets to Calcutta. The nerve centre of the metre gauge system happens to be Gorakhpur and yet the critics on the opposite benches say that the entire democratic structure is going to be

in jeopardy if Gorakhpur is retained as the headquarters of a metre gauge system. They want that Calcutta should be the headquarters of two railway systems. This proposal was coolly considered, deeply analysed and after giving due thought and attention to every point of view the authorities came to the conclusion that Calcutta should remain the headquarters of the Eastern system with Sealdah division tagged on to it, whereas the exclusively metre gauge system should remain with its headquarters in Gorakhpur. As to the tagging of the Sealdah Division to the Eastern zone, the Government of West Bengal was consulted and this arrangement embodies the wishes of that Government. Trade interests were consulted and this arrangement has their blessings too. Therefore, to stigmatise this arrangement as a negation of logic, as something improper, causing harm or injury to Calcutta, is, I submit in all earnestness and with all humility, absolutely unfair.

There were also allusions made to the fact that the centres of coal industry will be in considerable difficulty, in the matter of getting empty wagons. Coal-fields, Sir, are no longer the concern of Bengal or Bihar. It is the concern of the entire country. If there is any dislocation, if there is any difficulty, the country as one body will feel and see that this difficulty, even if there be any, is removed at the earliest possible moment. For this purpose there is stationed in Calcutta today an officer whose duty it is to consult, to coordinate and control the other railway systems and if there be any such apprehension in the minds of those who are espousing today the cause of Calcutta, that fear, I have no doubt, will be dispelled.

I have had the good fortune of travelling extensively in countries which in their configuration resemble that part of the country from which I come—the Himalayan region. I have had occasion to travel abroad and extensively in the Alpine fairland and one thought that always assailed me was that the God-made country that is mine possesses the same gorgeous beauty, but the hand of man has done nothing to enliven it, so that the common man from the remote corners of the country may be able to go and admire and appreciate it. I very much feel and wish that the Railway Department of ours should borrow a leaf from the railway systems of Switzerland, so that on our heights, more beautiful than the

[Shri Tek Chand]

Alpine heights, we could have funiculars, we could have aerial cableways and we could have rack and pinion railways.

[SHRIMATI AMMU SWAMINADHAN
in the Chair]

From the heights of Gornergrat I could see like the Japanese fan spread out, the white pinnacles of Switzerland. I can recall to my mind very similar scenery which I can see from my varandah at Simla. But my regret today is that whereas I could go to Monte Rosa I could not go to the pinnacles here which I see but which I cannot approach. Why can we not have those mountain railways? It will attract tourist traffic. It will unfold the treasures that are hidden since centuries. Our land is blessed with minerals, with timber, with orchards. The only problem is to exploit them. If our railway administration could devote some thought and attention, if we could have rack and pinion railways, cage railways and ropeways, I have not the slightest doubt that the beauties of the country will be unfolded and it will be the centre of almost globular tourist traffic. This is one suggestion I would like to make.

If I am not entrenching upon the valuable time of the House, may I also suggest that it should be the duty of the railway administration to see that important towns having a population of at least 10,000 should be provided with a railway system? When I make this suggestion I am particularly referring to two parts of my constituency. Naraingarh and Kharar. They have a population of 10,000 and they have the makings of good industrial areas, but for want of being connected with railway they are suffering considerably and are therefore unable to contribute or add to the national wealth.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज: श्रीमती महोदया,

मुझे बहुत संतोष हो रहा है कि मुझे भाषण करने का मौका दिया गया है।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. If I may bring it to the notice of the hon. Member, I do not understand Hindi. If he could speak in English I should be grateful.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: I cannot speak in English.

मैं यहां रेलवे बजट के बारे में जो कुछ कहना चाहता हूं वह मैं केवल कोई विरोध करने के लिये नहीं कह रहा हूं। मैं कोई विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा नहीं हुआ हूं, मैं विरोध से विरोध बढ़ाना नहीं चाहता। जो अच्छा होगा तो उस को अच्छा कहूंगा। जहां तक रेलवे का सवाल है यहां माननीय सभासद जानते हैं कि पहले गांधीजी के जमाने में ज्यादा से ज्यादा थर्ड क्लास में सफर करते थे। वह गांधी जी का जमाना तो चला गया। अब तो इस वक्त कांग्रेस का जमाना है, कांग्रेस का राज्य शुरू हुआ है। उस वक्त से अब तो फर्स्ट क्लास में ज्यादा से ज्यादा टूर (tour) करते हैं थर्ड क्लास की जो परिस्थिति है उस में मेरे स्थान से ज्यादा फर्क नहीं हुआ। लोग कहते हैं कि बहुत फर्क हुआ है। लेकिन मैं आपको बंबई से पंजाब को जो पैसेजर्स गाड़ियां जाती हैं उन की हालत बताना चाहता हूं।

Shri R. K. Chaudhury (Gauhati): On a point of order, Madam. The hon. Member was requested by you to speak in English, and he is proficient in English. It will be of great advantage to this House...

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. When I asked the hon. Member to speak in English I said "if he could", and he said he could not. So it is all right.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज: तो बंबई से पंजाब को जो बड़ी मेल गाड़ी है उस में तो पंजे लगे हैं, और बैठने का भी इंतजाम ठीक है लेकिन जो पैसेजर ट्रेनें हैं उन में इतनी भीड़ रहती है कि उन में बैठना मुश्किल हो जाता है। मैं मिनिस्टर महोदय से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूं कि एक वक्त आप थर्ड क्लास में जायें।

इस वक्त आप थर्ड क्लास में जाय तो आप को मालूम हो जायगा कि पैसंजर ट्रेन में कैसी तकलीफ होती है ।

कई माननीय सदस्य : कई दफा थर्ड क्लास में ट्रेवल किया है ।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : अब जाइये । अब तो आप मिनिस्टर बन गये हैं, फर्स्ट क्लास में और सैलून में जायेंगे । तो मेरे ख्याल से थर्ड क्लास में बहुत कुछ होना चाहिये । पैसंजर ट्रेन में कोई पंखे का इंतजाम नहीं हुआ है । इन्हीं पैसंजर ट्रेनों में लोग ज्यादा से ज्यादा सफर करते हैं, इस के लिये भी सुविधायें अच्छी तरह से मिलनी चाहियें । मुझे कोल्हापुर और पूना की तरफ जाने का बहुत मौका पड़ता है । वह एम० एस० एम० रेलवे है । तो उस तरफ जो रेल है उस में पंखे बिल्कुल ही नहीं हैं । और वह दो घंटे में तीस मील जाती है । वह ट्रेन जाती है कोल्हापुर से मिराज, इस तरह जाती है कि जैसे एक टट्टू चले दो दिन में एक कोस । वह दो घंटे में करीब करीब ३० मील जाती है । गाड़ी की स्पीड तो बढ़ गई है । लेकिन आप देखेंगे कि जो गाड़ी पंढरपुर जाने वाली है, जो ट्रेन पंढरपुर से खुर्दवाड़ी को जाती है, जिस को बरसी लाइट रेलवे कहते हैं, उस में इतनी भीड़ रहती है कि जो जानवरों के डब्बे लगे हैं, उन्हीं डब्बों से पैसंजर सफर करते हैं । आप जांच कीजिये, मैं गलत नहीं बताता हूँ । मैं ने उस ट्रेन में कई बार सफर किया है । हमारे महाराष्ट्र के भाई करमारकरजी बैठे हैं उन से पूछ लीजिये कि यह बात सच्ची है या झूठ । और हमारे पटासकर महोदय ने भी

कहा कि रेलवे के बारे में भी कुछ न कुछ होना चाहिये । लोग कहते हैं बड़ा अच्छा हो रहा है । लेकिन बड़े बड़े लोगों के लिये ही अच्छा है । अभी ऐम० एण्ड ऐस० ऐम० रेलवे में सैकिण्ड क्लास में एक एक पंखे लगा है । लेकिन पैसंजर ट्रेन के बारे में भी ज्यादा से ज्यादा सुविधा होनी चाहिये ।

अब जो यह नया तरीका निकला है कि जिस से प्राविशियल तरीके से जो जगड़ा हो रहा है वह तो रीग्रुपिंग (regrouping) के बारे में मैं समझता हूँ बहुत खराब बात हो रही है । रीग्रुपिंग के पहले हमारा जो भाषावार संगठन था वह खत्म हो रहा है । पहले राष्ट्र भाषा के अनुसार संगठन था, कि जो मराठी भाषा वाले हैं वह उस एरिया (area) में थे, जो बंगाली भाषा वाले थे वह उस एरिया में थे । अब बंगाल का मद्रास में जायगा, मद्रास का बंगाल में जायगा और उत्तर प्रदेश का बंगाल में आयगा । तो वह वहां क्या भाषा समझेगा और उस को कितनी कठिनाई होगी । तो यह जो हमारा संगठन था, यह जो लिन्ग्विस्टिक प्राविन्सेज (linguistic provinces) के बारे में हम संगठन करना चाहते हैं, हम लोगों ने जो यह आन्दोलन उठाया और पंडित नेहरू जी ने जो हम को प्रामिस (promise) दिया, यह कैसे बनेगा ? यह तो डिवाइड एंड रूल (Divide and Rule) जो अंग्रेज की पालिसी थी वैसे ही यह आप की सरकार का, आपस में लड़ाना और राज्य करना, काम हो गया है । ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये । और इसी वास्ते आप लोग समझते हैं कि विरोधी

[श्री पी० एन० राजभोज]

पार्टी वाले गाली देने वाले लोग हैं। हम लोग गाली नहीं देते हैं। हम लोग तो अच्छे सुझाव देते हैं। लेकिन हम लोग हां में हां मिलाने वाले नहीं हैं और इसीलिये हम विरोध की पार्टी में हैं। जो गवर्नमेंट को सपोर्ट (support) करने वाले जितने माननीय सभासद हैं वह कहते हैं कि सब ठीक है। अंधेर नगरी चौपट राजा, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। मेरे ख्याल से टका सेर भाजी टका सेर खाजा यह परिस्थिति रेलवे बोर्ड की अंधेर नगरी में है। हम लोग जो अपोजीशन ग्रुप (opposition group) में हैं वह कई दलों के हैं और मैं तो आल इंडिया शिडयूल्ड कास्ट्स फेडरेशन (All India Scheduled Castes Federation) के रिप्रेजेंटेटिव (Representative) के नाम से खड़ा हुआ हूं। मैं सारी बात थोड़े शब्दों में बता देता हूं। बहुत सी बात कहनी थी, लेकिन टाइम बहुत थोड़ा है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे अछूत भाई जो नौकरी के लिये जाते हैं उनके साथ बहुत अन्याय होता है। पहले सर गोपालस्वामी आयरंगर और बड़े महामान्य महोदय थे वह तो ब्रिटिश जमाने के हैं। लेकिन यह हमारे शास्त्री साहब, हमारे वर्तमान मंत्री महोदय तो कांग्रेस के जमाने के हैं। मुझे उम्मीद है कि यह जनता की राय क्या है, पबलिक में क्या हो रहा है, उस को कैसी तकलीफें होती हैं, इस को जानने की और दूर करने की कोशिश करेंगे और सब जातियों के साथ न्याय हो, अन्याय न हो, ऐसा उन का विचार

होना चाहिये। और बड़े बड़े जो सरकारी अफसर होते हैं रेलवे में उन के बारे में हम क्या कहें, वह तो जैसी गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी होती है, वैसा वह काम करते हैं। रेलवे और पबलिक सर्विस कमिशन में आप देखिये मेम्बर लम्बी चौड़ी टनख्वाहें लेते हैं, लेकिन वहां भी शिडयूल्ड कास्ट के साथ न्याय नहीं होता है।

Shrimati A. Kale: On a point of order, may I say that the hon. Member is speaking on anything and everything except the subject proper?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may proceed with his speech.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : यह जो बड़े बड़े रेलवे अफसरान हैं और आई० सी० एस० के अफसरान हैं, इन के दिलों में शिडयूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों के लिये कोई प्रेम नहीं है और मुझे मालूम है कि भुसावल में जहां बड़े बड़े रेलवे के डिवाजनल अफसरान बने बैठे हैं, उन के पास जब कोई शिडयूल्ड कास्ट का आदमी जाता है, तो उस की तरफ जल्दी ध्यान नहीं देते, लेकिन जब इंग्लो इंडियन, क्रिश्चियन, ब्राह्मण, बनिया और दूसरी अन्य जातियों के लोग जाते हैं तो उन की बात फौरन सुनी जाती है। यह छुआछूत और जाति भेद अभी तक गया नहीं है, यह बड़े अफसरों की बात है कि यह बच्चे शिडयूल्ड कास्ट के लोग जो इसी देश के रहने वाले हैं और भूतकाल में जिन के उद्धार के लिये महात्मा गांधी ने एक जोरदार आवाज उठाई थी, उन को इस तरह भुला दिया गया है और उन के संग न्याय नहीं किया जाता है। आज जितना हमारे देश में मैन्युएल लेबर (manual labour) करने वाले हैं

और हमारे नौकर चाकर हैं, कुली, गैंगमैन (gangman) और दूसरे छोटे छोटे काम करने वाले लोग हैं, यह सब शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के हैं। यह भी खूब रही कि लड़ने में तो उन बेचारी को आगे कर दिया और खाने के वक्त खुद आगे आ गये और उन का कोई स्टाल न रखता। सारा सफाई आदि का काम तो हमारे लोग करें, गैंगमैन हमारे लोग करें, कुलीगिरी हम करें, इस के अलावा हमारे लोग बी० ए० एम० ए० भी पढ़ते हैं और पब्लिक और रेलवे सर्विस कमिशन का इम्तिहान भी पास कर लेते हैं लेकिन जब कमिशन इंटरव्यू के वक्त उन से पूछता है कि तुम्हारा लीडर कौन है, जगजीवन राम या डाक्टर अम्बेडकर, और अगर कहीं वह डाक्टर अम्बेडकर को अपना नेता मानता हो और उस ने कह दिया कि उस के नेता डाक्टर अम्बेडकर हैं तो उस को इंटरव्यू रिजेक्ट (reject) कर दिया जाता है और उस का नाम काट दिया जाता है। अगर वह जगजीवन राम का नाम लेता है तो सब ठीक हो जाता है क्योंकि यह मालूम हो जाता है कि यह उम्मीदवार कांग्रेस पार्टी का है और इस का नेता डाक्टर अम्बेडकर हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह दूसरी पार्टी वालों के साथ मेजोरिटी पार्टी (majority party) वालों का बहुत बड़ा अन्याय है।

दो मिनट में मुझे जो कुछ कहना है, वह मैं जल्दी से कहे देता हूँ।

Shri G. H. Deshpande: On a point of order Sir, the hon. Member has made a very serious allegation against the Members of the Public Service Commission. He says that the question is asked whether a particular applicant belonged to Ambedkarites or to Jag-

jivan Ram's party. That is the allegation the hon. Member has made and the Members of the Public Service Commission are not present here to defend themselves. I think it is out of order.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मुझे दो और मिनट बोलने की इजाजत दी जाय।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member has already spoken for ten minutes which is the allotted time. I can allow him one more minute.

श्री राजभोज : मैं इस समय अपने भाई देशपांडे के सवाल का जवाब देना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि समय नहीं है, उन को मैं जवाब नासिक में दूंगा। लेकिन मैं जल्दी से दो एक प्वायंट रख देना चाहता हूँ। पिछड़े हुए लोगों के बारे में मैंने जो कहा है, वह आप ने सुन ही लिया। वह लोग जो आप के सारे मैन्युएल लेबर के कामों में लगे हुए हैं, आप के कारखाने और मिलों में काम करते हैं, मेरी प्रार्थना है कि उनके रहने के लिये मकान साफ और सुथरी जगह बनाये जायें जो स्वस्थ और हवादार हों और जिन में उनके बाल बच्चों सहित रहने के लिये काफ़ी जगह हो और उस के साथ साथ उन को पानी और राशन की भी सुहाय्य मिलनी चाहिये। जो गरीब और अछूत लोग हैं और जो रेलों और कारखानों में काम करते हैं उन की तनखाह, भत्ते और छुट्टी आदि के बारे में भी सरकार को विचार करना चाहिये।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member may resume his seat.

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Madam Chairman, I am very glad that I have been given an opportunity to speak here on this occasion.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. If I may bring it to the notice of the hon. Member, I do not understand Hindi. If he could speak in English I should be grateful.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: I cannot speak in English.

When I am speaking on the Railway Budget it is not with any idea of opposing it for the sake of opposition. I do not want to increase opposition by opposition. I would deal every point on its merits, and if it is good I would say that it is good. The hon. Members remember that they used to travel in the third class when Gandhiji was living as far as railway travelling was concerned. That was the Gandhian age. But now it is the age of Congress rule. Congress rule has begun. They mostly tour in first class now. As regards third class travelling, I think there has not been any significant change. People say improvements have taken place. But I would like to give you an idea of what happens on passenger trains which run between Bombay and Punjab.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: On a point of order, Madam. The hon. Member was requested to speak in English and he is proficient in English. It will be of great advantage to this House.....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. When I asked the hon. Member to speak in English I said "if he could", and he said he could not. So it is all right.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: So the Mail train that runs between Bombay and Punjab is provided with fans etc. and there are good seating arrangements as well in that train. But the passenger trains are so overcrowded that one cannot easily find room in them. I would like to request the hon. Minister to travel in the third class some time. He would come to know about the inconveniences that a person has generally to experience there.

Some Hon. Members: He has travelled in the third class many a time.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: Let him travel now. He is a Minister now and travels in first class compartment as well as in saloons. My impression is that third class needs to be improved a great deal. There are no facilities for fans etc. in

the passenger trains. People travel mostly in these passenger trains; as such sufficient amenities should be provided in them. I have been a frequent traveller to Kolhapur and Poona side i.e. on M. & S. M. Railway. The trains that run in that part of the country have no fans; they run at a speed of fifteen miles an hour. The train that runs between Kolhapur and Miraj moves at a snail's pace. It takes about two hours to cover a short distance of thirty miles only. It is said that the speed of the train has somewhat increased now. But you would see that the trains, which run between Pandharpur and Khurdwadi and which is called the Barsi-Light Railway, are so overcrowded that even the wagons meant for animals are used by the passengers. You can make enquiries and ask whether my statement is correct. I am narrating a fact when I am saying these words. I have travelled many a time on this line. Our friend, Shri Karmarkar, who hails from Maharashtra, is sitting here. Ask him whether or not what I say is correct. Our friend Shri Pataskar too has said that something should be done with regard to these trains. People say that many improvements have taken place, and that fans etc. have only recently been fitted in the Second class compartments on the trains which run on M. & S. M. Railway. But I say that is not sufficient; more facilities should be provided in passenger trains also.

The disputes and differences which have arisen on account of regrouping of railways and which seem to have some provincial bias are in no way creditable. Our linguistic unity, which was existing before regrouping, is also coming to an end. Formerly there was unity based on languages. Those who spoke Marathi were in one area, and people speaking Bengali were in another. Now persons from Madras would have to go to Bengal and those from Bengal would have to go to Madras. Similar would be the case with persons who live in Uttar Pradesh and Bengal. What can these persons understand when they go from one area to the other? How can these linguistic provinces, in which our unity lies, for which we struggled and about which Pandit Nehru has given us promises, be formed? This is the same Divide and Rule policy which was adopted by the Britishers earlier and it is being followed by this Government now. It should not be like that. That is why you are under the impression that members of the opposition know only how to abuse the Government and the Congress. We do

not abuse anybody or carry on vilification against anybody. We only put forth our suggestions which we think are good. But one thing is certain that we are not your yes-men, that is why we are on the opposition benches. The hon. Members, who support the Government claim that everything is all right. Let it not be said, that "in a fool's domain there is no distinction between a criminal and a Saint." In my opinion conditions are not very different from that in the Railway Board. We, who form the opposition, belong to several parties and I represent the All India Scheduled Castes' Federation here. I would describe the whole situation in a few words. I had to say many things but the time at my disposal is very short.

The other thing to which I would like to draw your attention is that our Harijan brethren are not fairly treated when they approach for services etc. Formerly the Department was under the charge of Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, who besides being a very respectable man, had the privilege of having his past associations with the British regime in India. But now the department is under the charge of Shri Shastri, who is associated with the Congress rule. I hope he would definitely try to know as to what is happening around him, and what sort of inconveniences people have to undergo. I hope he would do his level best to remove these inconveniences and would also see to it that justice is properly done and no injustice is done to anybody. I hope he too would be thinking on similar lines. Certainly we cannot say anything about the big Government Officials, because they do only what the Government want them to do. Just look towards the Railways and the Public Service Commission. The members of these Commissions draw fat salaries, but no justice is being done to the Scheduled Castes' candidates even there.

Shrimati A. Kale (Nagpur): On a point of order, may I say that the hon. Member is speaking on anything and everything except the subject proper?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may proceed with his speech.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: These big officers and I.C.S. people have no sympathy or love for the Scheduled Castes and I am aware of instances where scheduled Castes' people have tried to see big railway officers such as the Divisional officers, in Bhusawal. But they were not attended to properly. On the other hand, when Anglo-Indians, Christians, Brahmins, Baniyas or persons
44 P.S.D.

belonging to other castes approach them, they at once listen to their requests. The curse of untouchability and discrimination on the basis of caste is still existing. It is very sad that persons belonging to the Scheduled castes, about whom Mahatma Gandhi raised his powerful voice sometime ago, should have been so awfully neglected and deprived of justice. To-day you would find in the country that all the manual labourers, whether they are domestic servants, coolies or gangmen etc. etc. belong to these scheduled castes. It is amusing that at the time of strife and struggle they are being sent to the front but at the time of reward no heed is paid to them and others come to enjoy the fruit of their labour. It is so strange that our men should work as coolies, and gangmen and when they pass B.A. or M.A. and even pass examinations of the Public and the Railway Service Commissions, they are asked at the time of interview as to whom they owe their allegiance, to Jagjivan Ram or to Dr. Ambedkar. And if anybody says that his leanings are towards Dr. Ambedkar, he is rejected forthwith in the interview on that very basis. But if he mentions the name of Shri Jagjivan Ram his chances brighten because that shows that at least that particular candidate belongs to the Congress party, and is no longer an Ambedkarite. I am of the opinion that this is a great injustice that is being done by the majority party to the other parties.

Madam, I would finish my speech within one or two minutes and would say what I have to say.

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik—Central): On a point of order Sir, the hon. Member has made a serious allegation against the Members of the Public Service Commission. He says that the question is asked whether a particular applicant belonged to Ambedkarites or to Jagjivan Ram's party. That is the allegation that the hon. Member has made; and the Members of the Public Service Commission are not here to defend themselves. I think it is out of order.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: Please allow me to speak for two minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member has already spoken for ten minutes which is the allotted time. I can allow him one more minute.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: I do not want to give a reply to my friend Shri Deshpande at this time. I would reply him in Nasik. Here I only want to put forth one or two points. You have already

[Shri P. N. Rajabhoj]

listened to what I said about the backward classes. I request that people who do manual labour for you and who work in mills and factories, should be provided with sufficient accommodation facilities. Clean, healthy and ventilated quarters should be constructed for them where they may live in comfort. Along with this, facilities regarding water and rations etc. should also be given to them. In the case of people who are poor and the so-called untouchables, who work in Railways and factories, the question of pay, allowances, holidays etc. should also be considered by the Government.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member may resume his seat.

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू : मैं जरूर अंग्रेजी में बोलती, लेकिन एक अर्सा हुआ जिस वक्त मैं मुल्क की आजादी की राह में लड़ाई लड़ने लड़ी हुई थी तो मैंने यह प्रतिज्ञा भी करी थी कि मैं अपनी राष्ट्रीय भाषा में ही बोलूंगी और अपनी मादरी ज़बान में बोलूंगी और आज मुझे दुःख है कि जब यहां अंग्रेजी अंग्रेजी की आबाज सुनाई देती है, तो मैं हिन्दी में बोलने पर मजबूर हूं, क्योंकि इस में मेरा कोई दोष नहीं है मुल्क काफ़ी दिनों से आजाद भी हो गया है और आप आजादी के लिये लड़े भी, आप हर चीज़ को नैशनलाइज़ (nationalise) करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन अफ़सोस यह है कि आप ने अभी तक अपनी ज़बान नहीं बदली, ज़बान आप की वही की वही है। इसलिये ज़बान पर ज्यादा न कहकर मैं अपने मिनिस्टर साहब को मुबारकबाद देती हूं कि उन्होंने इस ख़ुबी से यह रेलवे बजट हमारे सामने रखा है, लेकिन मैं साथ साथ यह भी बता देना चाहती हूं कि मुबारकबाद देने के बाद भी जो कमियां मुझे इस में दिखाई देती हैं, उन का भी मैं जिक्र करना जरूरी और अपना फ़र्ज़ समझती हूं। जब से मैं यहां बैठी हूं, मैं बराबर अपनी दाहिनी तरफ़ के जो हमारे आनरेबल मेम्बर आये हैं, उन की बातें बहुत देर से ध्यानपूर्वक सुनती रही हूं, और उन की स्पीचें मुझे

युनिवर्सिटी यूनियन के डिबेट की याद दिलाती हैं। उन की ज़बानें कितनी खूबसूरत हैं, ख़्यालात भी खूबसूरत हैं, तल्लफ़ुज़ भी खूबसूरत हैं सारी चीज़ें खूबसूरत हैं, लेकिन उन में सिर्फ़ एक डिबेट (debate) का मादा है, उन में कोई कन्सट्रक्टिव (constructive) मादा नहीं है। वैसे ख़्यालातों में मतभेद होना कोई डर की बात नहीं है और अगर आप के कोई ऐसे ख़्यालात हैं जिन से देश को लाभ हो सकता है और हमें लाभ हो सकता है, तो हमें जरूर उनका स्वागत करना चाहिये और हम जरूर उन को मंज़ूर और अख़्यार करेंगे। उसी तरह से अगर आप यह देखें कि दूसरी तरफ़ के लोगों के ख़्यालात ऐसे हैं जिन से देश को लाभ पहुंच सकता है तो आप को भी उन ख़्यालातों को मुल्क के फ़ायदे को मद्दे नज़र रखते हुए मंज़ूर कर लेना चाहिये। मैं तो इसी भाव से इन डिबेट्स को देखती हूं। लेकिन जो व्याख्यान उधर की तरफ़ से हुए हैं और जो कई बातें हमारे मुखर्जी साहब ने कहीं, उन को सुन कर तकलीफ़ हुई। उन्होंने जो यह कहा कि हम जो कांग्रेस वाले हैं वह सक्सेसर्स आफ़ तुग़लक (Successors of Tughlaks) हैं उन्होंने जब हम कांग्रेस वालों का मुहम्मद तुग़लक से मुकाबला किया, तो मुझे बहुत तकलीफ़ हुई उन की ज़बान से हम ने यह भी सुना कि इंडिया डेटिज़ भारत (India that is Bharat)। भारत डेटिज़ यू० पी० (Bharat that is U. P.), जब यह फ़िक्ररा उन्होंने कसा, तो मैं ने सोचा कि इतने वह बड़े बुजुर्ग हैं, बैलेंस्ड (balanced) हैं, इतने समझदार हैं, लेकिन वह भी जब यू० पी० डेटिज़ भारत की बात कहते हैं तो मुझे अपने स्कूल के दिनों की बात याद आ जाती है जब वहां पर लड़के इस तरह की बातें किया करते थे। मुमकिन है इस तरह के रिमार्क (Remark) जो उन्होंने हम पर किये वह इस वजह से हों कि आज कल यहां की आबहवा भी गर्म है, चारों तरफ़ गर्मी है तो उस में इंसान की तबियत

भी घबड़ा जाती है और उस को यह अहसास नहीं रह पाता कि मैं क्या कह रहा हूँ, तो यह चीजें हमारे सामने आईं, जो कुछ मुनासिब और ठीक नहीं थीं। अब मैं इन के बाबत ज्यादा न कह कर अपने विषय पर आना चाहती हूँ, क्योंकि अगर मैं इस डिबेट में पड़ जाऊँ और मैं अपने उस तरफ़ के जो बैठने वाले हैं उन की चर्चा करने लगूँ, तो शायद मैं इस रेलवे बजट के बाबत बोलना भी भूल जाऊँ। इसलिये और कुछ ज्यादा न कह कर मैं आप से यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि थर्ड क्लास की गाड़ियों में आप ने पंखे जरूर लगवाये हैं, मैं ने खुद उन को जा कर लेकिन उन डिब्बों में इतने ज्यादा मुसाफिरदेखा भरे रहते हैं कि वह पंखे बेकार से हो गये हैं और यह मालूम ही नहीं पड़ता है कि पंखा चल रहा है। थर्ड क्लास के डिब्बों में इस क्रदर भीड़ रहती है कि उन के दरवाजे तक खुले रहते हैं और मुसाफिर दरवाजे के रास्ते में और सब जगह ठसाठस भरे रहते हैं। वहाँ बैठ कर यह ब्याल आता है कि यहाँ की सफाई भी होनी चाहिये लेकिन सफाई कैसे करें और किस चीज की की जाय, जब वहाँ इंसान एक दूसरे इंसान पर चढ़ा हुआ दिखाई देता है।

वहाँ पर यह हालत है। अब इस हालत को बदलना है। इस हालत को बदलने के लिये या तो आप ज्यादा रेलें चलायें या रेलों में जगह ज्यादा करें। मुसाफिरों को काफ़ी सहुलियतें दी तो गई हैं, लेकिन मैं ने मुसाफिरों को यह कहते अक्सर सुना है कि उन्हें जगह नहीं मिलती, कोई उन का ब्याल करने वाला नहीं है हालांकि उन का किराया बढ़ा दिया गया है। तो जब हम ने उन का रेलवे किराया बढ़ा दिया है तो हमारा धर्म यह है कि हम उन को आराम भी दें।

फिर अब जब थर्ड क्लास की तरफ़ आप की तवज्जह हुई है तो हम देखते हैं कि जो फर्स्ट और सैकण्ड क्लास के पैसैजर्स हैं

उन की तरफ़ से आप की नज़र हट गई है। हम जब फर्स्ट और सैकण्ड क्लास में चलते हैं तो क्या देखते हैं कि उन की गड़ियां फटी हैं और ऊंची नीची हैं, और दरवाजों के बोल्ट (Bolts) नदारद हैं। गाड़ियां बहुत पुरानी हैं और गुसलखानों में शीशे तक नहीं हैं। बेसिन्स (basins) जो हैं वह बहुत गन्दे हैं। उन को देख कर यही ब्याल आता है कि इस तरफ़ बिल्कुल तवज्जह नहीं है। अब की दफा तो मैं ने देखा कि फर्स्ट और सैकण्ड क्लास में से बल्ब (bulbs) भी गायब हैं। आप को इस तरफ़ भी तवज्जह देनी है क्योंकि वहाँ पर भी किराया बढ़ाया गया है और उसी हिसाब से आप को उन को सहुलियत भी देनी है। मैं ने यह देखा कि फर्स्ट या सैकण्ड क्लास के अंदर जो गुसलखानों की खिड़कियां हैं उन के अन्दर आप ने बार्स (bars) नहीं लगाये हैं और उन के अन्दर आसानी से इंसान घुस सकता है। गुसलखानों के जो दरवाजे हैं उन के अन्दर आप ने बोल्ट नहीं रखे हैं और उन के जरिये से कोई भी सीधा डब्बे के अन्दर तक आ सकता है। मुझे इस सब की चर्चा इसलिये करनी पड़ रही है कि आज कल रेलों में बेहद चोरियां ही रही हैं।

आज कल ऐक्सिडेंट्स (accidents) भी काफ़ी बढ़ते जाते हैं। मैं बराबर रेलवे वालों से पूछती हूँ कि आखिर यह रेलवे ऐक्सिडेंट्स क्यों बढ़ते जाते हैं तो मुझे बताया जाता है कि चूँकि कनाडा से नये इंजिन आये हैं और रेलें बहुत पुरानी हैं। इंजिन इतने भारी हैं कि रेलें उन का बोझ संभाल नहीं सकतीं। तो इन रेलों को भी हमें तब्दील करना है। यह आप का मेहकमा है और आप इस सब बात को समझते हैं लेकिन यह जरूरी है कि आप इस की तरफ़ ध्यान दें। सब बात को समझने के बाद आप का फ़र्ज यह है कि आप इन सब चीजों की तरफ़ तवज्जह दें और जरूरी तब्दीलियां करें।

[श्रीमती उमा नेहरू]

इन सब चीजों को देखने के बाद मैं एक सुझाव दूंगी। हम देखते हैं कि जब स्त्रियाँ सफर करती हैं तो अक्सर ऐसी होती हैं कि जो अनपढ़ होती हैं जब वह स्टेशनों पर उतरा करता है तो उन को कोई ठीक रास्ता बतलाने वाला नहीं होता है। इसलिये आप को वीमेन सोशल गाइड्स (Women Social guides) मुक़दर करनी चाहियें जिस में औरतों को टिकट लेने और रास्ता वगैरह जानने में मदद हासिल हो सके। वजह यह है कि अभी हमारे भारत में स्त्रियाँ इतनी क्राबिल नहीं हो सकी हैं, इतनी लिटरेट (literate) नहीं हो सकी हैं कि बगैर किसी की मदद के इधर उधर जा सकें। इस के लिये बहुत जरूरी है कि आप फ़ौरन कार्रवाई करें।

अभी अपने चुनाव के सिलसिले में जब मैं सीतापुर गई तो वहाँ पर मैं रेलवे क्वाट से भी चली गई। वहाँ पर मैंने देखा कि किसी के पास एक कोठरी है, किसी के पास दो। लेकिन उन को और उन के बच्चों को देख कर मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ। मैं समझती हूँ कि उन के रहने के मकानों की तरफ़ आप को जरूर गौर करना होगा।

अब बहुत समय नहीं रहा है। क्योंकि घंटी भी बज चुकी है। दस मिनट के अन्दर इतने लम्बे चौड़े बजट पर कुछ कहना बड़े कमाल की बात है। लेकिन फिर भी जो कुछ बतलाया जा सके उतना तो आप को बतलाना ही है। इसलिये मैं ने तीन चार बातों की तरफ़ ध्यान दिलाया। मुझे पक्का यकीन है आप अभी नये आये हैं और खुद आप ने इन चीजों पर गौर किया होगा। मुझे आशा है कि आप इन सब चीजों पर गौर कर के जरूरी तब्दीली करेंगे।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shrimati Uma Nehru (Sitapur Distt. cum Kheri Distt. West): I would have spoken in English but for the pledge I took when I was a fighter in the cause of the country's freedom that I would speak only in the nation-

al language or my mother tongue. Today when I hear "speak in English" on all sides I feel sorry, but I should not be blamed if I speak in Hindi. The country has been free for a considerable time now. You fought for this freedom and you wanted to nationalize everything, but it is to be noted with regret that you have not changed your language. It continues to be the same.

Not going into the details of the language question, I would deal with the matter under consideration and would like to congratulate the hon. Minister on his Railway Budget, which he has so ably presented. At the same time I consider it my duty to bring to his notice the defects which I find in this Budget. For a long time I have been listening attentively to the speeches of the hon. members on my right. Their speeches remind me of the University Union debates. Their ideas, language and pronunciation are all fine, but there is one thing which I miss in them and that is the constructive approach. Their speeches are made purely from the point of view of a debate.

Difference of opinion is quite a normal thing. If they have any ideas or suggestions which can benefit us and the country, we would certainly welcome them and adopt them. Similarly, in the interests of the country, they should also accept any ideas or suggestions, which we might have for the good of the country. I look upon these debates in this light. I have been pained to listen to some of the speeches from the opposite side and by some of the things Dr. Mookerjee has said. I was pained by his remark that we Congressmen are the successors of Tughlaks and by the comparison that he made between Congressmen and Mohd. Tughlak. He has uttered the phrase—"India, that is Bharat; Bharat, that is U.P.". Such a phrase coming from the mouth of an elderly person of an intelligent and balanced mind reminded me of my school days when children used to indulge in such phrase-making. Perhaps he made this remark under the influence of the hot weather prevailing now which disturbs one's mental equilibrium and which does not let anybody realize the implications of what one may be speaking. I do not think his remark was proper or just.

Now I come to the subject before us, for if I begin to discuss the speeches of members opposite, I might forget to speak on the Railway Budget altogether. I would like to bring to your notice the fact that though you have installed fans in third class

compartments, and I have seen them myself, yet these compartments are so much overcrowded that the fans are almost useless, because one does not feel their presence at all. The passengers are packed like sardines and every inch of space, including passages and doorways is fully occupied. Such conditions demand that cleanliness and sanitation arrangement should be perfect, but how can cleanliness be maintained where over-crowding is so acute? This state of affairs has to be changed. You will have either to run more trains or to increase the accommodation in the existing trains. Passengers have, of course, been provided with some amenities, but their universal complaint regarding shortage of accommodation still remains. Although fares have been raised, still nobody has paid any attention to their comforts. In view of increased fares it is our duty to give them more comforts.

While paying attention to the needs of third class passengers, the first and second class passengers have been ignored. What do we find in first and second class compartments? The cushions are torn and uneven and the bolts on the doors are missing. The coaches are very old and there are no mirrors in the bathrooms. The basins are extremely dirty. It appears that even slightest attention is not paid to these things. I found that even bulbs were missing from first and second class compartments. You have to pay attention to the needs of first and second class passengers also, and provide them with corresponding amenities, because the fares of these classes have also been raised. I have noticed that no bars have been fixed to the windows of bathrooms in first and second class compartments and one can easily enter through these windows. There are no bolts on the doors of bathrooms and anybody can come directly into the compartments through them. I have had to mention all these things because of the increasing number of thefts taking place on the railways these days. Accidents are also on the increase these days. When the Railway authorities are questioned about these accidents, they put the blame on the new type of engines imported from Canada and the old and worn-out rails. The engines are so heavy that the rails cannot bear their weight. We have got to change these rails also. You perhaps realize these things, but you have to pay attention to them and make the necessary changes.

I would like to make a suggestion. We find that when women passengers,

who are mostly illiterate, get down on stations, there is nobody to guide them on their way. Therefore women social guides should be appointed, who should help the women passengers in purchasing tickets and finding their way. This is necessitated by the fact that Indian women are not yet literate enough to be able to go from one place to another unaided. Therefore immediate steps should be taken in this regard.

During my visit to Sitapur in connection with my election I visited the Railway quarters there. I found that the majority of the people had either one or two small rooms to themselves. I was greatly pained at the conditions in which they and their children lived. In my opinion, urgent attention should be paid to their housing problems. There is not much time left now, as the bell has rung.

It is well-nigh impossible to deal at length with such a huge Budget in a period of ten minutes. One must be content with whatever can be said within the time-limit. That is why I have made three or four points. I am sure that, new as you are, you would consider these points—you must have considered them by yourself—and introduce the necessary changes.

Shri Hukam Singh: I propose to address the Chair as Sir; I hope the Chair has no objection.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member is addressing the Chair; he can address as he likes, Madam or Sir.

Some Hon. Members: A good ruling.

Shri Hukam Singh: This debate has been going on for full two days and it is very difficult for any one to adduce fresh arguments. Of course, I have had the advantage of listening to so many speeches and I have benefited from them. But, at the same time, I have this handicap that anything that I say may be considered as commonplace because most of the arguments that can be advanced have already been advanced. Yet, I feel, even though it may look like repetition, there are certain things that must be stressed over and over again. I feel encouraged in this attitude of mine by the speech of Dr. Deshmukh who told us that this side of the House was addressing arguments that he or others of his like or party used to address in previous years. I think that when Dr. Deshmukh had greater freedom to speak out his mind and

[Shri Hukam Singh]

could be more true to himself, he said the things that I am now saying and my comrades here are saying. I am confirmed in my view that these are really matters that must be addressed to the Government to get redress.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: My freedom has in no way been curtailed.

Shri Hukam Singh: There has been a complaint of jaundice which developed subsequently to Myopia. (*Some Hon. Members:* Yellow fever). Subsequently also,—I forgot—our respected lady Member observed that one of our Members here, though he was a great and wise statesman, had acted like a child or something like that. But, ultimately, I was pleased to find that she herself was making the same complaint as Dr. Mookerjee had done or any of our other Members had done. Dr. Deshmukh has said that because our railway Minister Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar was an experienced administrator, we cannot conceive that he has done a wrong thing. That looked rather queer, and seemed strange to me that we should accept re-grouping because it comes from Mr. Gopalaswami Ayyangar.

Then, an hon. Member tried his utmost to make out a case that regrouping was a necessity, and that it had been taken after long discussion and deliberation. But I want to submit that the dispute is not whether there should be regrouping or there should not be regrouping. The only complaint was this. If we had made three regions, we could have waited to see the result of regrouping and need not have rushed in spite of opposition from the other side. We do not say that regrouping is bad. We have not got so far any data to give our decision. Personally speaking, for those people who do not come from U.P. or Bengal, it is very difficult to appreciate the differences that they have got. But, at least, this much we can appreciate that they have this complaint to make that when Parliament was to consider the matter, and when certain Members felt dissatisfied they ought to have been given a patient hearing in this democracy and that they ought to have been listened to with sympathy. And, perhaps, if it were possible, the Government and the protagonists of this scheme could have convinced those persons that it was in the interests of this country. I am sure, if that had been done, those people must have also fallen in line with the others who thought that it was necessary.

So far as the speech of hon. Minister is concerned, we had two speeches. But there is one satisfaction, that each hon. Minister said that he would save the House from the agony of hearing a speech. But I can assure Government that though there was no speech according to their profession, yet the agony is still there.

The Railway Minister has taken pride that our finances compare very favourably with any similar undertaking anywhere in the world.

[SHRI M. A. AYYANGAR in the Chair.]

I have no grouse with him at all on that. If that is the only consideration, namely whether the finances are good, certainly I must congratulate the Railway Minister. But there are other things also.

The Minister said that there was some committee which had recommended that coal could bear even cent per cent. increase in freight. Now if the railway administration were to increase the freight by 100 per cent. or if they were to increase the passenger fares also by another 50 per cent., then they will come up here next time with a net surplus of 50 crores in addition. They would certainly then be applauded that they had made so much money. But at what cost? The other side must also be taken into consideration. What about the facilities to the passengers, labour welfare and increase in wages to the workmen? When this is taken into consideration I wonder whether really the Railway can be proud that it has given benefit to everybody, who is entrusted with the smooth running of the trains. So taken as a whole this thing should be judged.

I feel that there has been considerable improvement. After the war there has been much rehabilitation and it cannot be denied. But this policy of amassing and swelling the funds, be it development, revenue reserve, depreciation or rehabilitation, cannot be appreciated, when our masses are so much in need of welfare measures and many of the amenities are denied to them. Can success lie in simple swelling of the funds? My answer is in the negative.

As regards the net surplus it has progressively increased. It was 15 crores in 1950-51, it rose to 21 crores in 1951-52 and now it is estimated at 25 crores in 1952-53. The surplus earned has been to the tune of 62 crores and much of it has been put into these funds.

It has been said that Rs. 3 crores has been set aside for amenities to the passengers. Is that enough for the passengers of all classes and particularly the third class passengers, whose case has been quoted again and again? They pay 85 per cent. of the revenues of the railways. Is that class being attended to as it ought to be? Is it only the first class people that require sleeping accommodation? Are the others not human beings that they should not be provided with such facilities? At least for long distances the trains could be made longer and some bogies attached to them, so that for an additional small fee these people can have the comfort of sleeping accommodation. This would not cost much to the Government also, because these bogies would be attached to the trains already running. Also more Janata trains should be provided. So longer trains and more trains could ease the overcrowding which is still there in spite of the efforts of the Government for the last so many years, because greater attention is being paid to the amassing of wealth by the railway and taking pride in it.

Last year the fares were raised and we were told that the raising of freights was a regressive step and hence was not resorted to. When the people have suffered that increase in fares the rise in freight, which was considered regressive last year, has now been put on. People have to bear it in the hope that it would help in the rehabilitation of the railways which is very necessary.

I only ask whether this policy is quite fair for a welfare state and in the case of a public utility service, where people are suffering from many disabilities and privations. I am sure the Government would pay more attention to these things than to swelling up their funds, which can be done even subsequently.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Lingaraj Misra.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: Sir, may I speak? I have been waiting for a chance for the last two days. I caught your eye before you called upon the other speaker.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member will resume his seat. There are definite parties both for the Government and for the opposition. It is left to the parties to decide who ought to be given a chance. I am trying to go as far as possible in accordance with that.....

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: So far as the party in power is concerned there is the spokesman of the party, the Minis-

ter. As regards the others the discretion is left to the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: I thought the hon. Member belonged to the Congress Party. Has the hon. Member ceased to belong to the Congress Party?

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: What I was trying to point out is this. If the rule is that the Chair will call upon the Member to speak provided his name is on the list presented to you, then the rules of procedure should be modified accordingly. Why should we live in doubt and suspense and perform this acrobatic exercise over and over again of catching your eye?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member evidently has not been here when yesterday I made known to hon. Members the names of all persons whom I intended to call and I gave the order also. It is not as if I am asking hon. Members to get up in their seats. Evidently the hon. Member has come only just now. The hon. Member is always catching my eye. There is no difficulty about that. I will give him an early opportunity next. Let me come to the last of the list.

Pandit Lingaraj Misra (Khurda): While congratulating the hon. Minister of Railways and expressing my general satisfaction on the budget he has presented to the House, I must say that there is nothing in this Budget to satisfy the State which I represent here. Our State has suffered all along throughout the whole period of railway administration and it is reflected in the provisions in this year's budget also. I still remember how in 1918 the late lamented Thakkar Bapa of revered memory once referred in the Press to the negligence of the Bengal Nagpur Railway in the humorous way that it took full two decades for them to discover that latrines were a necessity in a third class compartment. Well, the same negligence was to be found even now. After all formerly it was a profit-seeking company but the Railway Ministry which has taken over the administration for the last six or seven years has not improved matters much.

Orissa is a State over 60,000 sq. miles in area and the entire length of the railway mileage in the State is only 875. There are several districts, particularly most of the newly integrated ex-States areas which have no facility of rail communication at all. When Dr. Matthai the then Railway Minister visited Orissa in 1948 some of the immediate needs of Orissa in respect of extension of railway lines and establishment of a port

[Pandit Lfingaraj Misra]

on the east coast were pressed upon him by the Orissa Government of which I happened to be a member then. As a result of that, three lines were surveyed and estimated. One of these is the Talcher-Bonai-Sambalpur-Balangir-Kontabanji on the Vizainagram-Raipur line. This is a line which cuts through the rich forest and mineral regions and the area which is fast developing into an industrial area as a result of the multipurpose Hirakud dam scheme. We had expected that at least some provision would have been made for this line, but I am disappointed to find that not only does this year's Budget contain no provision but even the programme for the next two years does not mention this particular project. I would therefore appeal to the Railway Minister to kindly consider if it is possible to revise that programme to include this scheme which is of vital importance to the development of that State.

As regards the port, I understand some navigation experts from France have recently surveyed the Orissa coast and they have recommended that the mouth of Mahanadi at Paradip would be a very suitable site for a modern port. I hope steps will be taken to connect the inland with that proposed port. These are immediate necessities to which attention should be given.

Then again, of these 275 miles of railway there is not a single mile of double track. Whenever the local Advisory Committees or the public

press for an additional passenger service they are confronted by the authorities with the fact that unless some of the main sections of the line are doubled it is not possible to add even one more passenger train. Many hon. Members must be knowing that the eastern section of the former Bengal-Nagpur Railway carries heavy passenger traffic due to the constant flow of pilgrims and tourists to the religious shrines and the archaeological monuments at Puri, Bhubaneswar, Konarak etc. So double lining this section of the Railway is a matter of paramount urgency and cannot be put off indefinitely.

Then, the inadequacy of the welfare facilities for the railway employees can be judged from the single fact that there is only one middle school at Khurda Road throughout the length and breadth of this State to cater to the needs of the children of the railway employees. That too is so ill-equipped in accommodation and in staff that last year I as Minister of Education had to intervene and postpone the withdrawal of recognition of this institution by the Education Department and I gave some time to the Railway authorities to make up the deficiency pointed out.

Mr. Chairman: It is now one o'clock. The hon. Member may continue his speech on the next day.

(The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Wednesday, the 28th May, 1952.)