

[**Shri Bansal**] fifty per cent, all that this Act has been able to do is to eliminate investment to the extent of about Rs. 25 crores over a period of three or four years. Frankly, I do not think that is a great achievement on the part of this particular Act. We should not forget that a very large sphere of the work which is supposed to be done by this particular Act is done by various other pieces of legislation. The hon. Finance Minister himself referred to the Industries Development and Regulation Act. The main instrument for controlling industrial development and therefore directing investment in certain desirable channels is there and not in this Capital Issues Control Act. That Act covers a very wide field. There are very few industries of any significance which are really outside the scope of that Act. Therefore, I should imagine that all the national investment policy which Shri Asoka Mehta had in mind is taken care of by the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act.

[**PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair**]

I should imagine that under that Act this particular aspect is being looked after quite satisfactorily. My complaint is that even when some of the applicants are given licences under that Act, the Controller of Capital Issues sits down and takes unnecessarily long time in sanctioning the issue of capital. I do not like to mention particular cases but I would like the Finance Minister go into that and see as to what are the reasons which weigh sanctioning applications which come through the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act and which are passed by the licensing committee. Why should those applications take so much time in his department. We heard some time back that there was some sort of a joint committee which was sitting where officers of this department as well as of the various other licensing departments were sitting together to see that the time-lag between the sanction of the application by one department and the other department was reduced. I have no doubt that it must be happening in a large number of cases but still there are some cases where this delay occurs and I would like the Finance Minister to look into such cases.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I am sorry to open another dialogue but I would like to ask whether the hon. Member believes that the field covered by both these Acts is exactly the same in that that a

licence must automatically be followed by the grant of permission for capital issue. That is not the case.

There are certain powers. I give an instance. I licence is given to a certain company. Now, if they want to issue shares or to make some kind of special issues, that becomes a matter of capital issues and not a matter of licensing under the Industries Development and Regulation Act.

Shri Bansal: I fully agree and I am thankful to the Finance Minister. But the type of case which I have in view, as far as I know, is a straightway case and therefore, there was no such complication of the type involved. There are a few such cases and I think it will be worth the Finance Minister's while to look into them.

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): Will you kindly send them? I would request the hon. Member to send his cases to us so that we may be in a position to find out whether there has been any unnecessary or undue delay.

Shri Bansal: I will be glad to forward to the Finance Minister such cases as I have in my possession. All that I was trying to point out was that within a certain field both the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act and the Control of Capital Issues Act overlapped each other and within that field there should not be a great wastage of time.

Mr. Chairman: Now, the hon. Member may resume his seat. It is time for private Members' business.

Shri Bansal: I have got a lot more to say on this. Will I be allowed to continue my speech?

Mr. Chairman: Certainly.

3 P.M.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FORTY-FOURTH REPORT

Shri Altekar (North Satara): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 22nd February, 1956."

This is a report in connection with the categorisation of four Bills and they are all categorised in clause (b) of the report. There is also another item in

connection with the allotment of time for those Bills. The time that is allotted for each Bill is also stated in the report. I move that the report be agreed to by the Lok Sabha.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 22nd February, 1956."

The motion was adopted

INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Insertion of new section 170A)

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860."

The motion was adopted

Dr. N. B. Khare: I introduce the Bill.

INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Insertion of new section 427A)

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras-Distt. Central): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code, 1860."

The motion was adopted

Shri Raghunath Singh: I introduce the Bill.

PROCEEDINGS OF LEGISLATURES (PROTECTION OF PUBLICATION) BILL*

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Distt.—West cum Rae Bareil Distt.—East): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to protect the publication of reports of proceedings of Parliament, State Legislatures and their Committees.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to protect the publication of reports of proceedings of Parliament, State Legislatures and their Committees."

The motion was adopted

Shri Feroze Gandhi: I introduce the Bill.

MOTOR VEHICLES (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Substitution of section 65, etc.)

Mr. Chairman: Shri M. L. Dwivedi and Shri S. V. Ramaswamy are not present here. So, we shall take up the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri T. B. Vittal Rao on the 16th December, 1955:

"That the Bill further to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, be taken into consideration."

Out of two hours allotted for discussion of this Bill, two minutes were taken on the 16th December, 1955, and therefore, one hour and 58 minutes are still available. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao may continue his speech now.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): This Bill seeks to regulate the conditions of work of the workers in motor transport. The principal Act refers only cursorily to the working conditions and the hours of work of the workers in this industry. There is no further provision for transport workers. Under the existing conditions in India today, there is a lot of scope for the development of road transport in view of the fact that the railway transport system has not been able to catch up with both industrial and agricultural development of the country. Even railway transport, from the figures that I will present before the Sabha, is comparatively meagre. Only the other day, the Chairman of the Railway Board, while addressing the Institute of Engineers at Bhopal, has given the following facts. The facts are very revealing. He has compared the route mileage of railway transport in India to that of various other countries. In India, for an area of 1,000 sq. miles, we have 27 miles of railway. In the United States, it is 74, that is, three times that of India. In the United Kingdom, it is 204 which is 7.6 times. I have got the figures for Canada, France and Japan which