

Time permitting, I propose also, as I stated yesterday, to bring before this House the University Grants Commission Bill for reference to a Joint Committee.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER  
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE  
BAN ON EXPORT OF TAPIOCA STARCH  
AND FLOUR

**Shri A. K. Gopalan** (Cannanore): Under Rule 215, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Food and Agriculture to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The necessity for immediate removal of ban on export of tapioca starch and flour to Continents in order to offset the growing steep fall in prices of tapioca, ruining lakhs of cultivators and increasing tremendously unemployment among agricultural and industrial workers in Travancore-Cochin State and in Malabar district of Madras State."

**The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture** (Shri M. V. Krishnappa): A short notice question was also received in this connection from Shri Matthen and Shri A. M. Thomas and the position is as follows:

The recent decline in prices of tapioca has not been confined to that commodity alone; prices of almost all agricultural commodities have undergone decline in recent months. As a matter of fact, it is not recently that prices of tapioca have fallen but that the downward trend began several months ago. The prices indeed, have been virtually steady for the past few months. Since tapioca constitutes an important subsidiary food in Travancore-Cochin, the State Government of Travancore-Cochin has been anxious to preserve the available supplies in the State for the consumption of the poorer sections of the population. It was at the instance of the Travancore-Cochin Government that the export of tapioca outside India has not been permitted. Until very recently,

even the export of tapioca outside Travancore-Cochin to other States remained banned; this ban on inter-State movement was lifted only about a month ago. With a view to preventing the prices from falling to an unduly low level, the Government of 1954 have now decided to permit the export of 10,000 tons of tapioca flour and 2,000 tons of tapioca starch as an immediate measure. The Government will keep a watch on the behaviour of prices of tapioca and its products and take suitable measures to safeguard the interests of both the producer and the consumer.

RESOLUTION RE: REPORT OF  
RAILWAY CONVENTION COM-  
MITTEE

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the time allotted for this Resolution is six hours.

**The Minister of Railways and Transport** (Shri L. B. Shastri): Yes, Sir. I beg to move:

"That this House approves the recommendations contained in the Report of the Committee appointed to review the rate of dividend at present payable by the Railway Undertaking to General Revenues as well as other ancillary matters in connection with the separation of Railway Finance from General Finance, which was presented to Parliament on 30-11-1954".

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

This House is aware that a Committee of both the Houses of Parliament was set up on the 12th May 1954, by a Resolution adopted by this House, and concurred in by the Rajya Sabha on 14th May 1954, to review the rate of dividend payable by the railway undertaking to the general revenues as well as other ancillary matters connected with the separation of railway finance from the general finance. The review indicates that the principle underlying the separation of railway finance from the general finance has worked satisfactorily during the period of five years and has enabled the railways to discharge their obligations effectively.

[Shri L. B. Shastri.]

In regard to the payment of dividend to the general revenues, the Committee have carefully considered the important issue whether Railways should be treated as a commercial concern with the general revenues as the ~~soc~~owner of the undertaking interested in securing a fair return on the capital invested or whether the railways should be treated as a purely public utility concern with no profit motive, paying the minimum rate of interest chargeable on the capital invested. The Committee have come to the conclusion that the railways are not to be treated purely either as a commercial concern or as a public utility service without any return on the investment, but that a balance should be struck between these two aspects. Having regard to the financial prospects of the railway undertaking during the next five years as well as the needs of the general revenues for financing developmental expenditure in the country, the Committee have recommended that the present rate of dividend should remain unaltered for another period of five years. They have, however, felt it necessary to afford some relief to the Railway Finance in the matter of computation of the amount of the dividend payable. The relief will take the shape of:

(i) the railways paying dividend on the element of over-capitalisation which has taken place due to the haphazard growth of capital structure of the Indian Railways, at the average rate of interest charged by the Government of India to the Commercial Departments from year to year. This element will precisely be assessed by the Railway Board, though it is estimated to be Rs. 100 crores approximately.

(ii) reducing the dividend payable on the capital-at-charge of new lines to a lesser rate, viz., the average rate of interest charged to the Commercial Departments and by declaring a moratorium in respect of dividend payable on the capital invested on new lines during the period of construction and up to the end of fifth

year of opening the line for traffic, the deferred amount being repaid from the sixth year onwards.

As the Members would have noticed, the recommendations of the present Convention Committee seek merely to streamline the provisions of the 1949 Resolution in the light of actual working and the future financial prospects of the railway undertaking. The financial position and the financial structure of the railways has further been sought to be strengthened by extending the principle recognised by the Convention of 1949 that the over-capitalisation of the undertaking should be arrested by raising the standard of remunerativeness for incurring capital expenditure. Besides, the moratorium on the dividend payable on the outlay on new lines to which I have already referred, would afford some immediate relief to railway revenues and encourage construction of new lines.

The Committee have also recognised the need for efficient maintenance of physical assets of the railway undertaking and have, therefore, proposed that the annual contribution to Depreciation Reserve Fund should be raised to Rs. 35 crores as against Rs. 30 crores actually appropriated during the last five years.

The need for continuing the Development Fund for providing amenities to railway clientele and railway labour and thereby preventing over-capitalisation is fully recognised. In view of the lean prospects of appropriations to the Development Fund in the next five years for financing developmental expenditure, the Committee have recommended that money could be advanced by way of loan from general revenues to the railways for utilisation on projects of a developmental nature. The railways will pay interest on this loan to the general revenues at the average rate chargeable to Commercial Departments.

On the one hand, the financial position of the railway undertaking in the years to come may not be so buoyant as to justify any increase in its obligations to general revenues,

may there may be some justification for a decrease therein so that more resources become available for expansion of rail facilities. On the other hand, the needs of general revenues for additional resources during the second Five Year Plan, which will be of a greater magnitude than the first Five Year Plan, cannot be ignored in the larger interests of the country. The House will thus appreciate that the recommendations of the Committee seek to achieve a balance between the needs of the railways and the needs of the general revenues.

I commend the Resolution to the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Resolution moved:

"That this House approves the recommendations contained in the Report of the Committee appointed to review the rate of dividend at present payable by the Railway Undertaking to General Revenues as well as other ancillary matters in connection with the separation of Railway Finance from General Finance, which was presented to Parliament on 30th November, 1954."

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair** (Quilon—cum—Mavelikkara): I beg to move:

That in the original resolution, the following be added at the end:

"with the modifications:

- (a) that the present rate of dividend in Recommendation No. 2 being too exorbitant, only 3½ per cent. dividend need be paid for the next five years; and
- (b) that in Recommendation No. 7, it is necessary to earmark a minimum of rupees four crores instead of rupees three crores for expanding the scope of amenities to include 'all users of Railway transport'."

**Shri Damodara Menon** (Kozhikode) I beg to move:

That in the original resolution, the following be added at the end:

"with the modifications:

- (a) that the rate of dividend at present payable by the Railway Undertaking to the General Revenues be reduced to 3.18 per cent. of the capital at charge and the minor adjustments suggested by the Committee in the calculation of the capital at charge and arriving at the total of the dividend payable to Government be not accepted; and
- (b) that instead of rupees three crores, a minimum of rupees five crores be earmarked per annum on the account of the development fund."

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** (Visakhapatnam): Sir, I had gone out on some urgent business; I request I may be allowed to move my amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He may.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I beg to move:

That for the original resolution, the following be substituted:

"That this House having examined the recommendations contained in the Report of the Committee appointed to review the rate of dividend at present payable by the Railway Undertaking to General Revenues as well as other ancillary matters in connection with the separation of Railway Finance from General Finance, which was presented to Parliament on 30th November, 1954, recommends that a further investigation be made into the manner in which depreciation is sought to be charged by the Railways and also recommends the rationalisation of freights on the principle of one rate for one industry everywhere in the country."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Amendments moved:

(1) That in the original resolution, the following be added at the end:

"with the modifications:

- (a) that the present rate of dividend in Recommendation No.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker ]

2 being too exorbitant, only 3½ per cent. dividend need be paid for the next five years; and

- (b) that in Recommendation No. 7, it is necessary to earmark a minimum of rupees four crores instead of rupees three crores for expanding the scope of amenities to include, 'all users of Railway transport'."

(2) That in the original resolution, the following be added at the end:

"with the modifications:

- (a) that the rate of dividend at present payable by the Railway Undertaking to the General Revenues be reduced to 3.18 per cent. of the capital at charge and the minor adjustments suggested by the Committee in the calculation of the capital at charge and arriving at the total of the dividend payable to Government be not accepted; and
- (b) that instead of rupees three crores, a minimum of rupees five crores be earmarked per annum on the account of the development fund."

(3) That for the original resolution, the following be substituted:

"That this House having examined the recommendations contained in the Report of the Committee appointed to review the rate of dividend at present payable by the Railway Undertaking to General Revenues as well as other ancillary matters in connection with the separation of Railway Finance from General Finance, which was presented to Parliament on 30th November, 1954, recommends that a further investigation be made into the manner in which depreciation is sought to be charged by the Railways and also recommends the rationalisation of freights on the principle of one rate for one

industry everywhere in the country."

The time allotted for this motion is six hours. This is a Resolution and according to our rules a Member can take fifteen minutes, though the Mover himself in this case has not taken so much. So, I would lay it as 20 minutes for Leaders of Groups and 15 minutes for the others.

**Shri Damodara Menon:** Those who have moved amendments may be given more time.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am sure every hon. Member will get a chance to speak.

**Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West):** I would like to express my views on the Report of the Railway Convention Committee. Though I was a Member of this Committee, I have in several instances differed from the majority of the Committee. There is a convention, no doubt healthy, that the report of the Committee should, as far as possible be unanimous and no Minute of Dissent should be appended. I, therefore, could not append a Minute of Dissent, and I had to agree to your suggestion, you being the Chairman of this Committee, that I could express my views on the floor of the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member need not put it that way. He can say now whatever he wants to. Whatever transpires in a Committee is supposed to be confidential, in order to avoid comment outside. Hon. Members serving in the Committee would be embarrassed if what all transpires in a Committee is given out. After all this Report has to be accepted by the other Members of the House; so he can say whatever he wants. He started with a preamble that he was not in a position to append a Minute of Dissent. He can express here whatever he wanted to.

**Shri Tulsidas:** I have always been feeling that the accounts of the Railways have not been kept in a commercial manner, or proper accounting

manner. Whenever any expenditure, particularly of a capital nature is incurred, it is added to the capital at charge, while a number of items of expenditure which can normally be considered as capital expenditure is debited to the Depreciation Fund. As the Railways have to expand, the expenditure on the new works are added to the capital at charge. This expenditure does not earn anything, while on the other hand the Railways have to pay to the general revenues the 4 per cent. interest on the capital expenditure. Sir, it has been said that the general revenues have to borrow the money and finance the railways and therefore, the railways must pay for the borrowings from the general revenues. I would in this connection like to bring to the notice of the House that there are several undertakings of Government, different corporations, and all these corporations have capital which is called a block capital where no fixed rate of interest is allowed to be charged, while on the working capital or the loan capital, the general revenues charge a rate of interest which is higher than what the railways can pay.

The fundamental fact is that in the Railway Undertakings there is no block capital. All the capital is loan capital. Therefore, the railways have to pay 4 per cent. on the entire block or loan capital. The Railway Convention Committee of 1949 made a specific recommendation that there should not be block capital as well as loan capital. It is possible that the total block amount of the railways is to the extent of Rs. 1,000 crores and the loan capital is Rs. 900 crores. Therefore, the Rs. hundred crores is block capital. I refer to that point because this Rs. 100 is not block capital as it is termed to be, but loan capital.

You say that an undertaking has got a fixed capital of one thousand crores. No undertaking can be run when the amount of capital is financed to the extent of 90 per cent. of loan capital. Therefore, I consider that the accounting is not in a way as it

ought to be, because it does not give us a clear picture. I do not plead for the railways because I have so many things to say against the railways' working. But I do like to say that the accounts of the railways have to be put on a proper commercial basis.

There is another aspect with regard to the Depreciation Fund. Even the Railway Convention Committee of 1949 in their observations pointed out that the Depreciation Fund is not really a depreciation fund in the sense it is understood. They have said that the Depreciation Railway Fund should be replaced by a renewal replacement reserve fund. Here again, according to the information the Depreciation Fund is calculated on the basis of the replacement and renewals for future years. And, it is provided accordingly. Otherwise, on the basis of the diminishing effect of the capital assets the Depreciation Fund has no comparison whatsoever. Now, if you compare the Rs. 900 crores as the block which stands today, considering the income-tax the normal depreciation whether it is on the buildings or other assets, it cannot be more than 5 per cent. That is what I understand. The railways also should consider that on the average of the total block it cannot be more than 5 per cent. I can see that 5 per cent. may be depreciation for the year. In calculating 5 per cent. of the total block, the minimum depreciation should be calculated at nothing less than Rs. 45 crores. We have been calculating Rs. 30 crores uptill now. The recommendation of the Committee is that the Depreciation Fund should now be added over and that it should be Rs. 35 crores. It is also the view of the Railway Ministry that the block of the railways will go up within the next five years to the extent of Rs. 1,200 crores. Even if you take into consideration five per cent. on the increased block, even then it will come to about Rs. 11 crores as an average for the next five years and it will be nothing less than Rs. 41 crores if it is added to the Rs. 30 crores that has been calculated uptill now. Therefore, what I maintain is that this

[Shri Tulsidas ]

Depreciation Fund should not be considered as a Depreciation Fund but should be named as "Renewals and Replacement Fund", because, otherwise it gives a completely different picture.

Now, coming to the question of over-capitalisation, the Committee has decided and it says that the general revenue is definitely giving a favour for the railways and that the average borrowing rate should be charged on this over-capitalisation. What is the total amount of over-capitalisation according to the Committee? It is Rs. 100 crores. This over-capitalisation is not on account of tangible assets, but is due to several expenditure which had to be incurred in earlier stages and it is also on account of taking over of different railways for which payments may be made from here with regard to the difference in exchange rates. There are no tangible assets of Rs. 100 crores. Even on this Rs. 100 crores, the railways have to pay 3.18 per cent. That again is a burden on the railways.

When I was pointing out this, it has been said that I am trying to reduce the burden on the railways. My point is that the railways must show that the accounting is done on a proper basis. We can then judge whether the railways are working efficiently or not and whether the community at large benefits from this undertaking. Otherwise, the picture is dark and we do not actually know how the railways are working. On the one hand the railways have to go on paying four per cent. on the entire block of the loan capital and also including the intangible assets, plus, according to the figures given there will be a deficit for the next five years and the railways will have to debit that deficit again to the funds which are there, so that at the end of the five years almost all the funds will be wiped off. That will be the state of affairs as it looks. I do not know how any undertaking can run without any funds available

after 5 years except the depreciation fund which will be to the extent of Rs. 35 crores. At the end of 5 years all other funds will be more or less wiped off. What will be the effect of this? The effect will be, the hon. Railway Minister will come forward either in the next Budget or afterwards to increase the railway fares and freight rates. What will happen when the railway freights and fares are increased? The burden will be on the community. Railways are not existing merely for getting more revenue; they work on the public utility basis. Railways should not be considered merely as a source of revenue. If the railway freights and fares are increased then the position is that, not only it will put a burden on the community at large, but will also have its effect on the different industries which will have to pay more for getting the raw material. They will have to pay more for coal and automatically our manufacturing costs will go up. I feel that if production costs are going to mount up in our manufacturing industries, then it is bound to have an effect on the entire community.

Besides, we are today on the threshold of increasing our industrial potential in the country. We are also trying to develop our foreign markets. If the railway freights go up the whole economy will have a deterrent effect. Therefore, unless and until the railway accounts are kept in a proper manner, one cannot judge whether there is any justification for increasing the railway freights or the railway fares. Unfortunately the picture is given to us that railways must get more resources by increasing the fares and freight rates, otherwise they will not be able to balance the budget. That is why my point is that unless this accounting is done on a proper basis as is being done in whatever Government undertaking or any other undertaking in this country, unless the accounting is done in a similar manner, the fact whether the railways require increased railway fares or increased freight rates cannot be properly judged.

Now, I would like to make a suggestion. The railways will have nearly Rs. 900 crores of block account capital-at-charge at the end of the five year period. I suggest that a technical valuation survey may be made and thereby the total capital block of the railways may be converted into the block capital. After that if you want to reduce it by whatever total depreciation which has been provided upto now, then that much reduction can be put down from the total block. The effect will be that the total capital-at-charge or the total loan which the general revenues gave to the railways will be reduced, in my opinion, to the extent of 50 per cent. If it is reduced to the extent of 50 per cent. then the general revenues, naturally, will lose by way of interest. But, in any undertaking a shareholder does not expect a dividend every year when that undertaking is not making any profit. The shareholder expects profit when the undertaking has a surplus. I am prepared to agree that if the railways earn after paying the interest to the general revenues on the loan capital, then whatever surplus is left even after providing for Depreciation Fund, 50 per cent. of that total surplus may be given over to the general revenues as shareholders. If that is done, then the accounting procedure will be on the proper basis.

Here, we have been now faced with a situation that if general revenues do not get the interest from the railways, then the general revenues will also lose that much revenue so that the general revenues will have to consider whether any further taxation will have to be put on the community in order to balance the General Budget. Now, that is the problem. But, here, as I explained, by the method which I have suggested, there will not be very much reduction. If you see the other process, what is happening here? The general revenues will go on getting interest from the railways, but, on the other hand, all the funds will be going down and we will go on paying the general

revenues by ways and means in the capital expenditure and the capital-at-charge will go on increasing. I do not know how this process will ever apply if the Railway Convention Committee of 1949 felt that this was the proper method to adopt. But according to the figures given and according to the opinion of the Railway Minister then, for the next five year period, that is, 1950-55, there was a great scope of the railways incurring surplus and that is why they have continued to have the present manner of accounting. But according to the figures given now, the next five year period is such that the railways are not going to make any surplus. There is bound to be deficits and if that is so, is it not the proper time at this stage to have the railway accounting made on a proper basis? The future five years are going to be such that we will not have a surplus, but, on the contrary, we will have a deficit. As I explained, I feel that with the committee's decision, a situation has arisen that the railways will have to increase the railway freight and fares. We have got today the Railway Rates Committee. There is also a tribunal. The railway rates have to be maintained on a basis which will not be a burden either on the transport or on other industries or on the community at large. I am afraid that there has been a great dissatisfaction with the way in which this Committee has been functioning and I feel that unless the railways are also co-ordinated with the expansion of the country, with the economy of the country, the economy of the country will not be co-ordinated properly, because, on the one hand we want to increase industrial production and on the other hand any increase in rates will be an added burden. Therefore, I suggest that whenever any change in the railway structure is made, it should be properly looked into from this point of view—namely, that the economy of the country as a whole must function in a proper manner. I have made my points and I would like the House to consider them carefully. I know the Deputy-Speaker may not be very happy with the suggestions that

[Shri Tulsidas ]

I have made, but I have ventured to make them.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is exactly what I wanted the hon. Member to guard against!

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** It is appropriate that this very important debate should have been initiated by my hon. friend, Shri Tulsidas who has worked on this Joint Select Committee on the continuance of the Railway Separation Convention of 1924 and the subsequent provisions thereof. Shri Tulsidas is a hard-boiled businessman, and very naturally his attempt, as far as his arguments were concerned, has been to examine whether the financial health of the railways is sound, whether the prospects in the immediate future are bright, and he has given sound answers to these questions. Not being a businessman, I will not be able to pursue that line of argument beyond certain limits. With your permission, I propose to approach this question from a different angle altogether. You were the distinguished Chairman of this very important Committee consisting of estimable colleagues of this House and also from the other House. As one who has worked with you on a number of committees, Joint Select Committees and statutory committees, I quite realise the able manner, and the alacrity, with which you are able to obtain information by cross-examining witnesses, etc. I am rather pained to make a statement, and I hope the House will bear with me on this point. The report of the Committee covers every nook and corner of the railway administration, but not even half a dozen sittings were held by this Committee to dispose of this very important question. I am not trying to cast any aspersion on the ability or integrity of the personnel or on the procedure of the Committee, especially when you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, were the Chairman at the Committee and, as I said, I have worked with you on a number of committees. But my regret is that the technical competence of this

Committee to go into the various ramifications of the Railway Separation Convention has not been what it should have been. I would have preferred that instead of a Joint Parliamentary Committee an expert committee should have gone into this question. As you would recall, when the Railway Separation Convention was made possible in 1924, it was made on the basis of the findings of a prolonged, detailed, technical enquiry into the railway administration and finances. I am thoroughly aware of that position and I am sure you will also disagree with that point. What I am driving at is this: in all certainty, parliamentary procedure has become imperative that a Joint Select Committee of this House and of the other House should go into the question, and to make a recommendation on the basis of which my hon. friend, Shri L. B. Shastri, is to bring forward this Resolution which is on the Order Paper this morning. But I feel very strongly on this point, that the manner in which this highly intricate, financial and administrative question was disposed of even inside half a dozen sittings is certainly not what this House is entitled to, in terms of the recommendations of the Committee, and much less the country at large. I will examine textually, some of the observations of the Committee. I regret to say that the Committee had to lean very heavily upon the advice tendered and the facts submitted by the Railway Board. You were a distinguished Member of this House before the Constitution for nearly 25 years, and I remember the contribution you had made towards the elucidation of the problems of the Railway Board. Let there be no mistake: the Railway Board is an *imperium in imperio*. It has become a completely closed preserve. Whatever the attempts any Member of this House wishes to make to go deep into its ramifications or its activities, the results will not be appreciable.

I have to draw your pointed attention to paragraph 18 of the report that the Committee has submitted, in

this connection. It is on the question of what you call over-capitalisation. I will just read the passage. The language runs like this:

"The element of the over-capitalisation should be precisely assessed by the Railway Board."

I regret to say that a Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament should not have arrived at this conclusion. It is not for the Railway Board to arrive at a proper assessment whether the railway finances are over-capitalised or not. It is for the Committee and more so for this Parliament to assess whether it is a fact or it is not a fact. I made an apology for having to make this observation, because I am very much worried about the manner in which the recommendations of the Committee have been placed before this House, recommendations on the basis of which my hon. friend the Railway Minister has brought forward this Resolution. The language of the Resolution is very clear:

"...approves the recommendations contained in the Report of the Committee appointed to review the rate of dividend at present payable by the Railway Undertaking to General Revenues as well as other ancillary matters in connection with the separation of Railway Finance from General Finance...."

You are personally aware of the numerous implications of every sentence contained in this report, apart from the list of recommendations of the report itself. The result is that I feel called upon to make this sort of rather unusual approach on my part to the report of the Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament.

I next draw the pointed attention of this House to paragraph 30 of the Report in order to clinch the issue, and in order to indicate the agony which I had gone through while studying the enormous literature in relation to this subject. What does that paragraph say? This sentence is

seen at the bottom of page 14 and is continued on page 15:

"After considerable discussion the Committee came to the conclusion that in the event of the Development Fund not being in a position to meet the programme of expenditure chargeable to that Fund, from its own resources, money should be advanced from the General Revenues to the Railways for utilisation of those Projects or Works which are of a developmental nature".

This exactly, I feel, is the burden of the speech made by Shri Tulsi-das. A series of permutations and combinations has been gone through to arrive at a position in which the hon. Minister of Railways and Transport has channelled the figures into Depreciation Fund, Reserve Fund, Development Fund, dividend and so on and so forth. If you permit me to say so, Sir, with great respect....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members ought not to feel at all embarrassed. I have no personal interest in this matter; except saying anything personal against me—that I am indifferent or indolent or something—all other things can be said. Even indolence can be attributed to me.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I crave your indulgence to say that—and I repeat—as one who has worked with you in many statutory committees and Select Committees, I mean no reflection on you and I cannot think of making one.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let there be no embarrassment.

**The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan):** You, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, are the least indolent.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Ignorance is a thing which depends upon the degree of knowledge. My hon. friend is just looking up. So far as ignorance is concerned, I shall come to it in a minute.

**Shri Alagesan:** I said that the hon. Deputy-Speaker is the least indolent.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Then there is no quarrel between me and my hon. friend the Deputy Minister. I shall proceed.

1 P.M.

As I have said earlier, there are innumerable reasons why this particular Resolution should be brought before the House—as a Member of the Business Advisory Committee, I know those reasons. It was rushed at the last stage. I am not able to go into them all. But the fortunes of an undertaking—an undertaking of the order of Rs. 900 crores—are sought to be disposed of in this manner. I repeat that a competent technical and expert enquiry should have been conducted as far as the railway and the general finances are concerned.

Your operative recommendation is *status quo* for another five years. I have tried to draw the attention of the House to this particular recommendation. It would be found in their list of recommendations No. 18 (para. 37). The Ministry of Railways should submit a review of the general working of the railways during these five years to the next Contention Committee for their consideration. In other words, it is a *carte blanche* to the Railway Board to carry on for another full five years, as it has been carrying on the administration of the railway system of India all along. I regret that that this has been done in the manner in which it has been done. I know that this hon. House has an opportunity to discuss the various administrative and financial questions relating to this great utility undertaking of our country every year at the time when the demands for railways are discussed. This is a question for the experts; this ought not to be disposed of in the manner in which it is sought to be done. Coming to my own amendment, I would like to go on in a more detailed manner.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is the House to understand that the hon. Member wants that before the Convention Committee sits—a Committee of both the Houses of Parliament—and goes into the matter, there should be a detailed investigation by an expert committee so as to enable this Convention Committee to come to an independent judgment apart from the facts placed before it by the Railway Board by way of memoranda, etc.?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** That is the main point. These are complicated and highly difficult questions and the time and the technical skill at the disposal of the Select Committees are not equal to the task. That is the main burden of my argument. You, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, will not misunderstand what I have said; I have given an assurance that I have no aspersions to cast upon anybody, but I have liberty to point this out: and make a general statement as to my dissatisfaction about the manner in which this Committee has referred to this matter in para. 37. Now, I come to my amendment.

Here, I have got a statement. If I am wrong in any material respect, my hon. friends, the hon. Minister and the hon. Deputy Minister, will correct me. Let us see the structure of freights. That was the point which my hon. friend Shri Tulsidas Kilachand referred to generally. The freight on movement of coal from Asansol to Calcutta—a distance of 125 miles from the Raniganj coalfields—is Rs. 5-7-0; from Dhanbad to Calcutta—a distance of 161 miles—the freight is Rs. 7/-. From Adra to the same place, a distance of 177 miles, the freight is Rs. 7-11-0. That is one thing which I would like the hon. Members to remember. Now, I will give you two sets of rates, or rather freights—one to Bombay from these three areas, namely, Asansol, Dhanbad and Adra, and the other to Ahmedabad and Baroda from the same places. From Asansol to Bombay the freight is Rs. 18-3-0 and the total mileage is 1,218 miles; from Asansol to Ahmedabad—a distance of 1,197 miles, if

is Rs. 20-3-0. From Asansol to Baroda, a distance of 1,192 miles, it is Rs. 20-3-0. In other words, Ahmedabad and Baroda pay a higher rate for lesser mileage than Bombay. Lest it should be stated that I am taking isolated instances, I would like to give two more sets of examples. From Dhanbad to Bombay—a distance of 1,180 miles—the freight is Rs. 18-3-0; from Dhanbad to Baroda—a distance of only 1,155 miles—the freight is Rs. 19-12-0, and from Dhanbad to Ahmedabad—a distance of 1,160 miles—the freight is Rs. 19-14-0. Let me compare the rates as far as Indore is concerned, so that the illustration will be general and apply to the whole country.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Do all these arise out of this? Is it open to the Railway Convention Committee to go into these matters and say that there ought to be a single uniform rate for one trade and so on and so forth? They may be very relevant in the discussion on the Railway Budget.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** There is a general impression from the report of the Committee, even though it is not stated specifically as such, that there should be an upward revision of rates and fares.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No, no. The Committee was evidently anxious to avoid making any such suggestions and creating any such impression. What is the paragraph?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I refer to paragraph 23. I will not labour that point, now that you have made your suggestion. But my two main considerations in this regard are as follows. The finances of the railways, as stated even in this report, are not very encouraging. They are problematic. The suggestion to increase the contribution by Rs. 5 crores certainly involves increase in the rates and fares so that the whole thing may increase from Rs. 30 crores to Rs. 35 crores.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He evidently refers to paragraph 14 on page 7. I would take him to the last few lines.

"This shortfall (of Rs. 31 crores) could be made up partly by a moratorium in respect of the payment of dividend to the General Revenues... and partly by minor adjustments in fares and freights."

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Minor adjustments mean minor adjustments in relation to the overall necessity of additional Rs. 5 crores.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He will kindly read further.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** It reads:

"They, however, stated that this would leave no funds to be appropriated to the Development fund for financing development expenditure during the next five years unless the tariff rates were raised generally or the quantum of the dividend liability was substantially reduced by bringing down the rate of dividend."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is the case of the Railway Board.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** That is why I say that the whole structure of railway finances is based upon the general health of the economy of the country. The various items concerning this can be brought under two broad categories—fares and freights—which are able to provide the sinews of finance for the Railway Administration.

My point is this. I am very deeply concerned about the question of rationalisation of freights and fares, particularly freights, which has not been attempted. This very morning my hon. friend, Shri Alagesan answered a question relating to the work of the Railway Rates Tribunal. When asked whether there was any reference to that Tribunal on this point, he answered in the negative. When asked further, he said that this question was under contemplation. But, this has been under contemplation for a number of years. Apparently the Railway Board and the Railway Ministry are not able to—I would not say they are unwilling arrive at a deci-

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

sion on this. This point was mentioned by my hon. friend, Shri Tulsidas.

**Shri Alagesan:** I did not say that we intended to entrust the Railway Rates Tribunal with the work of undertaking a review. But it is proposed to undertake such a review. I said so.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But it is not through this agency.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Here are two mechanisms available to the Railway Board. "The Tribunal has not much work", these are the words used by him. Why can they not continuously review the freight structure in terms of the economic, industrial and other conditions? Why should petitions be made to the Tribunal? Why can they not have a continuous process of reviewing having regard to the economic and industrial tempo of the land?

**Shri Alagesan:** It shows that there is nothing much wrong with the freights structure.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** My hon. friend has given me the point. It is thoroughly chaotic. There is no consistency in the rates and fares fixed. That is why I quoted the figures from station to station, but I do not want to waste the time of the House.

**Shri L. B. Shastri:** Does Dr. Lanka Sundaram consider it advisable for the Tribunal to deal with this question? Because, that is more or less a quasi-judicial body and the cases referred to it have been about the propriety of the rates. If any committee has to consider this matter, it cannot certainly be the Railway Rates Tribunal.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** My answer would be very simple. The Railway Rates Tribunal waits for complaints to be made. If my hon. friend the Railway Minister does not want it to deal with the question of rationalisation of freights, let him appoint another body. The Tribunal is a statutory body, and there is an obligation to maintain that unless we amend the constitution. But what I am urging is the urgent ne-

cessity of rationalisation of freights, for without that the tempo of industrialisation will be affected and matters under the Five Year Plan will not be properly handled by the Government in the coming years.

Having said this I would like to make two other observations. I am not happy that the Joint Committee was unable to arrive at any—what you call—reasoned conclusion whether the Railways are a commercial undertaking or a public utility undertaking.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** They said it is a combination of both.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Because my whole argument is this. I say very seriously and sincerely it is the type of manipulation of accounts—manipulation in the general sense, not in the defalcatory sense—the channeling of all funds into various pockets and their re-grouping; and until and unless you arrive at the conclusion whether they are a public utility concern or a commercial concern you will not be able to lay down policies which will solve the problems.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is the view of the hon. Member?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** It is a public utility, pure and simple. Take the other things. Telephones are a public utility. Posts are a public utility. If I post a letter to Ghaziabad or to Dhanushkodi there is no difference.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Therefore, any amount of deficit can be allowed?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I am only drawing a main parallel. These are public utility undertakings, and this House must pronounce itself on the point.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No question of balancing the budget? It may end in loss, and the general tax-payer must go on paying?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** He has paid. If I can draw a comparison, under Sir Andrew Clow for a period of years the Railways never paid any dividend to general revenues, and—I am speaking off-hand—about Rs. 60 crores were written off.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does he suggest to the House to do that?

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I am not satisfied with the milk-and-water recommendation or conclusion reached by the Committee, that it is a combination of both. I want to have an opportunity of saying that it is a public utility, and I hope I am given that right.

Secondly, on the question of dividend rate, I think four per cent. is too high. I would rather say three per cent. is just about the appropriate rate.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There are so many minuses there.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** I am coming to it. I have pointed out paragraph 30 of the Report wherein it is said that in case the railways are unable to pay, the general revenues should be again asked to pay. Why these cross-movements from the railways to the general revenues and from the general revenues to the Railways?

I think the House is entitled to express its very clear opinion on this matter, but the amendment is only for raising a discussion. I will not be willing to force a division on this point, because I have always understood that amendments are for focusing attention on any vital issue involved as the particular Member who puts down the amendments wants them to be understood.

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair:** I have sponsored a two-pronged amendment to the original Resolution. One relates to Recommendation No. 2. I consider that four per cent. is too exorbitant and only 3½ per cent dividend need be paid for the next five years. The second part of the amendment concerns amenities to passengers. The amount that has been allotted for this purpose in the past was only Rs. 3 crores, and I am suggesting that it may be raised to Rs. 4 crores.

To a certain extent my arguments have been touched upon by earlier

speakers. I also feel that the recommendations of the Railway Convention Committee are not satisfactory. The tall claims made by them that they have taken into consideration all aspects of the railway services cannot also be accepted in the light of the recommendations made by the Committee. The recommendations of the Committee give me the impression that they conceive of the railway services as a milch-cow got on hire which should not be fed too much but which should be kept on starvation rations and milked as often as possible, and milked dry.

The recommendation on page 8 brings out the real attitude of the Committee to the Railways. They say:

"The General Tax-payer is the owner and sole shareholder of the Railway Undertaking and as such would expect a return not only to meet the interest obligation on the capital invested but also a reasonable dividend thereon".

This attitude leaves no doubt as to how the railways have been conceived of by the Committee. It is not conceived of as a public utility concern at all. It is conceived of, at best, as a money-making machine.

The arguments advanced also are very funny. An argument advanced is that the railways would have to pay a higher rate of interest if they float a loan in the open market, a higher rate of interest than the rate of dividend actually paid by them to general revenues. That is the argument advanced. It is a strange argument, advanced in a Shylockian manner and not in a reasonable manner; an argument which no Government can adopt towards its own railways or to its own people.

Another argument that has been advanced is that the railways have been paying Rs. 7 crores over and above the normal interest charges during the past five years. That should not be a reason to extort more

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair]

money from the railways or to continue the same interest, especially when they are working at a loss.

The Railway Board has declared that there would be a short-fall of Rs. 31 crores if interest at the original rate of 4 per cent. has to be paid. The suggestions given at page 7 to cover up the deficit are also not quite acceptable. As you yourself, Sir, have read out the portion, I will only refer to the earlier portion where they say:

“A review of the financial prospects of the Railway Undertaking for the next five years on the basis of the present rates and fares furnished by the Railway Board disclosed that if the Railways were to continue to pay dividend at 4 per cent. during the next five years after meeting all working expenses and providing adequate contribution to the Depreciation Reserve Fund, there would be a short-fall of Rs. 31 crores during that period. This short-fall, the Railway Board hope, could be made up partly by a moratorium in respect of the payment of dividend to the General Revenues on new lines during the development stage and partly by minor adjustments in fares and freights, without having recourse to a general increase in them.”

There are two suggestions. The first is moratorium. That only puts off things and enhances the dead weight of the final loan, and postpones the evil day to a later date. As regards adjustment in freights, any adjustment cannot serve the purpose. It cannot be a decrease in the fares or freight. It can only be an adjustment to increase it. Naturally it is not fair that we should increase our fares and freight when there is general economic depression in the country and money is scarce. Any attempt at adjustment by way of increase in freights and fares cannot

be tolerated by the people. Hence, the only reasonable course which appeals to me is to reduce the overall interests by Rs. 6½ crores every year or to bring down the rate of interest by one-fourth. That has also been the suggestion thrown out by Dr. Lanka Sundaram towards the close of his speech though he did not bring forward an amendment. Yet, I feel that the general revenues have a claim on the railways. It cannot be ignored that they are paying 3.17 per cent. interest now and they may have to pay something more later on. Therefore, instead of three per cent, I have suggested 3½ per cent. If the general tax-payer as owner and sole shareholder wants to extract anything more, it will only kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

A comparative study of the British Railways with the Indian Railways shows that during the war period, the private companies got only 3.75 per cent. interest on the huge capital they had invested in the British Railways. The companies got only £ 43 million for an investment of £ 1148 millions. During the past few years, the British Government is paying a very heavy subsidy to maintain the original rate of remuneration to the private companies on the basis of the second Agreement in 1941, which still holds good. The British Exchequer is shelling out £ 15 to 20 million every year to maintain the Railway service. It is at such a time that our Government comes forward and says that the railways should not only fulfil their obligations by way of interest, but also contribute substantively to run their Second Five Year Plan. I cannot understand this; nor can I appreciate it. We demand that the Government of India should not behave like a money lender and a village money lender at that. Even if the rate of dividend is fixed at 3½ per cent, even if we concede that the average minimum rate of interest will be 3.18 per cent for the next 5 years, there will be 32 per cent. as a dividend over and above the rate of interest for

general revenues. To raise the bogey of the tax-payer is futile in India because the vast majority of the people of India do not pay much of a tax except perhaps the sales tax which is generally considered to be a curse. So far as the common Indian citizen is concerned, he would be happy even if the tax-payer pays something more, provided his fares are not increased.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

Another weighty reason for lowering the rate of interest or dividend is the steady running out or liquidation of the assets of the railways. As has been pointed by the hon. Member Shri Tulsidas, the Reserve funds are running out. They had an opening balance of Rs. 122,82,85,000 in 1952-53. The closing balance of that fund in 1954-55 is estimated to be Rs. 98,16,17,000. In two years, about Rs. 24,66,68,000 have been swallowed up. The Railway Development Fund had an opening balance of Rs. 22,47,65,000 in 1952-53 and the closing balance in 1954-55 is estimated to be Rs. 13,66,30,000. Another sum of Rs. 8,81,35,000 have run out. On the whole about Rs. 33,50,00,000 have been used up from the reserves during the last 2 or three years. In the future years, it is quite natural and it is also admitted by the Railway Board and the Committee that the claim on the reserves would be of a higher order. If this House insists upon getting a 4 per cent. dividend, as has been pointed out by Shri Tulsidas, there will be no reserve at all for the Railways. Hence, I plead that the rate may be reduced to 3½ per cent. Of course, I have no objection if it is reduced still further. But, I do not think in the overall interests of the general finances, it can be done.

Another alteration which I plead for before this House is to raise the minimum allotment for amenities to passengers or to all users of railway transport, as it is called now. Originally, it was fixed at Rs. 3 crores. We know that a number of new lines have been started under the First

Five Year Plan and another 1500 miles of new lines are contemplated under the Second Five Year Plan. In spite of the fact that the overall mileage is expanding, the minimum allotment under this head has not expanded. That is not fair. Then, again, the Railway Board has recommended and the Committee has accepted that other items such as putting up goods sheds, platforms for passengers, and other items of work should also be added on to it. On page 12, there is a very funny remark, if I may be permitted to say so. It is said:

"The Committee considered the suggestion of the Railway Board that the scope of amenities to be provided may also, in future, include all 'users of railway transport'; such as improvement to goods sheds, loading and unloading platforms, waiting sheds for the trading public, etc. They understand that such an extension of the scope of this Fund will not in any way impair the progress in improving the amenities to passengers for which a provision of Rs. 3 crores per annum was earmarked by the 1949 Convention Committee."

It is very strange how the Committee was made to understand that it would not affect the amenities to passengers, even when other items are added on to it. It is a commonplace dictum of logic, as well as of mathematics that the part is lesser than the whole. Here I am told, the House is told and the Committee has been told by the Railway Board that even if new items are added, there would not be any difference in the case of amenities for passengers. That cannot be. Therefore, on two grounds, I plead that the minimum allotments for amenities to passengers must be increased. One is on the ground that the overall mileage has been increased and will be increased by another 1,500 miles during the next five years. The second ground is that other items, such as goods sheds, loading and unloading platforms, etc., are being added. There-

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair]

fore, I plead that this sum of Rs. 3 crores may be increased to Rs. 4 crores. I have no objection to accept the amendment tabled by Shri Damodara Menon saying that it may be raised to Rs. 5 crores. That would not be too much because there are two items under which increase has to be made. That can be accepted as a fair standard. But, if this House thinks that it would be too much, at least a minimum of Rs. 4 crores may be set apart for amenities to all kinds of users of the railway transport.

Bringing forth these amendments to the notice of the House, I conclude.

**Mr. Chairman:** I call upon Shri R. D. Misra.

**Shri Damodara Menon:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Deputy-Speaker, before you, said that Movers of amendment would be called before other speakers are called. I am the last Mover. There were three Movers of amendments. Therefore, I hope you will give me a chance.

**Mr. Chairman:** I shall give him the next chance,

**श्री आर० डी० मिश्र (जिला बुलन्दशहर) :**  
रंलवे कनवेंशन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट देखकर मुझे बड़ा अफसांस हुआ। उसका कारण यह है कि सन् २४ में यह निश्चय किया गया, कि रंलवे का और जनरल फाइनेंस का हिसाब अलग अलग रखा जाय और यह तै किया गया कि रंलवे कितना रुपया जनरल फाइनेंस को दे। इस के बाद बहुत सी कमेटीयां हुईं। सन् ४६ में पार्लियामेंट की एक कमेटी नियुक्त की गयी। उसने यह निश्चय किया कि पांच साल के बाद हिसाब देखा जाय कि कितना रुपया मिलना चाहिए। उसके मुताबिक इस साल भी एक कमेटी बनायी गयी और उस कमेटी के लिए १२ तारीख को हमारे हाउस ने मंम्बर नामजद किये और १४ तारीख को काउंसिल आफ स्टैंड्स से नामजद हो गये। १२ तारीख को कमेटी बनने के बाद उसका कोई काम नहीं हुआ। पहली अक्त्बर को वह कमेटी बुलायी गई उस दिन उन्होंने सिर्फ एक क्वेश्चनय

पैचार किया और रंलवे बोर्ड से कह दिया कि इनके जवाबत दे और अपना एक मैमोरैंडम तैयार करके कमेटी को दे और फाइनेन्शाल कमिश्नर से भी एक रिपोर्ट मांगी। उसके बाद कमेटी की बैठक १२, १३ और १४ नवम्बर को हुई। हमारी पार्लियामेंट १२ नवम्बर से शुरू हुई है। लिहाजा इस कमेटी के मेम्बरान इससे दो तीन दिन पहले आ गये होंगे। और तीन दिन में उस कमेटी ने इस काम का खत्म कर दिया। इस रिपोर्ट से मालूम होता है कि रंलवे बोर्ड ने कोई मैमोरैंडम कमेटी को दिया था और फाइनेन्शाल कमिश्नर ने भी कोई रिप्ट दिया था। लेकिन हमको कोई मैमोरैंडम नहीं सप्लाई किया गया जिससे हम पता लगा सकें कि जो सिफारिश कमेटी ने की है वह मैमोरैंडम से निकलती है या नहीं। हम अपनी राय कैसे कायम करें। यह रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने है। पांच चार बातें रंलवे बोर्ड व फाइनेन्शाल कमिश्नर की हमारे सामने रख दीं। उनको हम कैसे मालूम करें कि वह कहां तक सही है। मैं यह तरीका बरा गलत समझता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरान को वह डाक्यूमेंट न सप्लाई किये जायें जो कि कमेटी को दिये गये थे। हम कैसे अपनी राय कायम करें और साबं कि कितना रुपया रंलवे को देना चाहिए। पहली शिकायत तो मेरी यह है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि रंलवे का इतना कम्प्लीकेटेड हिसाब है। उसे जानने के लिए एक कमेटी मुकररे की गयी ताकि वह संसद को सही मशविरा दे कि कितना रुपया जनरल फाइनेंस को रंलवे से मिलना चाहिए। इस काम में जनता का जितना समय लगा हुआ है उतना लाभ भी होता है या नहीं होता है। लेकिन इस कमेटी ने तीन दिन में सरसरी तौर पर रंलवे के कुल हिसाब की जांच कर ली। यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आयी। तीन दिन में तो एक छोट से दफ्तर के हिसाब की जांच करना भी मुश्किल है।

अब दीखिये कि रंलवे बोर्ड ने दो तीन मोटी मोटी बातें रख दीं वही कमेटी ने मान लीं। पहली यह कि जो चार पर सेंट अब तक लेते हैं

वही आगे पांच साल तक लिये जाइयें, और फिर कुछ दिक्कतें रख दीं कि कुछ नयी लाइनें बनानी हैं इसलिये उसमें कुछ कन्सेशन यहां मिलना चाहिए और कुछ और बातों में वहां कन्सेशन मिलना चाहिए। और कमेटी ने कह दिया कि बिल्कुल ठीक। तां एक इतने बड़े कन्सेशन के मुताल्लिक इस तरीके की रिपोर्ट पार्लियामेंट के सामने पेश हो इसमें गलत समझता हूं और मैं अपने रेलवे मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूं कि वह इसकी पूरी जांच करने की कोशिश करें। इस तरह से कमेटी की दो तीन बैठकें बुलाई जायें और फिर पांच साल के लिए मुहर लगा दी जाय यह ठीक नहीं है। मुझे रेलवे बोर्ड का कोई एंतबार नहीं है। मुझे पहले एंतबार था कि रेलवे बोर्ड कुछ काम करता है। लेकिन अब मेरी राय रेलवे बोर्ड के मुताल्लिक यह है कि वह बिल्कुल गलत जाता है। उनका हाल मुग़िलवा सल्लनत की तरह से है। कोई बात उनसे कही जाय वह सुनने के लिए तैयार ही नहीं है। इस बार मैं मैं एक मामूली सी मिसाल दूं। वैसे मैं ने रेलवे बोर्ड के बारे में कहानियां तो बहुत कुछ सुन रखी थीं लेकिन जबतक आदमी पर खुद नहीं बीतती हैं वह ठीक से नहीं समझ पाता है। मैं अपनी एक मिसाल आपको बतलाना चाहता हूं। इसी तजरबे से मैं कहता हूं कि मुझे यकीन नहीं है कि जो मैमॉरैंडम उन्होंने दिया है वह सही होगा। अपने तजरबे के बाद मैं रेलवे बोर्ड की हर चीज को शक की निगाह से देखने लगा हूं। दूध का जला छाछ को भी फूंक फूंक कर पीता हूं। इसी तरह से मैं रेलवे बोर्ड के सब कामों को शूबहे की नजर से देखता हूं। जब मैं यहां पार्लियामेंट में आया तो मैं ने चाहा कि एक एक्सप्रेस दहली-बुलन्दशहर-खुर्जा होकर चले तो अच्छा। यहां पर एक रेलवे का महकमा है। मैंने रेलवे मिनिस्टर साहब से अर्ज किया कि यह जो लाइन टूटला होती हुई कलकत्ता जा जाती है इस लाइन पर इस वक्त चार थू एक्सप्रेस गाड़ियां दहली से चलती हैं। उनका गाड़ियाबाद से खुर्जा तक कोई स्टापेज नहीं था। इन चार गाड़ियों में से कोई भी बुलन्दशहर और हापुड़ होती हुई नहीं जाती

थी। मैं ने मिनिस्टर साहब से कहा कि अगर आप इन चार गाड़ियों में से एक को डाइवर्ट कर दें ताकि वह हापुड़-बुलन्दशहर होकर जाय और बाद में, खुर्जा पर मैन लाइन में मिल जाय तो रेलवे का कोई नुकसान नहीं होगा और इससे लोगों को बहुत आराम हो जायगा। मिनिस्टर साहब ने उस मामले को रेलवे बोर्ड को रफर कर दिया। उसका यह नतीजा हुआ कि त्फान एक्सप्रेस जां कि खुर्जा और टूटला होती हुई जाती थी और जिससे कि मुसाफ़रों को बड़ा आराम था, डाइवर्ट कर दी गयी मगर वह मथुरा-आगरा होकर जानें लगी। अब आप अन्दाजा कीजिये कि इससे मुसाफ़रों को क्या फायदा हुआ और इससे रेलवे को क्या फायदा हुआ। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से कहता हूं कि वह रेलवे बोर्ड से एछें कि इस गाड़ी के मथुरा-आगरा होकर डाइवर्ट करने से दहली से कलकत्ता जाने वाले मुसाफ़रों को क्या आराम मिला और रेलवे को कितना फायदा हुआ। यह देखकर मैं ने सोचा कि अच्छा होता अगर मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को यह मामला रिप्रेजेंट न करता। यह रेलवे बोर्ड का कारनामा है।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** ये बातें तो आपको बजट के समय कहनी चाहिए।

**श्री आर० डी० मिश्र :** इस वक्त मैं इन बातों को इसलिए कहना चाहता हूं क्यों कि यह जो हमारा सामने रिपोर्ट पेश है उसमें रेलवे बोर्ड का मामला है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस हाउस ने यह पास किया कि इस हाउस के मੈम्बरो को रेलवे पास दिया जाय ताकि वे सार्व हिन्दुस्तान में सफर कर सकें। पास की कोई इंफोनीशन एक्ट में नहीं थी।

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. This is not strictly relevant. The issue is how to divide the income or the revenue. He should also remember that he will get not more than 15 minutes from 1-30. That also he has to keep in mind. Besides, this is not strictly relevant.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मैं यह सचीवट करता हूँ कि इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट का कुल बीसस हैं रेलवे बोर्ड का मैमोरेण्डम और फाइनेन्शल कीमन्तर की रिपोर्ट। मैं कहता हूँ कि ये डाकमेंट हमको सप्लाई नहीं किए गए ताकि हम जांच कर सकते। और मैं एक मिसाल दे रहा था कि रेलवे बोर्ड हमको किस तरह से मिसूहाइरेंट करता है। अगर हमको मैमोरेण्डम मिलता तो हम उसको देखते और राय कायम करते कि कितना ख़या मिलना चाहिए। लेकिन हमको यह मैमोरेण्डम नहीं मिला इससे मुझे लगता है कि कहीं हमको मिसूहाइरेंट तो नहीं किया गया है। मैं कोई शिकायत नहीं कर रहा हूँ। मैं यह बतला रहा था कि यहां मेम्बरान को रेलवे पास देने के लिए कानून पास हुआ। अब रेलवे में पासों के लिये कायदा यह है कि फर्स्ट क्लास के पास वाले के साथ दो सर्वेट एलाउड हैं और सैकंड क्लास वाले के साथ एक सर्वेट एलाउड है। रेलवे का यह रूल मौजूद था। रेलवे बोर्ड ने पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों के पासों को टिकट मना। इसके संबंध में एक सदस्य ने मिनिस्टर साहब को एक पत्र लिखा। मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह मामला रेलवे बोर्ड को रफर किया तो उन्होंने कहा कि यह पास टिकट की तरह इस्तेमाल हो सकता है।

श्री एस० एन० दास (दरभंगा—मध्य) : रेलवे बोर्ड के काम के सम्बन्ध में आप बजट के समय कह सकते हैं।

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मैं यह कहा रहा हूँ कि मिनिस्टर साहब ने पास का मामला रेलवे बोर्ड को रफर किया और उन्होंने कहा कि इस पास को टिकट के तौर पर इस्तेमाल किया जाय और जो पास बनाकर मेम्बरों को दिये गये उस पर यह लिख भी दिया गया। इस तरह से उन्होंने ला के प्रेलाफ इंटरप्रेंटेशन दिया। पार्लियामेंट ने 'पास' तो किया रेलवे बोर्ड को उसको 'टिकट' कहना उचित नहीं था। जो मैं ने मिसालें दीं वह यह बतलाने के लिए कि मुझे रेलवे बोर्ड का कौसा तजर्बा है और इसी लिए मैं कहता हूँ कि दूध का जला छाछ को भी फूंक फूंक कर पीता है। रेलवे बोर्ड के

मैमोरेण्डम की बिना पर यह रिपोर्ट आई है इसीलिए मैं इस रिपोर्ट को जरा शुबहे की निगाह से देखता हूँ।

अब यह सवाल उठता है कि जब रेलवे बोर्ड की ऐसी हालत है तो कमेटी की इस रिपोर्ट पर जो हमारे सामने है हम क्या राय दें। हमसे कहा जाता है कि हम इस रिपोर्ट को मान लें। इस रिपोर्ट को देखने से पता चलता है कि कमेटी ने दो सजेशन रखे हैं जो कि पैरा १२ में दिये गये हैं। एक तो यह है :

“(a) a small fixed percentage on the Capital-at-charge, plus sharing of profits after payment of interest.”

यानी उन्होंने एक सजेशन यह रक्खा कि सूद के देने के बाद थोड़ा सा नियत ख़या असल पर ले लिया जाए और कुछ मुनाफे में से ले लिया जाए। और दूसरा सजेशन यह रखा :

“(b) Interest on Capital, plus a levy of Income-tax as on other Government Undertakings together with or without any contribution for investment, fixed or varying.”

यानी जैसे सरकारी दूसरे व्यापारी कामों में लगे हुए रुपये का सूद तथा इन्कमटैक्स का लेवी लिया जाय और उसके बाद लगे हुए रुपये का कोई कन्ट्रीब्यूशन नियत किया हुआ था बदलता हुआ लिया जाय या नहीं लिया जाय। क्या कि प्रत्येक कमर्शियल कन्सर्न को मूल रुपये पर सूद देना पड़ता है और आमदनी पर सरकार को इन्कम टैक्स देना पड़ता है और इसके बाद हिस्सेदारों को मुनाफा या डिवीडेंड देना पड़ता है। कमर्शियल कन्सर्न अपना एकाउंट इन्कम टैक्स कानून के अनुसार ठीक-ठाक रखती हैं परन्तु रेलवे अपना हिस्सा उस कानून के मुताबिक नहीं रखती इसीलिये आम जा कर इस रिपोर्ट में यह लिखा है कि अगर कमेटी ने दूसरी तजर्बीज मानी तो रेलवे एकाउन्टिंग में बड़ी गड़बड़ी हो जायगी रेलवे बोर्ड कहता है कि हम अलग अलग हर तरह का एकाउन्ट नहीं रख सकते जिस तरह का

एकार्जिटिंग इन्कमटॅक्स एक्ट के मुताबिक कमीशियल कन्सर्न्स रखती हैं, इस से रंलवे का तमाम एकार्जिटिंग स्ट्रक्चर बदल जायगा इसीलिये इस चीज को न मानिये। क्या साहब अगर सब कमीशियल कन्सर्न्स को बिस्तर तरह से इन्कमटॅक्स के कायदे के मुताबिक अपना एकार्जिट रखना हैं तो रंलवे भी जो एक कमीशियल कन्सर्न्स हैं अपना हिसाब उस तरह क्या न रखे जैसे इन्कमटॅक्स एक्ट में चाहा गया हैं। अगर उनका हिसाब-किताब और आडिट का सिस्टम इन्कमटॅक्स के कायदे के तरीके का रहता तो हमारी यह कमेटी कुछ सही नतीजे निकाल कर एक सही रिपोर्ट इस सदन को दे सकती थी। मेरी राय में कमेटी को अपनी रिपोर्ट में रंलवे एकार्जिटिंग को ठीक तौर पर मॉन्टर करने के बारे में रंलवे बोर्ड को सबेरे सल देना चाहिये था लेकिन वह सुझाव इसमें हम नहीं पाते। वहां पर रंलवे में एकार्जिटिंग के अन्दर बड़ी गड़बड़ होती हैं। बड़े बड़े सरप्लस स्टॉक पड़े रहते हैं और दूसरी बड़ी बड़ी शिकायतें होती हैं और आबकल एक रंलवे एन्टी-कॉरप्शन कमेटी बैठती हैं जब उसकी रिपोर्ट आयेगी तब पता चलेंगा कि रंलवे में कितनी गड़बड़ होती हैं। रंलवे में हिसाब रखने का जो तरीका है वह गलत है और उन्हें ठीक से अपना हिसाब रखना चाहिये। इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में बारहवें पैज पर स्टाफ क्वार्टर्स के रेंट्स के बारे में लिखा है, आडिट ने भी इसके बारे में रंलवे बोर्ड का ध्यान दिलाया था लेकिन अभी तक रंलवे बोर्ड ने तय नहीं किया कि कितना रुपया किस से किससे का लेना चाहिये। कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बारहवें पैज पर पच्चीसवीं लाइन के करीब ऐसा दिया हुआ है :

"The Committee, however, observed from para 42 of the Audit Report, Railways, 1951 wherein pointed attention has been drawn to the inadequacy of rent realised for railway quarters. Even in the Audit Report (Railways), 1953, which was presented to Parliament on the 19th May, 1954, it was observed that the question regarding the adequacy of the

return on the expenditure incurred on residential buildings has not so far been settled by the Railway Board."

रंलवे बोर्ड ने यह काम नहीं किया। यह सभी चीजें दिखाती हैं कि काफी गड़बड़ है और इसके मुताबिक हमें ठीक तौर से जांच कर फॉसला करना चाहिये कि कितना हमको रंलवे से कंटीव्यूशन लेना चाहिये। इस तमाम हिसाब की गड़बड़ी का नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि जितनी आमदनी इस रंलवे से हम को हानी चाहिये वह नहीं हो रही है। आडिट रिपोर्ट में ऐसा लिखा गया है :

'According to the Audit Report also, the return of rent obtained on residential buildings fall short of 4 per cent. for certain classes of quarters.'

रेंट जो हम चार्ज करते हैं उसके मुताबिक रंलवे बोर्ड ने हिसाब ठीक से नहीं किया। इसी तरह दूसरी और ऐसी चीजें हैं। हिसाब ठीक है न रखने के कारण किस तरीके से हम इस नतीजे पर पहुँच सकते हैं कि रंलवे को जनरल फाइनेंसिंग के लिये कितना रुपया देना चाहिये और कितना रुपया नहीं देना चाहिये। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से अर्ज करूंगा कि आप जरा रंलवे बोर्ड को ठीक कीजिये और इससे काम जरा ढंग से लीजिये ताकि यह इस तरह की कार्यवाही न करे कि मांगों रास्ता किधर को दे किधर को। मांगें बुलन्दशहर को और दे दे आगरा को, मांगें पास और दे दे टिकट। इस तरह से इनको काम करने की इजाजत न देनी चाहिये। रंलवे का काम ठीक होना चाहिये और कमीशियल लाइन पर होना चाहिये।

श्री रघुबीर सहाय (जिला एटा-उत्तर-पूर्व व जिला बल्लार्य-पूर्व) : डिप्टी-डिप्टी के मुताबिक क्या राय है ?

श्री अरू डी० मिश्र : जो राय इस पर कमेटी ने दी है उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। जब दूसरी और कोई रिपोर्ट नहीं है तो इसको तो

[श्री आरू डी० मिश्र]

मानना ही है और इस पर बोट करना है। कमंटी की रिपोर्ट में चार परसेंट लिखा है तो उसके होते हुए हम कोई और सुझाव ऐसा नहीं दे सकते कि दो परसेंट लिया जाय या छे परसेंट लिया जाय। हाँ, अलबत्ता अगर तमाम मॉटीस्थल और सार एकाउन्ट हमारे सामने रखे जाय कि इतना कौपटल लगा और इतनी आमदनी और खर्च है तो जरूर हम कोई नतीजा निकाल सकते थे और उसकी बिना पर कह सकते थे कि तीन परसेंट लिया जाय या बिलकुल न लिया जाय, लेकिन जब कुछ मसाला हमारे सामने नहीं है तो कमंटी ने जो रिपोर्ट दी है, वह ही हमें पास करनी है और दूसरी बात हम मौजूदा सूरत में कर ही नहीं सकते। मंत्री समझ में तो इस तरीके से कमंटी बना कर उसकी रिपोर्ट पेश करना हाउस की मंजूरी के लिये महज हाउस का टाइम बर्बाद करना है और कुछ नहीं है और इस प्रकार की रिपोर्ट से हम किसी सही नतीजे पर नहीं पहुँच सकते।

**Shri Damodara Menon:** My amendment deals with two alterations that I want to make in the recommendations of this Committee. I want the rate of interest payable to the general revenues to be reduced to 3.18 per cent. The second alteration I wish to make is that the minimum contribution to the Development Fund must be increased from Rs. 3 crores to Rs. 5 crores.

The hon. Minister in his speech today stated that the Committee considered the question whether the railways should be run as an entirely public utility service, or whether any profit consideration also must come in its working. He also stated that the Committee after careful consideration had said that in the context of our country today, when development works are being undertaken, it will be necessary for us also to see that the profit motive is maintained in the working of the railways.

I understand that we are planning for a welfare State or a socialist

State, if we are to follow the statements of the Prime Minister himself. The railways are the greatest public utility service we have in this country. If we cannot make a beginning now in the matter of this public utility service and run it entirely on the basis of the utility motive, I think we shall be doing an injustice to the principles we hold so dear. However, that is an academic question.

Even granting that during the period of the Plan, when huge development works are undertaken, it must be possible for us to run the railways on profit motives, I want to put it to the hon. Minister whether development of the railways also does not become part of this all-round development. Should we not find provision for the development of our railways? Should we not carry our new lines to the many places where they have not reached today? If we are planning an expansion programme for the railways, where are we to find the money for that? The money will either have to come from the profits made by the railways, or it shall have to be found by Government advancing money to the railways by way of loan. If Government are to raise the money, they may either have to borrow from the open market or from foreign sources, or they may have to raise taxation. Now, if the railways are to make the money, in view of the very grave statements made by the Railway Board, they may also have to raise the fares and freights. Both these, I think, are equal evils so far as the general public is concerned. I would say, so far as it is within the range of possibility, it must be our endeavour to see that railway fares and freights are not raised at the present stage. I do not share the misgivings of many of my hon. friends about the advice tendered by the Railway Board. I am referring to what they have stated about the result of the payment of 4 per cent. interest to the general revenues. They say that

if 4 per cent. is maintained after meeting the ordinary running expenses, and also making provision for the Depreciation Fund, the railways will have to meet with a shortfall of Rs. 31 crores during the coming five years. Now, how are we going to make up this deficit?

There is a suggestion made by the Committee that when advances are made for the construction of new lines, a moratorium in respect of interest may be made by Government. That view is also acceptable, I understand, to the Railway Board.

But even after issuing such a moratorium, the Railway Board are not quite sure that they will be able to cover all this deficit. They want some adjustment in fares and freights—I do not know what exactly that means. And they go further and say that even if all these things are done, there may not be any money for contribution to the Development Fund from the resources of the railways. Now, I am putting it to the hon. Minister and to this House whether, in view of this recommendation, and this warning given by the Railway Board, it would be fair for us to say that we must stick to this 4 per cent dividend that the Committee have recommended. Now, the usual rate of interest at which Government are borrowing is at present 3.17 per cent.; it may go up to 3.18 per cent, in the coming few years. So I have put it at 3.18 per cent on the capital at charge as the contribution of the railways to the General Revenues. That would probably give the Railways some amount of profit by which they can foot other bills.

Now, in a paragraph in the Report, the Committee have stated something about the test of remunerativeness. The Convention Committee in 1949 recommended that 4.25 per cent must be considered as proper remunerativeness so far as the Railways are concerned. Their calculation was that after deducting 4 per cent. payable to the general revenues, there must be .25 per cent. surplus, and that would be fair remunerativeness, according to them.

But the Railway Board say that it will not do; they want it to be at least 1 per cent. Now, the reduction that I have suggested will give that 1 per cent., and then the Railways, even according to the Railway Board, may be run at a remunerative rate. Therefore, apart from the considerations of profit motive or of a public utility service in general, I would suggest to the hon. Minister to accept this suggestion of mine that the rate of dividend payable to the General Revenues be reduced to 3.18 per cent.

Another suggestion I have made is regarding the Development Fund. As is apparent from the Report of the Committee, more burdens are now being placed on the Development Fund, and the Railway Board give us the warning that there may not be any contribution available to the Development Fund in the future. The Committee say that the cost of quarters for Class III servants of the railways must now be debited to the Development Fund; they also want that unremunerative operating improvement works costing more than Rs. 3 lakhs be wholly undertaken by the Development Fund. That means new burdens on the Fund. Then what will remain for improvement of the conditions of the travelling public? Even now, in almost every Budget Session, we are hearing of complaints; they are true also; the Minister knows and the House also knows. The condition of the third class passenger is very pitiable. I know that some efforts are being made; I do not want to minimise them. But more efforts must be made and there must be more money available for passenger amenities, and that has to be got from the Development Fund. Therefore, I am making the suggestion that the minimum contribution to this Fund should not be Rs. 3 crores, but Rs. 5 crores. I am sure if my suggestion regarding the reduction of the dividend payable to the general revenues is accepted by the House, there would be money enough to make a contribution of Rs. 5 crores to the Development Fund.

[Shri Damodara Menon]

Therefore, I hope that without going into the general theoretical question of a public utility service, even at the practical level, the suggestions I have made will be found acceptable to the House.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta—North—East): The Resolution before us intends to retain the *status quo* in railway finance, and my grouse against the Resolution, and against the Government, is that they betray a total lack of a real idea regarding the role of railways in a developmental economy. As far as we are concerned, we do not object, on principle, to the payment of the dividend to the general revenues, because, after all, our investment in the railways represents the State sector of capital and there is no reason why that investment should not bring in a proper return. There is, of course, something in the nature of railways which has always to be borne in mind when we try to ascertain what should be the proper return to our investment, and that is why we have to discuss from time to time resolutions of this sort that are presented before this House.

I should suggest that it is very important that we run our railways, as well as other State-sponsored undertakings, efficiently, more efficiently than is done by the average commercial concern. But there would be a difference, namely, that after all, those who are in charge of the railways or of State-sponsored undertakings are supposed to represent the interests of the people and, therefore, they would run these concerns just as efficiently as, perhaps even more efficiently than, the commercial undertakings, but, at the same time, would look after the interests of the people. It is from that point of view that we have to discuss this Resolution. That is why I say that I do not like that we should commit ourselves to the payment of a certain rate of dividend for the next five years. Five years may be a short span of time, but the next

five years are a very crucial period in the history of this country, because, after all, Government say they are going to have the second Five Year Plan and in the context of that Plan, the role of the railways will naturally be very much more expanded than it has been so far. So I do not see why we should pin ourselves down to the obligation of paying to the general revenues from the railways this 4 per cent as dividend. It may be that on one occasion the railways might pay even much more as dividend; on another occasion, it might pay much less, 2 per cent; or, as has happened before, there have been years when the Railways could not pay anything to the general revenues. So we have to look at this matter a little more comprehensively with the interests of the country at large uppermost in our mind. And I say from that point of view, I do not like this commitment; I do not like our being pinned down to this payment of 4 per cent as dividend.

As has been pointed out by previous speakers, this commitment has already landed us in some kind of a risk because, I find in page 7 of the Railway Convention Committee, which has been given to us, certain observations made by the Railway Board, which are repeated by the Committee. These observations suggest that under the rather euphemistic designation of 'minor adjustments in fares and freights', there is perhaps going to be some kind of tampering. There is going to be an increase in fares and freights. This is stated almost categorically towards the end of page 7. It seems the Railway Board made this observation:

"They, however, stated that this would leave no funds to be appropriated to the Development Fund".

That is to say, if 4 per cent dividend is paid, after that there would be no funds left to be appropriated to the Development Fund for financing development expenditure during the next five years, "unless the tariff

rates were raised generally or the quantum of the dividend liability was substantially reduced by bringing down the rate of dividend".

2 P.M.

This is an open threat which is given by the Railway Administration, and the Railway Convention Committee could not make any observation for our benefit which would reassure us that this threat is not going to be realised in practice. Perhaps the Minister today might give some kind of an assurance that it is very definitely contemplated—I hope it is very definitely contemplated—by Government that in the course of the next five years, at any rate, unless something absolutely extraordinary supervenes, there will not be any increase either in freights or in fares. That is why I say that we have to tend our railway finances very carefully and that is why we have to remember that we have inherited, along with so many other things in this country, a somewhat evil legacy from British imperialism, and we have inherited even the accounting, devices, as far as the railways are concerned—and that is what we are discussing today. I do not see any reason why we should not take a different view altogether. Sir, perhaps, on this occasion we might recall that after the railways were laid in our country by the British imperialist agency, the British imperialists took very good care to see that they got very much more than their pound of flesh. For nearly a hundred years we went on paying these interests charges. In about twenty-three years or so before 1949-50 they took away from our country about Rs. 678 crores by way of interest charges. Even in 1950, we had to give up a certain portion of our sterling balances because we were supposed to be indebted to these British coupon-clippers for their great generosity for having laid some tracts of railways in our country. Sir, every foot of railway track in this country has been paid for by the blood and sweat of the people of our country and that is what we have to remember all the time.

In those days the railways were starved to a certain extent, because of this obligation. So much money was squandered in the early days of railway construction in this country, because the British share holders were absolutely assured of their 4½ per cent. and any amount of money could be spent, any amount of money could be spent by way of indenting all kinds of things from England, and that is how things had gone on for so long.

We might be proud today to say that we have the largest railway system in Asia, the fourth largest in the world, and so on and so forth. But commensurate with the importance of our country, with the population of our country, with the resources of our country, our railway tracks are still very far from being adequate. Now my point is that in the earlier period, in the British period, the railways were denuded of enormous sums of money in this way in the interest of the British shareholders. Now there is no danger of that, because whatever we get from the railways will go to the general revenues, or would go back to the operation of the railways themselves. But let there be no denudation of the revenues in a manner which would redound against the development of our railway transport system. That is a point which is very important. It is exactly there, that we get into a kind of dilemma, which perhaps the Railway Minister feels that he has been confronted with. The dilemma might be stated somewhat like this: that if the railways today have to contribute sufficiently to the General revenues, that is to say, to the finances necessary for the Five Year Plans then the railways cannot expand in the direction and in the manner desired. This is one of the horns of the dilemma. The other horn of the dilemma is that if the railways expand in the direction and in the manner desired, then they cannot contribute what is expected of them to the Plan. I say this is a most unreal dilemma, because the crux of the matter is money and the only thing which those who put the dilemma before us can say is

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

that there is no money. I would say this. After all I am sure some of our Ministers here have taken part, for many years of their lives, in the struggle of the people and surely they would agree with me that after all money is muck, and the greatest capital that a country possesses is its people. They are our resources; their ability to work and their feeling of exhilaration in having a country which is constructed nearer to their heart's desire. That is the real crux of the matter. If today we can get that feeling in the country, then we can develop our Railways, we can develop them at a much faster pace than the pace which we have followed so far.

I find that somewhere about 1908 there was a report called the McKay Report which recommended in those days in 1908 that the total mileage of Indian Railways should be increased to at least one lakh. Now we have about 38,000 miles. So, what could be envisaged in 1938 as a kind of practical possibility by a British Chairman of a Committee which went into this matter is an envisagement which today seems to us absolutely beyond our comprehension—even our imagination! This is a dilemma which has got to be fought back. This is a cobweb in our mind which has got to be cleared off altogether. How are we going to do it? It is there you have to get down to brass tacks. And not being a financial expert, I cannot go into the details of the matter in the way some of my hon. colleagues might do. But I feel that there are certain things which are very patent on the face of it, which we should look into a little more carefully than we have done so far. The question of over-capitalisation has been raised, for example, and there is no getting away from it that there has been this over-capitalisation. The assessment of the amount of over-capitalisation, as far as the Railway Board and the Committee are concerned is Rs. 100 crores. Now, Sir, we know why over-capitalisation is made in the case of the private

sector of industry. They want to have more profits. That is why they bring about over-capitalisation. In our case what do we find today? We have to look into the reality of the matter.

I would like the Railway Minister to recall what has happened in regard to the capital resources of concerns other than Railways. I am told that in the thirties, in the depression period, most of the concerns in India deflated their capital, because that had to be done from time to time. But because of the guarantee which had been given to the British shareholders we find that as far as railways are concerned, even when the railways could not pay their way and had no surplus at all; even in that period there was no attempt to bring about an adjustment of the capital to the reality of the situation.

I should say—I am speaking off-hand and not as a financial expert—that the over-capitalisation in our railways has gone to the extent of at least Rs. 300 or 400 crores and if we find out the reality of the situation, then much of our trouble would decrease, so much of our worry in regard to Depreciation Fund and Development Fund and all that sort of thing might also decrease to a certain extent. I would like the Railway Minister to go into this matter very carefully to find out on a realistic basis what exactly the total capital resources of our railways are, to find out the historical reasons which have gone to the computation of the present capital of the railways at about Rs. 900 crores or so. We have had to pay through our nose; we cannot get it back again; I wish we could, but we cannot get it back again. But now that the railways have to be put on a sound pedestal, it is necessary that we look into the financial structure a little more carefully than this Committee or the Railway Board appears to have done so far.

I am as keen as anybody else regarding the development of our railways. But I want from the Railway

Minister as assurance that there would be no increase in freights and fares and I want also a further assurance regarding passenger amenities and labour welfare. Now I find it most amazing that it seems in our Indian railways safety is supposed to be an amenity, that is to say, it is an *ex-gratia* gift by the railways to the passengers who pay in order to travel on the railways. Now this is most amazing. Whenever I travel on the railways I am entitled to certain considerations from the Railway Administration. But even safety comes under the head of "amenities". This kind of thing ought to go altogether.

In regard to passenger amenities in every Budget discussion we get so many opportunities to point out how little money is spent, how so much money is left unspent and so on and so forth. Rs. 3 crores are spent, which works at about 4.4 pies per head on our passengers; the result is that passenger amenities are very inadequate indeed. As far as labour welfare is concerned, we know how things happen. Early this year I had rather a mortifying experience of having ascertained from the Railway Minister after a great deal of trouble, questions and cross-questions and so on and so forth, that the condemned wagons in Sealdah Division were intended to be abolished by the Railway Minister altogether, that he had made some allocation of funds for the building of quarters for these people. But somehow these quarters do not get built and the people are still living in quite considerable numbers in these condemned wagons. This is the information I elicited from him after a great deal of question—and cross-questions.

**Shri L. B. Shastri:** The quarters are being built—Mr. Mukerjee must be aware of it. They are being built every day, and I hope by the end of April or perhaps the beginning of May all the quarters to house the people in the condemned wagons would have been built.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** I am glad to hear that the Railway Minister is

taking steps which are expected of him in regard to this kind of matter.

But, Sir, I wish to recall, because I find Shri Alagesan before me now, what he had said in 1949 when the separation of railways from general finance was being discussed. He talked about surplus of railways and he said—in pages 924 and 925 of the proceedings of the Constituent Assembly of the 21st December, 1949:—

"What is after all this surplus? It represents that more money was taken from people for less amenities, from people who cannot afford to pay the high fares that are being charged, or it can be put in another way. We have not provided proper amenities for the money that we are taking from them and so there is surplus."

It shows this concern also in regard to amenities of passengers and labour welfare, and I hope steps are being taken in order to implement this kind of assurances.

I have said also that in many different ways we can get money for our railways. I do not see why we shall not really make a start in regard to the railway transport industry. I say this because—I have said it before, but I can repeat it now—the Moolgaonkar Committee had reported that the idle capacity of our engineering industries is about 25 to 30 per cent. and that imports can be prevented to a large extent if this idle capacity is utilised. But, somehow or other the railway transport industry has not been developed, so that I expect, one of the reason why the engineering industries are not being utilised to the full is that we have not got a real plan regarding the transport industry. I find also, that the purchase of imported railway stores has increased—I am not giving the figures; I have got them here before me—and in spite of the Railway Minister being, I am sure, a devoted champion of the swadeshi idea, this purchase of imported railway stores, increasing, is a rather dangerous thing.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Then, the fuel bill has increased by Rs. 7 crores since 1948-49. As far as I know, the economies promised by the Minister regarding the implementation of the Railway Fuels Enquiry Committee, that promise so far has not been fully implemented. Also, in regard to stores I find that in the last Budget speech the Minister was pleased to state that the stores balance stood at Rs. 57.20 crores on the 31st March, 1953 and he gave a promise that by the end of 1953-54 he would have a further Rs. 5 crores reduction. But, I find that in 1951 the Stores Enquiry Committee had said that the 1950-51 balance of Rs. 45.42 crores was inordinately high and should be immediately reduced by an overall reduction of Rs. 10 crores. Now, Sir, in this way much money could be found. Money could also be found by an imaginative system of expenditure. Take for example the question of electrification of the Calcutta area. There, as far as I can see, we have to wait for the moon. We have to wait till the Greek Kalends or whatever the literary fellows say, till we find electrification actually happening in the area. I think electric traction costs about half of steam traction. Therefore it is necessary that we imaginatively spend money and money will be certainly found. Money can be borrowed, borrowed on terms which are reasonable in this country as well as outside. We have no objection to borrowing money from outside, but we have objection to borrowing money at exorbitant rates from outside agencies who want to have a finger in our pie. That is what we object to; otherwise we want this kind of spending for our country.

So, I repeat what I have said earlier about my desire, that the Minister should give us an assurance regarding the non-increase in the next 5 years in the freights and fares and also regarding the welfare facilities for the working people.

In regard to this, Sir, I want to say one more thing before I finish, and

that is: it is very amazing that when an engine is purchased you have to find some place where you can put it up. Now, a building for an engine costs some money. That cost is charged to capital, but, when you are building quarters for staff you have many divisions, remunerative, unremunerative, so on and so forth, and you charge them to the Development Fund. The Development Fund should be meant to be something very different. When you have workers, you have to provide for their residences just as when you have engines you have to provide for them. Are you going to treat engines better than human beings who are working those engines? I do not see why in a welfare State this kind of thing should go on. This kind of thing goes on and is being done because we have an accounting system with this fund, that fund and the other fund. We put something in that fund, something in the other fund and then in the third category. So, altogether we get a very complicated apparatus and whenever non-technical people like my friend the hon. Minister comes to take charge, all these technical people try to say: "We are wonderfully well equipped people as far as the understanding of these complicated functions is concerned", and therefore, non-technical, lay people—whatever their patriotism, whatever their commonsense—should not interfere. There, I say, that the Minister should take courage in his hands and say: "I am going to develop the railway system of my country because transport is the most important factor in economic development, and for that reason I am going to take an imaginative view. I am going to find money in whatever market is handy and I am going to develop this transport industry. I am going to make railway people contented so that they can work more efficiently and honestly." Then, we shall see that the million railwaymen who so well man our railways, whom we are so proud of, would increase in number and the industry will provide employment to many. Money can be manufactured

just like that. As I said before, it is just like muck. Money can be had where you like. Your people are working. They can produce goods. Labour is the greatest capital that you have got. Requisition that labour. Get that feeling in yourself as well as in the minds of your people. They have to work in order to build a country which would be something really to be proud of. A country where the exploitation and misery that exist today will no longer be there. That perspective is something which I miss altogether in this Resolution, which I miss altogether in the doings of the Railway Ministry, which I miss altogether in the Railway Minister's performances every year.

As I said before, I do have a feeling—rightly or wrongly—that the Railway Minister does wish to do something good for his people. There is no doubt about it. But, I see him always, as it were, fettered and frustrated by the atmosphere. I want him to get out of that. I want him to throw away all old Resolutions if it is necessary in the country's interest. I want him to go forward and win the Cabinet. It is necessary that the railway sphere should have a really imaginative policy. Then and then alone shall we be able to launch on that course which will lead our country to happiness and to prosperity.

श्री ए० एन० बिद्यालंकार (जालन्धर) : जिस प्रस्ताव पर हम इस समय विचार कर रहे हैं उसका स्कोप बहुत ही लिमिटेड है, बहुत ही सीमित है। इसलिए बहुत सी बातें जो कि वक्ताओं ने रेलवे मिनिस्टर के बार् में मुझ से पहले कहीं हैं, उनका इस प्रस्ताव से कोई सल्लुक नहीं था। इस वास्ते में उन बातों पर नहीं जाऊंगा। जहां तक इस प्रस्ताव का सल्लुक है इसका सम्बन्ध सिर्फ उस रिपोर्ट से है जिस में हमें इस बात पर विचार करना था कि रेलवे के फाइनेंसिंग जो कि जनरल फाइनेंसिंग से अलग किस्म का कुछ है उन में से किन्तु जनरल फाइनेंसिंग को हिस्सा मिले, किस तरीके से मिले, एकाउंट्स कैसे रखे जाएं इत्यादि। इस

रिपोर्ट में कुछ फंड्स का जिक्र किया गया है जैसे कौपटल फंड, डिवेलपमेंट फंड, डिप्रिसिएशन फंड या रिजर्व फंड जिन पर हमें विचार करना है और उन पर विचार करते समय इस डिस्कशन का स्कोप कुछ लिमिटेड सा हो जाता है। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि जिस वक्त हम कोई ऐसी रिपोर्ट जैसी कि हमारे सामने हैं पर विचार करना शुरू करते हैं तो कुछ ऐसा महसूस होने लगता है कि शायद सारे मामले पर सम्पूर्ण रूप से विचार नहीं किया गया। अभी मेरे एक दोस्त ने कहा है कि इतने थोड़े समय में इतने बड़े सवाल पर पूरी तरह विचार होना बड़ा कठिन था और कमेटी को ज्यादा विचार करना चाहिए था। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि इस के ऊपर ज्यादा लम्बे कोई विचार की गुंजाइश भी नहीं थी, क्योंकि यह एक टेक्निकल सा एकाउंट्स रखने का सब्जेक्ट है। फिर भी मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि जब कभी इस तरह की कोई रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने आती है ऐसा महसूस होता है कि इस समय जो एकाउंटिंग का सिस्टम है उसके अन्दर तब्दीली की जरूरत है, उस में तरमीम की जरूरत है या उसको पूरी तरह जोवरहाल करने की जरूरत है। ये जो रूलज वर्गौरह हैं यह बहुत पहिले बनाए गए थे और ऐसा मात्स होता है कि ये आजकल की परिस्थितियों से मेल नहीं खाते। इन की वजह से हम कुछ बन्धनों में या जंजीरों में जकड़े हुए से लगते हैं और उन में से निकलने की कोशिश करते हैं लेकिन निकल नहीं सकते। तो मेरा पहिला सुझाव यह है कि हम कोई ऐसा तरीका ढूंढें जिस से कि हम इन तमाम रूलज को सिम्प्लिफाई कर सकें। इन को आसान बना सकें। जो कनवेंशन कमेटी बिठाई गई थी उसने इस बार् में कोई सिफारिश नहीं की कि इन एकाउंट्स को इस तरह रखा जाए या इस तरह न रखा जाए। इस वास्ते इस एकाउंटिंग सिस्टम को नई जरूरतों के मुताबिक बनाने के लिए मैं रेलवे मिनिस्टर साहब से दरखास्त करूंगा कि यदि आवश्यक हो तो एक कमेटी बिठा दी जाए जो इस सारे

## [श्री ए० एन० पिद्यालंकार]

मामल की जांच करने के बाद अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश करे। मिसाल के तौर पर अभी इस सदन में यह सवाल उठाया गया है कि फलां चीज को डिवलपमेंट फंड में डाला जाय और फलां को डिवलपमेंट फंड में न डाला जाए। मेरे दोस्त श्री मुकजी ने अभी सवाल उठाया था, कि रेलवे के इंजन जहां खड़े रहते हैं उनके लिए भी मकान या कोठर बनाए जाते हैं उसको तो कौपटल फंड में डाला जाता है, और मजदूरों के लिए जो क्वार्टर बनते हैं उनको आप डिवलपमेंट फंड में डाल दते हैं, ऐसा क्यों किया जाता है? मैं उनको कहूंगा कि कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में जो किया वह जो बख्शा ही किया, अर्थात् रेलवे के मजदूरों के क्वार्टरों के खर्चों को बजाय इसके कि कौपटल फंड में डालते, जिस पर हमेशा चार परसेंट सूद देना पड़ता, डवलपमेंट फंड के जिम्मे डाल दिया, जिस पर कोई सूद नहीं देना पड़ता। और इस बात की चिन्ता नहीं करनी पड़ेगी कि अगर थोड़े से और क्वार्टर बना दंगे, और इतना कौपटल खर्च करेंगे, तो उसके ऊपर चार परसेंट के हिसाब से सूद देना पड़ जायगा। क्लास सी रेलवे सर्वेडस के क्वार्टर्स को डवलपमेंट फंड में डाल दिया गया है, और उसको कौपटल एकाउन्ट में नहीं रक्खा। जितने भी एकाउन्टिंग के मौजूदा सिस्टम हैं और हमारे सामने और इस कमेटी के सामने एक डांचा बना रखा है उसके अन्दर हम कैसे टटवारा करें वह प्रश्न हमारे सामने है। मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि कम से कम रेलवे के जो क्लास तीन के इम्प्लायीज हैं उनके लिये किराया बढ़ाने का प्रश्न ही पैदा न होना चाहिए। मिनिस्टर साहब कहते हैं कि यहां क्वार्टर बनाने हैं, ऊपर से रेलवे बोर्ड कहता है कि इसके अन्दर कौपटल एक्सपेंडिचर बढ़ जायगा और हमारा इतना खर्च हो जायगा, इसलिए नये क्वार्टरों के लिए खर्च की गुंजाइस नहीं है। कमेटी ने इस दिक्कत का हल यहतलाश किया कि क्लास २ के क्वार्टरों पर जो खर्चा हो उसे भी कौपटल एकाउन्ट में न डाल कर डवलपमेंट

फंड में डाल दिया, आप सूद देने से बच जायंगे। मजदूरों के लिए जो विश्राम और मनोरंजन की सामग्री उपस्थित की जायगी, उस का खर्चा भी डवलपमेंट फंड से लिया जायगा। परन्तु रिपोर्ट के तैरहवें सर्फे पर लिखा गया है :

“They would however recommend that “the Railway Board should look into this matter of assessment of rent realised for railway quarters and ensure that a return of rent more commensurate with the capital cost is obtained on all residential buildings built for the Class III staff”.

मैं इसकी जरा बजाहत चाहता हूँ। आया इन फिक्शरों का मतलब यह है अगर कमेटी का कुछ ऐसा इशारा है कि क्लास तीन के सर्वेडस बिडिंग्स का किराया कुछ बढ़ाया जाय, उनके किराये में कुछ इजाफा किया जाय तो मैं कहूंगा कि ऐसा उन्हें नहीं करना चाहिये। कमेटी के इस सर्जेशन को मैं पसन्द नहीं करता, उसके लिये वह कोई और सूत निकालें। इस वक्त जो किराया क्लास तीन और चार के रेलवे इम्प्लायीज से वसूल किया जाता है वह काफी है, किराये के अन्दर और इजाफा करने से उन की कास्ट आफ लिविंग बढ़ जायगी। उस कमी को पूरा करने के लिये आपको कोई और रास्ता निकालना चाहिये ताकि उन्हें सस्ते मकान दिये जा सकें और उनके किराये न बढ़ें। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में जो यह इशारा है कि उनके क्वार्टर्स के रेंट्स बढ़ा दिये जाय और जो कौपटल एक्सपेंडिचर हुआ है उसके मुताबिक उसका खर्चा निकाला जाय। मैं समझता हूँ कि रेलवे मिनिस्टर साहब उसके ऊपर अमल नहीं करेंगे। जैसे मैंने पहले भी कहा कि हमारा हिसाब किताब रखने का तरीका या सिस्टम जैसा होगा वैसा ही हमारा आउटलुक और एंप्रोच होगा। हम उसी एप्टिकोण से सारे मामलें पर विचार करने लग जायंगे। मिसाल के तौर पर रैम्युनरीटिवनेस के मुताबिक ४.२५

परसेंट का एक टैन्ट रक्खा गया अब उसको बढ़ा कर पांच परसेंट कर दिया गया। कोई प्राब्लेम रैम्युनरीटिव हैं, या मुनाफा ई सकता है, या नहीं इस बात की परख करने के लिए कमेटी के सामने कोई खास मसला मौजूद नहीं था और जब उसी हिसाब-किताब रखने के तरीके के आधार पर इसका अन्दाजा लगाना था, जो तरीका आज चला हुआ है। इसलिए कमेटी और किसी परिणाम पर पहुँच ही नहीं सकती थी। वर्तमान ढंग से हिसाब रखा जाय तो जब कोई कौपटल एक्सपेंडिचर होगा आप को दिक्कत होगी। अगर आप रैम्युनरीटिवनेस के टैन्ट्स को बहुत खर्च करेंगे, तो बहुत कठिनाइयाँ आएंगी। हमें इस पांच साला प्लान के अन्दर बहुत काम करने हैं और इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें नये सिरे से सब बातों पर विचार करना चाहिये और बहुत ज्यादा अपने ऊपर जंजीरें, एकाउंटिंग, की और दूसरी टैकनिकल चीजों की जंजीरें नहीं जकड़नी चाहियें। कुछ बंधन जरूर होने चाहियें, क्योंकि यह एकाउंटिंग का मामला है, और मैं श्री एच० एन० मुकजी से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि कोई इसमें लिमिट नहीं होनी चाहिये। मिसाल के तौर पर चार परसेंट रख दिया, क्योंकि जब तक हम इसको तय नहीं करेंगे हमारी एकाउंटिंग किस लिहाज से होगी। आप अगर कोई सिस्टम नहीं रखते तो रुपये का इन्तजाम ठीक नहीं चलैगा। रेलवे कहेगी कि हम अपना खर्च करते जायेंगे और कौपटल में दूसरी तरफ से हम खर्च कर देंगे, हमें कोई निश्चित ढाँचा अपने सामने बनाना ही चाहिये। जो नुकताचीनी श्री मुकजी ने की, मैं समझता हूँ उसमें तो कुछ सार नहीं। उन्होंने यह कहा कि अगर फोर परसेंट रखना हो तो जैसा पेज सात पर कहा गया है, "अगर हमें डेवलपमेंट फंड को भी फायनेंस करना है तो इस चार परसेंट में कुछ नहीं बचेगा" और इसीलिये श्री मुकजी ने इस चार परसेंट के सम्बन्ध में शिकायत की। लेकिन आठवें पेज पर इस का जो जवाब दिया गया और बतलाया गया कि आखिर हम पांच साला प्लान को चलवा रहे हैं और उसकी वजह से आखिर रेलवे के अन्दर भी नरकनी होगी, रेलवे ज्यादा रैम्युनरीटिव होगी,

हमारी बहुत सारी चीजें आगे बढ़ेंगी। परन्तु श्री मुकजी ने इस बात को छोड़ दिया और उसको उन्होंने नहीं पढ़ा तो मैं कहूँगा कि अगर एक चीज को हम आधा ही पढ़ कर या आधी बात को सामने रखें तो हम ठीक नतीजे पर नहीं पहुँच सकेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो जवाब आठवें सफे पर दिया और पैराग्राफ १७ में जो उन्होंने निर्णय किया मैं उससे बिलकुल सहमत हूँ और मैं समझता हूँ कि वह बिलकुल ठीक है। लेकिन जैसे मैंने कहा कि आखिर दिक्कत जो हमें महसूस हो रही है वह दिक्कत एक ही है कि हमारा इस वक्त का जो ढाँचा है वह कुछ ऐसा जकड़ कर हमें रखता है, एंसी उसकी एकाउंटिंग बनी है कि उसके अन्दर किसी का कसूर नहीं है और न ही रेलवे बोर्ड का कसूर है। रेलवे बोर्ड भी इससे बंधा हुआ है। जो आज हम पास करते हैं कुछ कानून बने हुए हैं, गवर्नमेंट का हर एक अंग अपने अपने तरीके से किसी न किसी चीज से बंधा हुआ है। उन तमाम चीजों के बावत हमारी पार्लियामेंट ही फैसला कर सकती है और जैसे मैंने पहले आपको सुझाव दिया कोई एंसी कमेटी बिठायी जाय जो रेलवे के फाइनेंस, बैंकिंग और एंसी एकाउंटिंग सिस्टम के बारे में विचार करे और जो नुकतेनबर हो और जो आउटलुक हो वह सिर्फ यह न हो कि एक बर्ड ऑडिटर जनरल को या एकाउन्टेंट को बिठा दिया जाय क्योंकि वह तो महज एकाउंटिंग के नुकते निगाह से देखेगा, वह तो दो और दो चार हैं कि नहीं यही देखेगा लेकिन इतना ही काफी नहीं है, एकाउंटिंग के आउटलुक के जलवा दूयमन आउटलुक और इंसानी डेवलपमेंट की दृष्टि से भी देखना जरूरी है और यह भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि जो एकाउन्ट्स या हिसाब-किताब हम बनाते हैं वे आगे ही आगे बढ़ती हुई सांसाइटी के लिये हैं, एक विकास करते हुए समाज के लिये हैं। हमारा एकाउंटिंग सिस्टम पंसा होना चाहिये जिसमें डेवलपमेंट के लिये ज्यादा से ज्यादा फंड्स मिल सकें और हमें देखना चाहिये कि एकाउंटिंग सम्बन्धी कायदे कानून हमें इतना न जकड़ दें कि हमारे डेवलपमेंट काम रुक जायें। मैं आशा करता

[श्री ए० एन० विद्यालंकार]

है कि रेलवे मिनिसटर महोदय मेरे इस सुझाव को कबूल करेंगे।

**Mr. Chairman:** Those hon. Members who have already intimated their intention to speak need not rise every time; I have got their names.

**Shri B. Das (Jaipur-Keonjhar):** I am speaking on the floor of this House on this matter of Railway Convention after about five years. I was a party to the first Railway Convention and we demanded that the colonial pattern of the railway administration that then existed should not exploit Indian resources for the benefit of the United Kingdom. There was a report. After that some of us who are old and fossilized tried to prevent the colonial Government exploiting us. Happily and fortunately, Independence came and the bosses known as the Railway Board could not continue to exploit India for the benefit of the colonial rulers who ruled India then and for development of British Railway Industries. We then tried to evolve our own machinery so that our railway administration might be really a national one. As I said earlier, I was a member of the Second Convention Committee. We did go over our affairs thoroughly. I was one of the few who thought that the rate of contribution was very low. The share of the profit was very low owing to the past circumstances. The railways were built out of the tax payers' money. The colonial rulers built the railways by sucking the life blood of the tax payers. I had my fears then and I still have them now. I am disappointed at the approach of the present Convention Committee. This Committee were more obsessed with persons than with the immediate past. The former war-time Railway Member, Sir Edward Benthall, ran the railways as if they were British railway companies. He exhausted all our resources; he exhausted all our Railway Stocks and materials to help the Second Great World War and India miserably suffered. The re-

presentatives of our Government did not claim adjustment from England when the debt of England to India was settled after the war. When the British were here they let our railways deteriorate and went to help the war in Persia and other places by stripping our railway lines, Locomotives and waggons and materials. Those materials were never brought back. It was most unfortunate.

As an old and continuing Member, I felt that the high rates and freights which were introduced some time in 1946 or 1947 would be reduced with the advent of our national Government. But the national Government found itself helpless because the railway administrators—the Railway Board—were of a colonial pattern. My friends—the labour leaders—will permit me to say that at that time, in 1946 and 1947, the labour agitation became so difficult. Where one man was doing a certain quota of work, three men were employed to do the same quantity of work. The Railway employees' number became three times of what it was before that date. We could not reduce one man in the railway. They had also their labour unions. Thus, there was and there is more expenditure on the labour side and on the administrative side than what ought to have been.

In spite of all that, my friends, the Members of the Committee did not bother to say one word about the high rates and freights. These high rates were promised to be reduced in 1946 or 1947 some time later on. That was not done. My hon. friend Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and his predecessor the late lamented friend Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar, adopted very subtle ways by introducing a Development Fund, Depreciation Fund and all that. The Depreciation Fund has at last been raised to Rs. 35 crores. But it has been augmented by a very subtle process by other friends. Of course, this House is a party to that and I

am a party to that. We permitted the Railway Minister to spend up to Rs. 25,000 from the revenues towards replacements of small items of capital expenditure. No account has been kept for these five or seven years in the Railway Ministry as to how much has been spent on such replacements of small items. The Committee have recommended that there was over capitalisation and that that should be reduced. I call it an academic recommendation. It cannot stand any examination by this House or by the Railway Board. The previous Railway Boards were guilty of doing many such things to cover their inefficiency and maladministration. Sir Edward Benthall and others perpetuated that loot. They removed our lines, materials and assets and sent them over to other countries and nothing came back from the Allied Forces. I appreciate what my hon. friend, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri has done; he is now replacing the lines. I do not blame the Railway Ministers of the olden days for not claiming refund. The financial Secretaries, financial advisers and the Finance Ministers ought to have demanded from the United Kingdom the value of those assets that had been removed. We have been their allies and what did we charge them for these? We have been allies of even the United States of America which is the worst enemy of India today. My friend, the hon. Minister, may say that such claims had been made. At least to my knowledge there were no such claims. There were some very nice men in the Railway Board even at that time but after some time others came in. Though some of them were Indians and their colour was like ours, their actions were the most bureaucratic reminding me of the days of Sir Clement Hindley who was the first Chief Commissioner of the Indian Railways at the time of the first Separation Convention in 1926. I do think that no case has been made out for reduction of the capital of railways by the 3rd Convention Committee. I hope that the present Rail-

way Board which had been newly constituted after seven years of our independence would get certain nationalist mentality and spirit and would not follow the practice of their colonial masters whom their predecessors followed. At times they insulted us and brought us great humility. I feel our present Railway Board must economise in every respect. They must economise in every aspect. I know under the guise of development my friend the present Railway Minister has built many new stations and done lots of improvements. But these are not charged to capital expenditure. I see my friend Shri M. C. Shah smiling. I think Finance is in collusion with the Railways and simply because we might claim five per cent. contribution to the general revenues, they are spending away money showing less and less earned dividend. This is my *obiter dicta*. I won't be here five years after.

**Dr. Krishnaswami** (Kancheepuram): You will be here.

**Shri B. Das:** You are not my elector!

But I do not want the minds of the Railway Board, the minds of the railway engineers, and the mind of the Railway Minister to be canalised in that pattern. Everything should be done in an efficient way, but we must ride cars and coaches produced in our country—even Minister included. I do not think my friend rides a Rolls Royce, probably a "Hindustan" which is a production of India through the Commerce Ministry. That aspect, the humanitarian aspect, the national aspect has not found consideration here.

I saw some amendments by my friend Shri Punnoose, that 3½ per cent. should be contributed. A very good idea. I do not know what speech he had made. I am sorry, I was too busy in other places. But if tomorrow I want my friends Shri H. N. Mukerjee and Shri Gopalan to sit in the Government, whether I am

[Shri B. Das]

here or outside I will watch their administration. Let them look at the financial problems as a whole. If you deprive the general revenues of five or ten crores of its annual revenue that is not proper. I think we have been mulcted by five crores of rupees already, because Dr. Matthai insisted, "We will accept it at the present rate". If I was asked to give evidence I would have given evidence before the Committee. Because nobody is more alive to this question than myself, who knows the past from 1924 up to the present day and the working results of the previous two Conventions.

So I do make this appeal to the Railway Minister. He is a very great friend of mine and he has a great, human heart, he thinks more of the poor. But it is not benefits to the poor at the cost of the general taxpayer that is needed. What is needed is a proper adjustment and balanced administration. The railways are our biggest industry. We take fifty crores of capital off. So what the railways will practise will be followed by all the mushroom corporations that are springing forth. Every Secretary wants to manage every company without parliamentary sanction or control. That is of course in the offing. As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee I am very critical; I am watching. We cannot revive statutory railway authority as our masters wanted in 1929-30. We got over that. The same thing is happening in corporations and others. But the Railways are our biggest asset. Next is Posts and Telegraphs. There must be efficiency and commercial practice in administration. Let it be an incentive to other State-owned companies. Government are investing eighty to one hundred crores of rupees in various State-owned corporations. The big brother, namely the Railway undertaking, because it is earning big money and concealing it by revenue expenditure instead of by capital expenditure, let it properly

change its administration so that it will be an ideal concern. It is not a public utility concern in the sense that all the money should be spent on labour and the officers and nothing paid to the tax-payer who financed it. The blood that has been sucked by the British colonial rulers from the tax-payers for the building of railways is a sufficient warning, and it is a sufficient claim for the general revenues to demand more from the railways. These are my observations on this Resolution.

**Dr. Krishnaswami:** I should like to preface my remarks with the observation that the Railway Convention Committee has gone into this question with great thoroughness and industry. It has however unfortunately lacked the necessary vision to see the implications of railway finance and railway development in the context of the new era of planning. There are many interesting suggestions which the Committee has made. There are certain non-controversial suggestions which I think this House will accept without any doubt.

My hon. friend Shri Tulsidas who opened the discussion started with a proposition that it would be better in the case of railways if we followed commercial principles of accounting. I have tried my best to follow the implications of his argument. I wonder where his argument would lead us if we accepted his suggestion. I believe if we accept his suggestion that the viewpoint should be related to the earnings earned by a public utility enterprise, certain very serious consequences would follow. This would lead to Railways being allowed to indulge in a policy of discriminating monopoly in rates. It may benefit certain sections but it will not benefit society. The Railways would be allowed to charge on the principle of what the traffic can bear. An undertaking like railways, owned by the State and which are meant to be operated in the interests of the community, cannot be allowed to operate freight rates and tariffs on

this principle. I am therefore glad to find that the Committee has turned down this proposal.

I do not think that we are using the correct nomenclature when we suggest that what we are paying to the exchequer is a dividend on capital. We are unfortunately the victims of a phraseology inherited from the past. What railways are paying is a four per cent. preference debenture on Capital to the general exchequer. It is from this point of view that I should like this House to consider this payment by the Railways. The advantage of having this four per cent. preference debenture paid to the general exchequer is that the Railways know what exactly the costs are that they have to incur in advance. The result is that there is certainty, and anything that they earn in good years over and above this amount can be utilised for more development and paying labour. In what proportions it goes to labour and development will have to be determined by the Railways and I believe that for a long while to come there will be great debate as to how we are going to apportion the surplus between development purposes and labour.

Having accepted this suggestion of the Committee, I should like to join issue with it on three important points on which I do not find it possible to agree. The Committee in its recommendations has pointed out that depreciation has to be attended to as a first priority. I hold the view that we ought to pay more attention than in the past to the replacement of railway assets. It is one thing to emphasise replacement of railway assets; it is a totally different matter to make provision for a Depreciation Fund, and remark in these terms:

"The Committee recognise that the appropriation to Development Fund and the solvency of the Fund are dependent on the availability and the size of the surplus, while the provision for

depreciation should be based on the life of the assets and their replacement on the actual conditions which cannot be deferred, if their earning potential is to be maintained. They, therefore, feel that the replacement of these assets should bear no relationship with the ultimate loss or gain of the Undertaking but should be met out of the Depreciation Reserve Fund."

I do not understand the distinction that is sought to be drawn between a Depreciation Fund and Development Fund. In the first instance, depreciation need not necessarily be based on the life of the asset. Every commercial enterprise knows that this is a crude concept. From an economic point of view, it may be worth while to replace assets earlier. Sometimes it may be desirable to postpone replacement even when the life of the asset has come to an end. Besides, technological progress makes plants obsolescent long before their lives draw to a close. These factors have to be taken into account whenever we make provision for a Depreciation Fund. In the United Kingdom, when the question of renewal of capital equipment of Railways came up it was suggested because of the prospect of new investments having to be undertaken on a large scale, that the Railways should follow a policy of "make-mend". Let us look at this problem from a more practical point of view. In the current phase, when prices have gone up, when there is inflation, the Depreciation Fund becomes purely a conceptual fund. The problem that faces the Railway administration is not merely making provision for a Depreciation Fund, but also replacing assets and developing our Railways. There is no relation whatsoever between what is known as the Depreciation Fund and the actual replacement funds required for replenishing physical capital. This is a gap which we have to take into account. Let us approach this question mainly from the angle of development and not make a fictitious distinction

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

between a Depreciation Fund and Development Fund. I am surprised that my hon. friends should have been fettered by a purely accounting approach.

We are living in very difficult times and it is imperative that we should think very clearly of what we expect our Railways to be in the future. In the policy that we envisage for the Railways, I say this to my hon. friend the Railway Minister, the guiding point must be not the funds that are actually available to the Railways out of their earnings, but the rate of development that we envisage for the country. That is the approach that we have to keep in mind. That is the approach which the Mc Kay Committee, to which reference was made by an hon. Member a few minutes ago, made when it suggested that we ought to have one lakh route miles in our country. How are we tackling this problem? I am afraid that neither the Committee, nor the Finance Ministry nor the other sections of our Government have understood the responsibilities of the State owning the Railways. Today, I am putting forward my plea in favour of the Railways because I feel that the case for Railways appears to have gone by default. What is it that we want our Railways to do? Unfortunately, we are not willing to take upon ourselves the responsibility for translating the objective we have in view. Had the railways been run by private enterprise, in any boom period, speculators would have put in their funds and really developed them. They do not think merely of taking hold of the railway funds which mature from railway investment. After all, we are living in an underdeveloped country and the Railways have to obtain funds from outside on a very large scale. Of course, difficulties arise. But, these have to be faced, and it is to be regretted that they have not been faced by us or the Committee. What I am envisaging is a joint collaboration between the

three branches of administration in our Government. Railways look at the problem of investment from the point of view of unsatisfied demands. The Planning Commission would approach the problem of Railway investment from the angle of the proposed development of our economy; while the Finance Ministry would consider investment on the basis of the maximum funds that it can afford to put into Railways. There ought to be a joint body of these three to envisage the rate of development of our Railways and apportion funds to Railways for investment. I am however glad to note that the Railway Convention Committee has pointed out that the rate of interest that should be charged on loans to Railways should be the same as that charged to other commercial enterprises run by the State. This is a general rule that should be followed. But there may be occasions when the general exchequer may have to charge even less than charged for commercial enterprise run by the Government. For instance, the Railway Convention Committee suggests in one of their recommendations that the test of profitability of railway investment should be a five per cent. return on the capital borrowed. I do not know why that Committee should have been so apologetic about this recommendation. Possibly it did not understand the full implications of the recommendation that it made. When we are thinking of a five per cent. return on capital invested, what we ought to bear in mind is that the five per cent. should include not only the direct return to the Railways, but also the indirect returns that the country obtains as a result of this investment. The Committee should have approached this question from this stand point. You may find sometimes the rate of return from the Railways working out at 2½ or 3 per cent., and the remaining 2 per cent. accruing to the economy. This is not an approach altogether foreign to a public utility enterprise. Indeed in 1905 or there-

abouts, long before we lived in an age of planning long before we breathed the air of political economy, the Irrigation Commission, constituted to enquire into the profitability of irrigation schemes, pointed out that not only direct returns to these projects should be taken into account, but also the indirect return to the community in the shape of increased receipts in taxes, increased development and such other factors. All these things can certainly be taken into account once there is joint collaboration between the Planning Department of the Government, the Railway Administration and the Finance Ministry. There is no need to view the Railways as an organisation into which huge amounts of capital have been put and therefore meriting suspicion. We have not reached the stage when our Railways have attained the maturity, where there is no need for funds from outside being put in. On the other hand, the needs of the country are great, the needs of the community are great, there are large unsatisfied demands which have to be met. From the point of view, of trade and commerce in our country, it is essential that a new approach to this problem of railway investment should be made. There is no need to be timid. There is every need to be courageous and face the problems in the right spirit. I hope and trust that in the near future when we will have to consider these problems, we will undertake a more detailed analysis of the implications of the new railway policy which we are envisaging.

The Committee suggests that where railways borrow they must be at liberty later on when they have surpluses in their Development Fund to repay such loans. It is an excellent suggestion provided this qualification is borne in mind. They ought to bear in mind that expansion of Railways may often have a higher priority than repayment of loans. Railway administrators should not consider themselves to be bureaucrats willing to administer and mark time as in other branches of activities. They

must actively concern themselves with questions of investment, with questions of expansion, push forward new schemes, get the Planning and the Finance Departments to consider them and then perhaps the tempo of development would be greater. India requires not only a widening of investment, but also a deepening of investment as well, and the first essential for a backward economy is expansion of the transport system. The contribution to the national product by the transportation industry cannot be under-estimated, and I would wish my hon. friend the Railway Minister to emphasize these points of view in the Cabinet and to make the Government realise that far from there being a rivalry between general revenues and the railway revenues, there is need for our thinking in a co-operative spirit and helping to promote the development of our country. We have too long lived in isolated compartments to realise the benefits of inter dependent co-operation; this applies with greater force to Government departments than to other sections of the community.

3 P.M.

श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र (जिला मथुरा—पश्चिम) : रेलवे कन्वेंशन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आज हमारे सामने है। जो पुरानी व्यवस्था चली आ रही है, जो पुराना तरीका चला आ रहा है, जो पुराना रिवाज चला आ रहा है, आम तौर से इस कमेटी ने उन पुरानी बातों का समर्थन किया है। और मैं समझता हूँ, जैसा कि आज इस भवन के सामने कहा गया है, कि या तो इस कमेटी को कोई बहुत अच्छा और उपयुक्त मौका नहीं मिला कि वह रेलवे के हिसाब किताब और रेलवे की व्यवस्था पर इकनामिक ट्रीट से पूरे तौर से गौर करती या जैसा कि यहाँ पर एक मंत्री मित्र ने कहा है कि जो बातें कमेटी के सामने विचारार्थ थीं, और जिस तरह का रेलवे के हिसाब का ढांचा बना हुआ है उन सब को खत्म करके कमेटी के सामने बहुत बड़ा सवाल था इन चीजों पर विचार करने का जब तक कि रेलवे को एकाउन्ट के ढांचे में भी कोई तबदीली

[श्री कृष्ण चन्द्र]

नहीं की जाती। मैं समझता हूँ कि यद्यपि कमेटी बहुत कुछ बंधी हुई थी रेलवे के मौजूदा एकाउन्ट्स के ढांचे के तरीके से परन्तु तो भी कमेटी अगर चाहती तो इन सब बातों पर जिनके बारे में उसने सिफारिश की हैं, उन पर अपनी दृष्टि औरिजनुल तरीके से डाल सकती थी। कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को देखने से पता चलता है कि कमेटी के सामने जो रेलवे के फाइनेंशियल कमिश्नर ने अगले पांच वर्ष का रेलवे की भावी आर्थिक स्थिति का ढांचा पेश किया उससे कमेटी को इस बात का पता चला कि रेलवे के फायनेंस, रेलवे की आमदनी और खर्चों को देखते हुए अगले पांच सालों में जनरल रवेन्यूज को कोई ज्यादा हिस्सा रेलवे से मिल सकता है, इसकी गंजायश नहीं है बल्कि ऐसा मालूम होता है, रिपोर्ट को देखने से, कि कमेटी को इस बात में सन्देह था कि जो अभी तक कंट्रीब्यूशन जनरल रवेन्यूज को मिल रहा है अगर उस कंट्रीब्यूशन के ऊपर अनुसंधान किया गया अगर उसको भी कायम रखा गया तो बहुत मुमकिन है कि डेवलपमेंट फंड का जो साइज जो परिमाण आज रेलवे अपने हिसाब में रखवाती है बहुत मुमकिन है कि उस परिमाण को वह पूरे तौर पर कायम न रख सके और उस परिमाण में उसको कमी करना पड़े और इस वास्ते हम देखते हैं कि कमेटी ने अपनी सिफारिशों में यह भी एक सिफारिश की है कि यदि आगे कभी डेवलपमेंट फंड का साइज जरूरत से नीचे आ जाय तो जनरल रवेन्यूज से डेवलपमेंट फंड को रेलवे के विकास के लिये अस्थायी ऋण, टर्म्परी लोन के तौर पर जनरल रवेन्यूज से डेवलपमेंट फंड ले सके ताकि रेलवे का विकास पूरी तौर से जिस रफतार से वह चल रहा है उसी रफतार पर उसको कायम रक्खा जा सके। यह ऋण जो दिया जायगा उस ऋण को रेलवे जनरल रवेन्यूज को अदा करेगी, आसत दर्जे का सूद जो भी हो उसी हिसाब से अदा करेगी। उस सिफारिश को देखते हुए इस बात का इत्मीनान होता है, इस बात का यकीन होता है कि कमेटी के सामने गम्भीर

स्थिति थी। कमेटी के सामने एक बहुत खुशनुमा तस्वीर नहीं थी। रेलवे की भावी स्थिति का ख्याल रखते हुये कमेटी को इस बात का अंश था कि बहुत मुमकिन है कि आगे चल कर रेलवे को जो आज मुनाफा हो रहा है, रेलवे की आज जो हालत है आगे हालत उतनी अच्छी न रहे, इन सब बातों को देखते हुए कमेटी ने ज्यादा गौर करना मुमकिन है जरूरी न समझा हो और उन्होंने जो सिफारिशें हमारे सामने की हैं उनको जब हम इन बातों को अपने दृष्टिकोण में रखकर देखते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कमेटी की सिफारिशों हमारे मानने के काबिल हैं और अच्छी हैं और उसके सिवा दूसरी कोई सिफारिशों कमेटी कर नहीं सकती थी। आज रेलवे हमारे इस देश का सबसे बड़ा कारोबार और राष्ट्रीय उद्योग है। साथ ही आज हमारे लोकोहित का भी यह सबसे बड़ा काम है। हमारी यह पब्लिक यूटीलिटी कंसर्न सब से बड़ी है, साथ ही यह हमारी सबसे बड़ी नेशनल इंडस्ट्रियल अंडरटीकिंग है। रेलवे के ऊपर जब हम दृष्टिपात करते हैं तो इन दोनों दृष्टिकोणों को हमें अपने सामने रखना पड़ेगा कि यह नेशनल एन्ड इंडस्ट्रियल अंडरटीकिंग है और साथ ही यह पब्लिक यूटीलिटी का कंसर्न है। हम इन दोनों बातों को नहीं भुला सकते जब हम रेलवे पर विचार करते हैं। कमेटी ने भी इन सब बातों पर अच्छी तरह से गौर किया है। एक आद बातें मैं कमेटी की सिफारिशों के मुताबिक कहना चाहता हूँ। पहिली बात तो यह है कि कमेटी ने यह एजेंडा की है, सिफारिश की है कि जो आगे नई रेलवे लाइन बनायी जाय, रेल के जो नये मार्ग बनाये जाय उनके ऊपर यह चार फीसदी का मुनाफा उसी रोज से जारी नहीं होगा कि जिस रोज से वह रुपया रेलवे को निर्माण के लिये दिया जायगा। कमेटी की सिफारिश यह है कि नई लाइन का जब तक निर्माण होगा तब तक कोई पैसे उस पूंजी पर रवेन्यूज को नहीं दिया जावेगा और उसके पांच साल बाद तक भी नहीं दिया जावेगा। निर्माण खत्म हो जाने के पांच साल

बाद, लाइन पूरी मुक्कामिल हो जाने के बाद जब छठा साल आयेगा तो उस वक्त सिफारिश यह है कि रेलवे चार परसेंट उस पर नहीं दूंगी बल्कि जो कमीशियल कामों के लिये गवर्नमेंट का जो इंटरस्ट की दर है तीन परसेंट या २.९५ परसेंट वह उन लाइनों के कैपिटल के ऊपर रेलवे दूंगी। लेकिन शर्त यह है कि ६ साल के बाद जो पिछला बचा हुआ मुनाफा है, जो पिछला बचा हुआ सूद है, यानी निर्माण के समय का और पहले पांच साल का, वह भी रेलवे दूंगी, अगर उस रेलवे लाइन के, हिसाब में कोई मुनाफा है और देने की गुंजाइश है। लेकिन जगा गुंजाइश है तो मंत्री कहने का मतलब यह है कि मैं इस बात का स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ कि इस में यह भेद क्यों रक्खा गया ? अगर वह रेलवे लाइन खड़ी हो जाती है तो ४ परसेंट पूरा रेलवे क्यों न दे बजाय २.९५ परसेंट रियायत के। पांच साल छोड़ें गर्भे हैं और निर्माण का काल छोड़ा गया है। निर्माण का काल और पांच साल यह स्थायत काफी हैं। उस के बाद जब रेलवे लाइन खड़ी हो जाय और मुनाफा उस को होने लगे तो छह को मुनाफे में से पूरा डिबिटेंड देना चाहिये।

जो एमनेंटीज आज रेलवे मुसाफिरों के लिये और व्यापारियों के लिये दे रही हैं, हर एक कोई उस को जानता है। हम में से हर एक को ज्ञात है और बाहर भी इस का पूरा अनुभव किया जाता है कि आज रेलवे एमनेंटीज की तरफ, लोगों को सुविधायें देने की तरफ, बर्द क्लास और दूसरे क्लासों के मुसाफिरों को आराम देने की तरफ स्टेशनों की उन्नति के लिये, स्टेशनों पर नीचे दर्जे के मुसाफिरों के विश्रामालयों के लिये, उन की सुराक और भोजन के लिये, पानी के लिये तथा इन सब बातों के साथ और जो दूसरी सुविधायें रेलवे पैसेन्जर्स को चाहियें उन के वास्ते जितना खर्च आज किया जा रहा है और जितना ध्यान उन की तरफ दिया जा रहा है उतना पहले कभी नहीं हुआ। हम में से हर एक इस बात को महसूस करता है कि आज इस की रफ्तार पहले

है तेज भी हो रही है। कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने है, उस में कमेटी ने सिफारिश की है कि आज जो एमनेंटीज हैं जो सुविधायें पहले से कायम हैं उन के खर्च को और बढ़ा दिया जाय। उस में व्यापारियों की सुविधायें भी शामिल कर दी जायें जैसे कि इम्प्रूव्ड गुड्स शॉड, लोडिंग और अनलोडिंग, प्लेटफार्म्स और वीटिंग शॉड्स फार ट्रीडिंग पब्लिक। अभी तक यह चीजें एमनेंटीज में शामिल नहीं थीं, लेकिन अब कमेटी की सिफारिश है कि इन चीजों को भी एमनेंटीज में शामिल कर लिया जाय। कमेटी ने एमनेंटीज के खर्च को तो बढ़ा दिया है लेकिन साथ ही कमेटी ने यह सिफारिश भी की है कि इन एमनेंटीज के लिये जो रुपया सालाना इञ्चार्जमेंट किया जायेगा, निधारित किया जायेगा, वह बदस्तूर २ करोड़ कायम रहेगा। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि जब एमनेंटीज का स्कोप बढ़ाया जाता है, खर्च बढ़ाया जाता है तो साथ में रुपयों की तादाद भी क्यों नहीं बढ़ाई जानी चाहिये। अगर एक तरफ एमनेंटीज के खर्च को बढ़ाया गया, व्यापारियों को सुविधा देने-लोडिंग और अनलोडिंग के लिये और उन पर रुपया खर्च किया जावेगा तो जो सुविधायें आज पैसेन्जर्स को दी जा रही हैं उन में कमी आयेगी।

मेरा निवेदन है कि हमारे रेलवे मिनिस्टर साहब, जो खुद इस के लिये उत्सुक रहते हैं वह इस पर पूरा विचार करेंगे।

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North): At the outset, I shall begin by saying that the Report of the Railway Convention Committee, 1954, is a very useful document. The Resolution moved by Shri L. B. Shastri, the Minister of Railways, is based upon this document, and we fully support it.

It is obvious that the Committee has worked under some limitations. The Committee should have had a little longer time in which to consider this very important issue. Secondly, it appears the Committee has kept in mind always that the consideration of this issue has to be

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

done always keeping in mind the needs of general finance. As regards the question of considering the needs of general revenues as overriding in a matter of railway finance as being right or wrong, I shall deal with it presently.

But let us admit that the Report and the recommendations of the Railway Convention Committee, 1954, have provided us with a workable formula, which will help us out of a fairly difficult situation. I shall briefly refer to two or three of their very valuable recommendations. One of their recommendations is:

"The cost of construction of all new lines when decided to be constructed might be debited to capital from the very beginning."

This is a recommendation that will encourage new construction. An arrangement which placed the burden of new construction, and particularly the construction of unremunerative lines, on Development Fund, was an arrangement which was not at all convenient.

Then, there is another recommendation which reads:

"In the event of the Development Fund not being in a position to meet the programme of expenditure, money should be advanced from General Revenues to the Railways."

We very heartily endorse this recommendation.

There is another recommendation, which deserves a special reference here, and it is that:

"The cost of replacement of assets created out of Development Fund shall be met out of the Depreciation Reserve Fund."

We find somewhere in this Report that the Railway Board entertains fears that in years to come, railway finances will meet with difficulties and deficits. I for one do not share

that fear. In a country with a growing population, in a country with an expanding economy, in a country where production, industrial and agricultural, is increasing, I do not think we would be justified in entertaining such a fear. Here again, we are a country which does not produce oil; we are a country which is still deficient in electric power, and therefore, any competing alternative transport services are not very likely to be available to us in the near future. Therefore, I for one should think that the fears of deficits and financial difficulties in the near future for our railways are unfounded.

The separation of railway finance from general finance was achieved some thirty years ago. During all these thirty years, whenever the question of contribution by railway finance to general finance was considered by a series of committees, the question of stability of general finance was given great importance. Whatever may have been the reason for this attitude in the past, I do not think we would be justified in continuing this attitude any longer. I do not think it is right for general finance to subordinate railway finance to considerations of its own needs. Of course, general finance are the owners of the railways and they can very well please themselves and do what they like with them. But if separation is to be maintained, then it has to have some meaning. Then, we have to give railway finance a certain amount of freedom to function in its own interests. I think that we have once and for all to decide whether we shall still continue to have this kind of an overriding consideration always from the point of view of the needs of general finance. If we do not agree, then why not make the railways a department of the Government?

Then the Committee have avoided a decision on the question whether

we shall consider railways as a commercial concern or as a public utility service. Now, obviously, without much argument, it can be seen that our railways are nothing but a public utility service. We have to decide this issue once for all. The Committee choose to consider the railways partly as a commercial concern and partly as a public utility service. Now, that is not a thing that helps clear thinking. We have to decide whether it is fish or fowl; we cannot say it is part fish and part fowl. I for one would consider this a very fundamental issue and frankly treat our railways as a public utility service, and only on that ground can we justify the monopoly of transport services which we have given to our railways.

Then somewhere in the Report, we see a certain amount of confusion as to whether income-tax is payable in case railways are treated as a public utility service. Somehow we get the impression that the Committee believe that income-tax will be payable only if railways are treated as a commercial concern, and that they can be exempted in case of railways being treated as a public utility service. I do not think that theoretically, or even under existing practice in other countries, we can do that. Income-tax is payable, whether we treat the railways as a commercial concern or as a public utility service, and I would urge that the next Committee, whenever they meet, do give very serious attention and treat these fundamental issues courageously and decide. The issues are whether we shall still continue to treat the needs a general finance as an overriding consideration, and whether our railways shall be considered as a commercial concern or be treated as a public utility service. When this is done, then alone we can have some hope of bringing some kind of order, some kind of science, some kind of method in all the jumbled-up kind of accounting and in all the various kinds of funds and reserves that are being built up in our railway finance.

I think our railway finance does need a little more of scientific treatment.

My object in putting all these things here today is that I would like our railway undertaking and its working to be made comparable with the working of other undertakings, other monopoly undertakings in this country—publicly owned, of course—or with other railway undertakings in other countries. And we can do that only when we have made up our mind on these fundamental issues. I am quite sure that our Railway Administration can help us.

A certain difficulty was pointed out in respect of income-tax and it was said that it would be difficult to compute the depreciation allowance under the existing railway accounting system in accordance with the provisions of the Income-tax Act. I do not think this difficulty can be allowed to be a deciding factor. It certainly is a difficulty which can be overcome with will; and I am quite sure that our railways have a very good record, a very creditable record, to show and they have nothing to fear by any possible comparison with similar undertakings in this country or in other countries.

Finally, I would very much support the idea of an *ad hoc* Committee which has been referred to in paragraph 37 of the Report, which should go very carefully into, and examine, the economic working of the railways in all its aspects. I am sorry to find that this idea of an *ad hoc* Committee has been given up on the assurance of the Railway Board that they are vigilantly watching one year's working after another. That is not exactly the purpose we have in mind. As I have said, all these very essential and fundamental issues have to be decided and our railways have to be made in their working comparable to the working of other public-owned concerns or undertakings. It is all the more necessary in view of the fact that in our planning—in our current Plan as well as in our next Five Year Plan—there will be an

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

ever-increasing amount of public resources to be invested in publicly-owned and publicly-controlled undertakings, and if our railways can co-operate and assist us in putting up a comparison, I think it will help considerably in creating greater confidence in those who still have doubts about the working of public undertakings.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi** (Chittor): Unfortunately, the scope of this Committee was very limited. Otherwise, in my opinion, the reference ought to have been 'to review the general working of the railways and suggest ways and means for making the railways operate profitably and efficiently and ensure an income of not less than 4 per cent. on the capital involved'. That ought to have been the reference by which a comprehensive survey of the whole working of the railways could have been undertaken. Except for a suggestion contained in paragraph 26 of this report which says:

"Operating Improvement Works are partly purely safety works and partly other works to ensure smooth flow of traffic, including line capacity, works, improvement to workshops, watering arrangements etc. The present rate of such expenditure debited to the Development Fund is about Rs. 1.5 crores per annum which includes only a very small amount on account of safety works."

No other paragraph indicates that the Committee had within their scope of inquiry the idea of expenditure or control of expenditure. We have—one and all—said that it is a very big industry of ours. Even friends like Dr. Lanka Sundaram have also said that it is a big industry of ours. Yet, in the same breath, he says that it is a public utility concern. If this idea of public utility concern is given up once for all, we would be on safer lines. It is not a public utility concern. It is, pure and simple, a commercial undertaking, a big

commercial undertaking, a big industry; there is no doubt about it. We carry passengers in competition with others. We carry goods in competition with others. We charge them. We are liable for every act of misfeasance, malfeasance and non-feasance. What more is required for a commercial undertaking? We carry mails; we charge for that also. The only exception is that at times, it being our own concern, we make use of it for strategic purposes. That is a different thing. That is why we call it a national undertaking. But what does not mean that it is not a commercial undertaking. When these railways were run by the British-owned companies they were paying regular dividends. Today by the various manipulations of the Depreciation Fund and the Development Fund, we find that actually they are not earning anything. The reason why we are not earning anything is this. To talk anything about labour these days is taboo, but as was pointed out by my learned friend, Shri Das, our expenses on labour have increased tremendously. All those who are working on the railways think that the railway administration is a sort of philanthropic society for them. They must all travel free; not only they, but all their relatives, all their friends, and if unfortunately anybody is honest to check their passes or tickets, he is considered to be a very mean-minded ticket-examiner who does not allow the free travel of these people. About ten millions of people travel free and they bring about this deficit for us. About Rs. 10 crores of income is foregone by the tax-payer.

**Shri Amjad Ali** (Goalpara—Garo Hills): Sadhus and Sanyasis.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi**: Yes, sadhus, sanyasis, fakirs, Railway servants, their fathers, fathers-in-law, etc., etc. But why talk of sadhus and sanyasis? They are few and far between. It is enough if the railway employees cease to imagine that this is a

philanthropic society for all employees to be used as they like—they can steal any amount of material. I have seen instances where houses have been built from railway material by train examiners; houses have been built by guards; houses have been built by P.W. inspectors with the stamp of B.B. and C.I. or Indian Railway property on certain items. Every Indian railway employee has got a rexin bag with the stamp of the railway on it to carry about. Another remarkable feature is that stores worth Rs. 67 crores are lying idle. Yet we go on talking in terms which are not quite understandable.

Some hon. Members who have studied economics and know a great deal of it, talk in technical terms of adjusting one account against another, which laymen like me do not understand. But as an ordinary man with a knowledge of business, I put this proposition. If I go to an Income-tax Officer he would tell me: you have invested so much money as capital; so much is your turn over and 10 per cent. of the turn over should be your income. I do not believe your accounts: 10 per cent. must be your income and you pay Income-tax on it. When we have a big undertaking like this why should we not expect a similar income. An ordinary income-tax officer does not believe you when you say that you have not made any profit. Why can't you make a profit, especially when you have a monopoly. As my hon. friend Shri B. Das has very aptly put it: this colonial pattern of governing the railways must go. Every officer must feel that this is a national industry, which must pay us and which must pay us annually.

I would request the hon. the Railway Minister to look into the working of the late Rajasthan Railway. This small railway system owned by the Mewar Government was always paying very well: heavy dividends of not less than 10 or 12 per cent. Yet, it was most efficiently run; there was not a single theft; there was not

a single man who travelled on that railway without a ticket. You can never imagine of travelling without a ticket and yet, the comforts of the passengers were looked after in a tremendously better manner, than it is looked after by Government now.

**An Hon. Member:** Question.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** What question, you have not seen it. Even today with a lower standard of administration, you cannot travel there without a ticket.

**Shri Heda (Nizamabad):** Sadhus abound in Rajasthan.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. Members should address the Chair.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** I am sorry for having replied to my hon. friend's interruption directly in the heat of the moment.

The whole point of my argument is that we must bring to bear an outlook that this is a commercial undertaking. It is a useful concern, no doubt. Now, Rs. 3 crores have been set apart for providing amenities. Those of us who have the misfortune of travelling these days on lines which are not called first class lines, know, that, let alone amenities, even the small comforts, or even the necessities for the purpose of travelling are not available. The old second class bogies have been withdrawn and they have been replaced by small four-wheelers. The charges for the second class are the same, irrespective of the fact that the line is first second or third class. Sometimes there is not even a latrine if there is a latrine, there is no door to it; if there is a door there won't be bolt to it. You will find the mirror taken away. These amenities are meant only to provide some big bread for the contractors, and for the engineering branch of the railways. Fifty per cent. of the money spent on the amenities goes into the pockets of the engineering branch; out of the 50 per cent. that remains, 50 per cent. again goes into the pockets of the contractors; and only 25 per

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

cent. of the allotment is actually used for the benefit of the passengers. After all people do not go to the railways for having a good drink or a good meal. They go there for travelling. Let alone the amenities, I would request the Railway Ministry to provide the bare necessities. Any number of instances can be cited. Well built masonry latrines were demolished, to provide a different type of latrines, which we call public convenience. Where there were sixteen latrines, four have been provided. People clamour for more. Are these amenities? I have seen stations where all the amenities have been provided. By some bureaucratic method of computation, an estimate is made of the number of passengers getting down at a particular station and huge sheds are put up, without realising that adjoining the station is the town. Not for a moment does a single passenger stay in that shed. Why do you build such sheds? Nobody wants it? Because of the application of that formula. There is no imagination behind it. Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri would not have seen it. He cannot be expected to go to every station. No doubt he is a kind-hearted man, he visits all places to which people request him to go, but he cannot go to all the places and it is our duty to point out to him these things.

These Railways are a commercial undertaking meant for the good of the country, meant to serve the country well. It may be called a utility concern, but it is not a utility concern in the sense that it is a philanthropic society dispersing salaries and allowances to its employees. It is the tax-payer who pays the money. In the olden days you could travel cheaply. You could travel cheaply and yet you had comforts. Now, you pay more and you do not get comforts. The railway employees, big or small, wherever these amenities are provided, they take full advantage of them. For

example, if there is an apparatus for cooling water provided at a station, that cooling apparatus gives no water to those passengers who are passing by that intermediate station. But, it gives a very good supply for the railway staff. The railway staff at that station get cold water; there is no doubt about that. If the amenities are meant for those employees, well and good. Then, say that this is a labour welfare provision. This is not an amenity to the public. If you provide retiring rooms at a station you will find them occupied by railway employees. When you go, you are told:

वहां साहब ठहरें हुए हैं, अभी जगह नहीं ।

Even if the railway employees are staying there for three days—not only for 24 hours—you are not allowed the facility to stay there. Therefore, these railway amenities are only meant for that purpose.

I would request the hon. Minister to look into this. He has got the best and *bona fide* motives; I agree. But, he must see to it that this expenditure is properly utilised. The view that has been expressed by this Committee, to some extent, is correct. But, I hope that next time when we appoint a Convention Committee, this Convention Committee's reference should not be limited to the present scope of merely making a suggestion as to how the allocation of funds should take place, but it should also proceed with the other aspect of earning in the railways and how the railways serve our country. When that will be looked into, then alone we will be satisfied.

**Mr. Chairman:** I would request hon. Members to confine their speeches to 10 minutes and in no case beyond 12 minutes.

**Shri Mohiuddin (Hyderabad City):** This occasion of the consideration of the Convention Committee's Report comes only once in five years. It is unfortunate that the necessary data for consideration of the whole problem of

the financial structure of the railways has not been provided. With the Report of the Convention Committee the Memorandum and other papers submitted to the Committee could be printed and these papers could be circulated to the Members. The lack of this data limits our judgment regarding the recommendations made by the Committee.

The first important question which the Committee has referred to is whether the railway is a commercial undertaking or it is a public utility. They have not discussed the merits or demerits of one or the other. After simply stating the problem as it came before them, they have given their obiter dicta that it is a hybrid product of the Joint Committee of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. I do not know what is the implication of the proposition that the railway undertaking is both a commercial undertaking as well as public utility. There is no significant attached to the use of the words as such. If any name is to be given, either commercial undertaking, or public utility or a combination of both, this must have some implications. Otherwise, there is no meaning in calling them by one name or the other. What are, those implications? Why is it a combination of the two? These things are not made clear by the Committee, and I, for one, would certainly not accept that the railway undertaking should be treated as a combination of the two; that is, commercial as well as public utility. It should be treated as one or the other.

I am sure that by calling it a public utility we will be making a confusion worse confounded. When one knows that it should be treated as a commercial concern one has got a definite aim and definite object in his view about the keeping of accounts, about Depreciation Fund, about replacement of assets and so on. But, when it is treated as a public utility, perhaps, these ideas, these presumptions on which commercial accounts are kept, are relaxed and we do not know where this concept will lead us to.

I would have certainly agreed wholeheartedly with the Report if these

ideas were made clear and as they are not made clear and the whole concept is very vague, I suggest that the hon. Minister of Railways should make it clear that the whole undertaking would be treated as a commercial concern.

The Railway Board is very pessimistic in regard to the future finances of the railways. On page 7 and page 14 they say that unless the rate of dividend is reduced or fares and freights are increased, the finances will not be able to meet the demands of Development or Depreciation Reserve Fund. In spite of this pessimistic view of the Board submitted to the Committee, the Committee on the other hand are very optimistic. They are optimistic that in the expanding economy of the country the revenues of the railways will expand and there will be no difficulty in regard to either Development Fund, the Depreciation Reserve Fund or payment of the rates of dividend. Sir, I am not satisfied with these broad statements. On the one hand the pessimistic view of the Railway Board and on the other the optimistic view of the Committee leave us in great uncertainty. We do not have sufficient data to form our own judgment about the whole affair. The requirement of the moment is.....

**Mr. Chairman:** Two minutes more.

**Shri Mohiuddin:** I shall finish soon. The problem before the country is of very great magnitude and importance as far as the future development is concerned, and the railways and transport have got to play a very important part in the future development of the country. For that purpose, we have got to see that sufficient funds are available for development, for construction of new railways and for replacement of the wasting assets. The view of the Railway Board—though we have not got them in detail—seem to be that we will be short of funds for all these purposes in the next five years. I feel that this report definitely reaches the conclusion—at least it suggests the conclusion—that a very thorough enquiry, a thorough investigation is necessary into the working of the railways, into the efficient working of the whole railway system and into

[Shri Mohiuddin]

the amount of the capital at charge; whether to what extent there is over capitalization and into the fact whether the capital at charge should be Rs. 9 crores or Rs. 6 crores or Rs. 7 crores. It is necessary to find out whether the rate of depreciation that we are providing is sufficient for the replacement of the wasting assets and whether we will have sufficient funds for the future expansion of the railways in this country, to meet our requirements and needs. I would even suggest that the railway should pay to the Government only the minimum average interest on the capital which they have borrowed from the Government and the whole of the surplus earnings are left with them in order to meet the replacement of assets and to expand the railways in India.

श्री एस० एन० दास : मैं आपकी आज्ञा से इस विषय पर कुछ कहने से पहले एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि आप मुझे उसके लिए क्षमा करेंगे। जो माननीय सदस्य आपकी आँखों को पकड़ लेते हैं उनको पहले बोलने का मौका मिल जाता है और वे ज्यादा टाइम भी ले लेते हैं। जिन सदस्यों को बोलने का मौका बाद में मिलता है तो उस वक्त हाउस में कोरम ही नहीं रहता और बार बार कोरम पर करने के लिए घंटियाँ बजानी पड़ती हैं जिस की वजह से बड़ी बदनामी होती है.....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The position is this. Those hon. Members who had sent their names in advance were called upon to speak. Of course, Members from the Opposition side and also Government Members are taken into consideration, though this is not a Bill. As regards time, of course, those who speak in the beginning have to cover many points, and naturally those who come later on may not repeat the same arguments. It does not matter much.

Shri S. N. Das: I only wanted to draw the attention of the hon. Members to the point that those who have already spoken may also remain in the

House so that they could hear the new points which other Members might have. Of course, those who spoke earlier have been rewarded by having greater time, because they were given the first opportunity which we, who come later, have not got.

Shri Amjad Ali: Take note of the V.I.Ps.

श्री एस० एन० दास : मैं कहना चाहता था कि स्वराज मिलने के बाद जब १९४६ में रेलवे कनवेंशन कमेटी बिठाई गई थी उस समय रेलों की कार्यप्रणाली और रेलों के अन्दर जो दूसरे मोहकमे थे जैसे रेलों के जो कारखाने चलते हैं उन सब की खोज करने और उनमें सुधार लाने के लिये कमेटी बिठाकर जांच करने का उपयुक्त समय नहीं था। रेलवे रिग्युपिंग जो इसी बीच हुआ और जो रियासतों की रेलों थी वे भी केंद्रीय सरकार के कब्जे में आईं, इसलिये अब मैं समझता हूँ कि रेलवे कनवेंशन कमेटी बिठाने से पहले तमाम आर्थिक और दूसरे पहलुओं पर विस्तार से विचार कर लेना चाहिए था और फिर इन सब चीजों को इस कमेटी के सामने रखना चाहिए था। इन सब चीजों का ध्यान में रखते हुए इस कमेटी को फॉसला करना चाहिए था कि साधारण वित्त और रेलवे वित्त में क्या सम्बन्ध हो और अगले पांच वर्षों में साधारण राजस्व में रेलवे कितना अनुदान दें। संसदीय कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के पैरा २७ का दखन से पता चलता है कि जब इस कमेटी ने रेलवे के इकनॉमिक बिक्री की जांच एक विशेष कमेटी द्वारा कराने का सुझाव के सम्बन्ध में विचार करना शुरू किया तब रेलवे बोर्ड के यह कहने पर कि

"that a close watch over the trends of earnings and expenditure of the Railways was continuously kept and the appointment of a separate ad hoc Committee was not necessary"

इस सुझाव पर विचार करना छोड़ दिया और आगे भी इस प्रकार की जांच की आवश्यकता नहीं मानी गई। मेरे विचार में ऐसा करना ठीक

नहीं हुआ। मंरा तां विचार हैं कि अगले पंच वर्षीय पुनर्विभाजन के पहले ही इस प्रकार की कमेटी बँठायी जाय जो रेलवे के कामों के बारे में हर पहलू से जांच करे। इस बात का इंतजार नहीं किया जाना चाहिए कि पांच साल के बाद जो कन्वेंशन कमेटी बैठे वही इस पर विचार करे और तभी इस कमेटी की नियुक्ति की जाए। इस वक्त रेलवेज के वकील के बारे में पूरा चित्र दर्श के सामने और खासकर संसद के सामने रखने की आवश्यकता है और मैं रेलवे मिनिस्टर साहब से अपील करता हूँ कि वे एक ऐसी कमेटी जल्दी से जल्दी नियुक्त करें।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि १९२४ में जो कमेटी बिठाई गई थी उसने कहा था कि रेलवे फाइनेंस को जनरल फाइनेंस से अलग किया जाना न सिर्फ दर्श के ही हित में है बल्कि यह रेलवे और जनरल फाइनेंस के हित में भी है और ऐसा कर भी दिया जाना चाहिए। यहाँ पर यह प्रश्न भी उठाया गया है कि क्या रेलवे पब्लिक यूटीलिटी कनसर्न है या कमर्शियल कनसर्न है। मैं इसकी पेंचीदगियाँ में जाना नहीं चाहता। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि यह पब्लिक यूटीलिटी नसर्न भी है और कमर्शियल कनसर्न भी। हम यहाँ पर दोनों हीँसियताओं से बैठे हैं। जब हम इस सवाल पर टैक्स पेयर की हीँसियत से विचार करना शुरू करते हैं तो हम समझते हैं कि क्योंकि हम ने रेलों के निर्माण और विस्तार के लिए रुपया लगाया है, इस धात्वे हमें इसमें से नफा मिलना चाहिए। दूसरी हमारी हीँसियत जनता के प्रतिनिधियों की है। इस हीँसियत से हमें यह दर्खना है कि रेलों में लोगों को अधिक से अधिक सुविधाएँ मिलनी चाहिए और फ्रेंड्स और फेयरर्स यानी भाड़ा और किराया कम होना चाहिए। जब हम संसद के मੈम्बरों की हीँसियत से इस सवाल पर विचार करते हैं तो हम समझते हैं कि यह पब्लिक यूटीलिटी कनसर्न होना चाहिए। तो हमारी यह दोनों हीँसियतें हैं। इसका पब्लिक यूटीलिटी का भी काम है और साथ ही साथ टैक्स पेयर को नफा देना भी इसका काम है, इसका यह भी काम है कि यह सरकार को जो

कि टैक्स पेयर की प्रतिनिधि है मुनाफा भी दे। तो सचमुच यह एक पब्लिक यूटीलिटी कनसर्न भी है और साथ ही एक व्यापारिक संस्था भी है। इसलिए हमको इस पर इन दोनों हीँसियताओं से विचार करना चाहिए।

M.

जब इसके सम्बन्ध में एक बात और हमारे सामने आती है। जो चित्र रेलवे बोर्ड ने अगले पांच वर्षों के आय-व्यय के भविष्य के बारे में कमेटी के सामने रखा है उसके बारे में कहा गया है कि यह एक निःशुल्क चित्र है। कहा गया है कि अगले पांच वर्षों में जो रेलवे की आमदनी होगी वह ऐसी नहीं होगी जिसकी बुनियाद पर हम कोई बहुत बड़िया चित्र खींच सकें। मंरा ख्याल है कि अगर रेलवे के वकील के बारे में जानकारी प्राप्त करने के लिए कोई कमेटी बँठायी गयी होती और उसके आंकड़ों और दूसरे विषय हमारे सामने होते तो यह जो निःशुल्क चित्र रेलवे बोर्ड ने कमेटी के सामने रखा है यह न रखा जाता। हमको मालूम है कि रेलवे के बहुत से ऐसे कारखाने हैं जिनकी काम करने की क्षमता बहुत ज्यादा है लेकिन उस क्षमता के अनुसार उनमें काम नहीं हो पाता है। हम लोग चित्तूरजन का कारखाना दर्खने गये थे। यह बात सही है कि वह कारखाना अभी नया है और उसके साथ जो दूसरे उद्योग चलने वाले हैं उनका निर्माण ज़ोना बाकी है, लेकिन फिर भी हमने देखा कि वहाँ बहुत बड़ी तादाद में काम करने वाले और नशीनें बेकार थीं। केवल चित्तूरजन के कारखाने की ही यह बात बात नहीं है। और भी बहुत से कारखाने हैं जिनकी उत्पादन की क्षमता बहुत ज्यादा है और जहाँ आदमी भी बहुत ज्यादा है, लेकिन चीक़ उनकी ठीक निगरानी नहीं होती है इसलिए उन कारखानों में जितना उत्पादन हो सकता है उतना नहीं होता। रेलवे केवल यातायात का साधन ही नहीं है, उसके पास बहुत से कारखाने हैं उनको भी वह चलाती है और इस तरह से उसके पास उत्पादन का बहुत बड़ा काम है। इस कारण, जैसा मैंने कहा यह एक व्यापारिक संस्था भी है। लेकिन एक

[श्री एस० एन० दास]

व्यापारिक संस्था की दृष्टि से इसकी जितनी निगरानी होनी चाहिए वह नहीं होती है। इस झमेलें में कि यह पब्लिक यूटीलिटी कन्सर्न है या व्यापारिक संस्था है, हमारा रेलवे बोर्ड भी कभी कभी झमेलें में पड़ जाता है। और जब रेलवे बजट के समय इस सदन में यह कहा जाता है कि किराया घटना चाहिए क्योंकि गरीब जनता इतना किराया वहन नहीं कर सकती, और जब व्यवसायी लोग यह शिकायत करते हैं कि माल डोने का किराया बहुत ज्यादा है, इसकी दर पर फिर से विचार करना चाहिए तो रेलवे बोर्ड बहुत घबरा जाता है। जब हम कहेंगे कि यह कर्मीशियल संस्था है तो उस पर उसी दृष्टि से विचार किया जायगा। मैं नहीं जानता कि दूसरे देशों में किराया निर्धारित करने का क्या ढंग है, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि जो लोग रेल से सफर करते हैं उनका किराया नियंत्रित करने का कोई आधार होना चाहिए। मुझे यह भी नहीं मालूम कि हमारे देश में जो किराया घटाया या बढ़ाया जाता है वह किस आधार पर किया जाता है। अगर यह रेलवे व्यापारिक संस्था है तो उसके किरायों का निर्धारण, फिर चाहे वह प्रेंट हो या फेयर हो, वैज्ञानिक ढंग पर होना चाहिए। मैं नहीं जानता कि अब तक इस वैज्ञानिक ढंग से इस किराये और भाई की दर का निश्चय रेलवे ने किया है या नहीं। इसलिए इस बात को देखते हुए मैं कहूँगा कि इस बात की बहुत जरूरत है कि एक कमेटी इसको देखने के लिए निर्माण की जाय।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ। डेवलपमेंट फंड का दापरा बहुत बढ़ा दिया गया है। डेवलपमेंट फंड में जो चीजें पहले थीं उनसे कुछ और ज्यादा चीजें उसमें रख दी गयी हैं। उसमें रेलवे ट्रांसपोर्ट को इस्तेमाल करने वालों के फायदे और बढ़ा दिये गये हैं। मालूम नहीं कि जो कमेटी ने सिफारिश की है उसका क्या अर्थ है। क्या यात्रियों की सुविधा के लिए जो कम से कम तीन करोड़ रुपया रखा जाता है वह

कायम रहेगा या कि यात्रियों की सुविधा और जो रेलवे के दूसरे इस्तेमाल करने वाले लोग हैं उनकी सुविधाओं के लिए भिलाकर तीन करोड़ रुपया रहेगा। मेरा सुझाव यह है कि जो तीन करोड़ रुपया यात्रियों की सुविधा के लिए रखा गया है वह आगे के लिए भी कायम रहना चाहिए और जो लोग दूसरे तरीके से रेलवे ट्रांसपोर्ट का इस्तेमाल करते हैं उनके लिए और रकम इअरमार्क कर दी जाय।

एक बात और कहकर मैं खत्म करता हूँ। यह प्रस्ताव जो माननीय मंत्री जी ने सभा के सामने रखा है यह गोलमाल सा मालूम होता है। रिपोर्ट में जो सिफारिशों की गयी हैं वे एक जगह ठीक से नहीं लिखी गयी हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस तरह का प्रस्ताव सन् १९४९ में कांस्टीट्यूट असंबली में आया था और जिस तरह सुव्यवस्थित ढंग से उसमें हर एक चीज रखी गई थी उसी तरह अगर इसमें भी रख दी जाती तो यह भ्रमला न उठता। पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी में यह सवाल उठा था कि प्रस्ताव में डिप्रिसियेशन फंड के लिए १५ करोड़ रखा गया था लेकिन रिपोर्ट से मालूम होता है कि रेलवे ने १५ करोड़ के बदले ३० करोड़ रुपया हर साल डिप्रिसियेशन फंड में रखा है और रेलवे और आर्टिटर जनरल के बीच इस विषय में मतभेद पैदा हो गया कि क्या रेलवे बोर्ड को यह अधिकार है कि पांच वर्ष के अन्दर बिना सभा की राय के जो प्रिगिमम १५ करोड़ रखा गया था उसको बढ़ाकर ३० करोड़ कर दिया जाय। मालूम नहीं कि यह विवाद खत्म हुआ या नहीं। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो भी कमेटी की सिफारिश हो उसको १,२,३, नम्बर करके नए तुल्य शब्दों में रखा जाना चाहिए था जिसमें आगे चल कर विवाद की गुंजाइश न रहे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि रेलवे के वीकेंग की जांच करने के लिए जल्दी ही एक कमेटी का निर्माण किया जायगा।

**Shri Raghbir Sahai** (Etah Dist.—North East cum Budaun Dist.—East): While discussing this Resolution, we ought to bear in mind some relevant points of history regarding this problem. Every hon. Member of this House knows that prior to 1924, the railway finances were merged with the general finances. It was only in that year that this separation took place. The object with which this separation took place was to secure stability for civil estimates by providing for an assured contribution from railway revenues and also to introduce flexibility in the administration of railway finances. After that separation, things went on till 1949 when the whole matter was again considered. In 1950, a detailed resolution was brought before the Constituent Assembly by Shri Gopalaswamy Ayyangar in which this question of dividend was properly tackled. When the finances were separated in 1924, the rate of dividend was fixed at about one per cent. of the capital at charge but in 1950 the rate of dividend was fixed at four per cent. In the resolution it was again laid down that the whole matter with regard to this dividend should be considered after a period of five years. This Committee was formed simply to consider that limited and specific question.

In the course of the discussion on this Resolution, many other points beside the mark have been brought in. Some hon. friends have talked about the colonial mentality and also how the railways were built hundred years ago by the sweat and the blood of Indians. That may be true but they are not very relevant to the problem that we are discussing at the present moment.

This Committee, as I said, was only appointed to consider the question whether the dividend should remain at the level which was fixed in the year 1950 or whether there should be any reduction or increase therein. The Committee has recommended that the dividend should remain at the same level. Today some hon. Members from the Opposition have tabled certain

amendments and they have also spoken in support thereof. Some of the amendments are to the effect that the rate of dividend should be reduced to 3½ per cent. or 3.18 per cent. This problem also was considered by the Committee and, having considered all those things, they came to the decision of fixing the level at 4 per cent. I am really sorry that the Financial Commissioner's memorandum and the Railway Board's memorandum were not placed at our disposal. If those two valuable documents had been placed before us, perhaps they would have given more food for thought and material for our conclusions. But that as it may, the entire material was considered by this responsible Committee and they came to the conclusion that the rate of dividend should be fixed at 4 per cent. Perhaps the reduction which is being proposed is due to the remark in the Report that the Railway Board has admitted that during the last five years there was a shortfall of Rs. 31 crores, and that can give rise to a suspicion that this rate of 4 per cent. may not be proper in the years to come. But hon. Members will find that side by side with this statement it is also recorded in the Report that during 1950-51 to 1954-55 a sum of Rs. 7 crores per annum on an average has been paid by the Railways to the general revenues by way of contribution over and above the interest charges on the total capital-at-charge. So this fact also should be taken into consideration, and I think it was taken into consideration by the Committee when they arrived at their conclusions.

Secondly, it should also be borne in mind that we are already executing our First Five Year Plan in which the railway development figures very prominently. The Second Five Year Plan is also in the offing and we have to take account of that also and have our general finances in such a way that they may be able to bear the cost of the Second Five Year Plan. As in the First Five Year Plan the item of railway development is a very prominent one, so would it be in the Second Five Year Plan also.

[Shri Raghbir Sahai]

Along with these it should also be noted that at the time when four per cent dividend was fixed the rate of borrowing was about 3.18, and this Committee also has come to the conclusion that this very rate of interest, that is 3.18 per cent, is to be reached very shortly. So from all those considerations we can easily come to the conclusion that the rate of dividend which was fixed at four per cent. was the proper rate and there should be no diminution or increase in it.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Another amendment was also tabled that with regard to the amenities wherein a provision has been made for Rs. 3 crores per annum, the same should be raised to Rs. 4 crores or 5 crores. Well, Sir, everybody would welcome, if the finances of the railways would permit an increase in that direction, because amenities are very necessary, and the more money is spent on them the better. But I submit that in this Resolution and also in these recommendations it would be seen that there is only a provision that a minimum sum of Rs. 3 crores per annum be earmarked for amenities; no maximum amount has been laid down. So we should not tie down the hands of the Railway Department. We should expect, and we should bring to bear that parliamentary pressure upon them, that in subsequent years they may not only be satisfied with spending Rs. 3 crores on amenities, but more than that.

It was also said by Shri H. N. Mukerjee that the Government should give an undertaking that in the next five years no increment will be made either in freights or fares. Well, Sir, that is again another thing which would be welcomed by all. But I do not understand how a responsible Government or a Minister thereof can give an undertaking or an assurance for the future. That is also not a practical proposition.

There are one or two welcome features in this Report which I would

briefly mention. There is a provision for the encouragement of new lines in regard to which some great concessions have been made. In the first place, for the capital or for the amount that would be spent in the construction of those lines the interest charged would be less than what is usually charged for other items; and in the second place there would be a moratorium. The interest would not be charged year to year, but that would be deferred till the railways are on a running basis, and a period of five years has elapsed.

Another welcome feature is that the amount set apart for the Depreciation Reserve Fund, which upto now was only Rs. 15 crores, has been raised to Rs. 35 crores. The Committee has taken into consideration that during these five years the sum that was contributed to the Depreciation Reserve Fund was not only fifteen but thirty crores of rupees every year, and therefore they have very rightly fixed the amount of the Depreciation Reserve Fund at thirty-five crores of rupees.

I welcome this Resolution and give my whole-hearted support to it.

Shri P. Subba Rao (Nowrangpur): While supporting this Resolution I wish to make a few observations with regard to one or two points.

The report recommends to the Railway Board to look into the matter of assessment of rent and ensure that a return of rent more commensurate with the capital cost is obtained on all residential houses for Class III staff. It is common knowledge that about one-third of Class III staff is provided with quarters and two-thirds are without quarters. They have to pay a very high rent for private houses. Quarters are allotted on the basis of seniority in service and there are instances where a house is allotted to one employee and he sublets it for four times the rent to another employee who is not provided with quarter. Another point to be borne in mind with regard to this question is that the cost of the

present construction should be taken into account and not what it was when the house was built a few years ago. With regard to fares, most of the Railways were constructed several years back at a low cost. We charge a uniform fare. While the new constructions do not pay even any interest, the old concerns are profitable. We are not having two rates of fares, one for the old lines and another for new lines. Applying that rule, I want a uniform rent to be charged irrespective of the time of construction. If this rule is followed, more quarters can be built for the staff who are thrown into the street. I agree with the recommendation that the cost of Class III staff quarters should be debited to the capital account.

With regard to the construction of new lines, I agree with the recommendation contained in para. 19. At the same time, I would request that inflation mileage should not be taken into account. I believe that in some Railways, say, for example, the Nilgiri Mountain Railway, inflation charges exist. The cost of construction of hill railways is much more. That was done in the British days when the Englishmen wanted to have hill resorts. I think there will be no more necessity to construct any hill railways. All the constructions will be for public benefit.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What about the railway to Jammu?

**Shri P. Subba Rao:** I think it should be constructed.

**Shri Amjad Ali:** That is being built.

**Shri P. Subba Rao:** I am opposed to any railway that is to bring loss to us.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** In the beginning, no railway will pay.

**Shri P. Subba Rao:** If it is guaranteed, as recommended by the Committee, that it would pay after five years, I would have no objection. If it does not pay, we should not undertake the construction of such a line.

In order to connect the metre gauge in the south with that in the north, the Hingoli-Khandwa line has been

suggested to be constructed and the work has also finished. The question of charging inflationary mileage was hinted at. I do not see any reason why there should be any inflationary charge in this line. This was constructed only for lessening the loading and unloading charges from the metre gauge to the broad gauge and also to facilitate moving of wagons from the north to the south and vice versa. I would have no objection to a dividend of four per cent. provided we can realise all that we ought to get.

This problem of ticketless travel was hinted at by my hon. friend. It has increased. I believe nowhere else in the world you have such ticketless travel as in India. I would suggest to the hon. Railway Minister to send a Committee of three or four people to study the conditions as to whether there is ticketless travel abroad and the steps taken to put an end to this. There was also a lot of commotion about the granting of passes to the employees and servants of the Railways. I think there is some abuse in the use of passes and P.T.Os. The rules must be made more stringent so that there will be no abuse. About amenities, the hon. Minister has already announced that sleeping berths for third class passengers would be provided in all the Railways. It will take some time. But, I believe that a part of this sum of Rs. 3 crores allotted for amenities would be utilised for this purpose.

**श्री हेन्ना :** यह जो रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत की गई है यह एक बहुत ही मजेदार रिपोर्ट है वह इस अर्थ में कि इस से कुछ ऐसा लगता है कि इसमें कुछ भी नहीं है लेकिन वास्तव में तकरीबन हर चीज इसके अन्दर सिद्धि में मौजूद है। इस क्लबेशन के सुपुर्दे एक बहुत बड़ा काम किया गया था और वह था हमारे राष्ट्र का सब से बड़ा व्यवसाय जिस में कि उद्योग का पहलू भी शामिल है और लगभग एक हजार करोड़ रुपये जिस की मूल पूंजी है। उस कार्य का आर्थिक निर्माण व आर्थिक ढांचा कैसा हो, उसके अन्दर मूल पूंजी कितनी लगे, कैसे आए सुद देना चाहिए या

[श्री हेडा]

नहीं दूना चाहिए, और अगर दूना चाहिए तो उसकी दर क्या हो, इत्यादि मामले उस कमेटी के सुपुर्द किए गए थे। इन सब बातों का विवरण हमारे सामने लाया जाता है और वह भी बहुत संपीड़ित रूप में। लेकिन फिर भी एक बात जरूर है कि हर प्रश्न के हर पहलू पर कहीं न कहीं कुछ न कुछ प्रकाश अवश्य डाला गया है। पांच वर्षों में इस प्रकार का एक विवरण हमारे सामने आता है और हर बार इन सब पहलुओं पर विचार किया जाता है। पहला सवाल जिस के ऊपर कि इस में चर्चा की गई है वह यह है कि रेलवे एक ऐसा व्यवसाय है जो कि जनहितकारी कार्य है और में समझता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में जो रिपोर्ट में मान्यता दी गई है वह तकरीबन सर्वमान्य होनी चाहिए। उन्होंने एक स्वर्ण पदक प्राप्त किया है यह कहकर कि यह दोनों ही हैं। यह जनहितकारी कार्य भी है और साथ साथ व्यवसाय का पहलू भी इसके अन्दर शामिल है और यही कारण है कि आगे चलकर चार प्रतिशत की मूल पूंजी के ऊपर लाभ चाहिए, डिबिटेंट चाहिए, जनरल र्वेन्यू में देने का जो संकेत है, जो सुझाव है, वह सुभाव सब के लिए मान्य है और मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत कम सदस्यों की ओर से उसका विरोध हुआ है। साथ ही साथ हम यह आशा कर सकते हैं कि यह चार प्रतिशत देने के बाद जो कुछ भी बचता है यानी वाजबी चीजें जो उठानी चाहिए जैसे कि डीप्रिसियेशन रिजर्व फंड और इस तरह के फंड्स वर्गरेह के लिए रुपया निकालने के बाद जो कुछ भी बचता है जिसे कि असली मुनाफा कहा जा सकता है, उसके बारे में कुछ सदस्यों ने यह राय जाहिर की है कि उसका ५० प्रतिशत फिर जनरल र्वेन्यू में आना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह चीज वाजिब नहीं होगी जब हम इसे एक पब्लिक यूटिलिटी यानी जनहितकारी कार्य समझते हैं। तब एंसी हालत में फिर जो कुछ भी बचता है वह जनहित में ही लगाया जाना चाहिए न कि जनरल र्वेन्यू के अन्दर आना चाहिए। जनहित के सम्बन्ध में अब जो हमारा फंड यहां मौजूद है

उसके बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आम तौर पर यह होता है कि जहां से ज्यादा शार होता है या जहां से कुछ कष्ट होने की सम्भावना होती है उन स्थानों के ऊपर ज्यादा ध्यान दिया जाता है, क्योंकि आम तौर पर घर्षण के सिद्धांतों पर ही लोगों का ज्यादा ध्यान होता है और यही कारण है कि कुछ सदस्यों ने यह सुझाव दिया है कि कम से कम तीन करोड़ रुपये जो इसमें दिखाए गए हैं वह उतनी रकम कंवल मुसाफिरों के लिए और उनकी सुविधा के वास्ते, उनकी सहूलियतों के ऊपर ही खर्च होनी चाहिए। बाकी जो दूसरी सुविधायें हैं उनके वास्ते और रकम बढ़ा दी जाय। कुछ लोगों ने सुझाव दिया है कि कम से कम तीन करोड़ जरूर रखा जाय। कुछ ने सुझाव दिया है कि इसको पांच करोड़ किया जाय, बाकी रकम और चीजों में खर्च की जाय। इस सम्बन्ध में, मैं यह अर्ज करूंगा कि इस समय में यह तीन करोड़ की रकम माने लेंता हूँ। लेकिन अगर रेलवे में ज्यादा लाभ हो तो उसी हिसाब से इसको चार करोड़ या पांच करोड़ कर दिया जाय। मैं इसके लिए कोई परसेंटज नहीं रखना चाहता। मैं चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम तीन करोड़ तो रखा ही जाय और यदि ज्यादा लाभ हो तो उस हिसाब से इसको चार या पांच करोड़ कर दिया जाय।

एक चीज का मैं और उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ। वह यह है कि जिस प्रकार हिसाब रखा जाता है वह तरीका ठीक नहीं है। श्री तुलसी दास जी ने इस विषय में काफी विस्तार से चर्चा की है और जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा है और जो कुछ मैं ने समझा है वह यह है कि हिसाब रखने की वही पद्धति होनी चाहिए जैसी कि कर्पोरेट फर्म में होती है। इस प्रकार की पद्धति न होने की वजह से हर वर्ष जब हमारे सामने रेलवे का बजट आता है तो हम यह नहीं समझ पाते कि हमारी क्या पांबीशन है। हमको यह पता नहीं चलता कि हमारी कितनी पूंजी कहाँ लगी हुई है।

साथ ही, जो रकम डीप्रिसियेशन के लिए निकाली जाती है वह भी ठीक तरीके से नहीं

निकाली जाती हैं। वह भी उसी प्रकार से निकाली जानी चाहिए जैसे कि दूसरे उद्योगों में किया जाता है। हर चीज के लिए ५ पर सेंट निकालना ठीक नहीं है। अगर एक चीज की उम्र बीस साल है तो उसके लिए तो पांच पर सेंट निकालना ठीक होगा। लेकिन अगर किसी चीज की उम्र पचास साल है तो उसके लिए भी पांच पर सेंट निकालना बहुत ज्यादा होगा। इसके बिल्कुल अलग अगर किसी चीज की उम्र दस बारह साल है तो उसके लिए पांच पर सेंट निकालना बहुत कम होगा। तो यह जो पांच पर सेंट का तरीका रखा गया है वह ठीक नहीं है। रेलवे में भी जो डीप्रेसियेशन लगाया जाय वह उसी तरीके से लगाया जाय जिस तरीके से कि दूसरे उद्योगों में लगाया जाता है।

नई लाइनें कहां तक मुनाफा देती हैं और कहां तक मुनाफा नहीं देती हैं, इस सम्बन्ध में इसके अन्दर बड़ी अच्छी चर्चा है हालांकि वह बहुत संक्षेप में है। यह कहा गया है कि जब हम नई लाइन खोलते हैं तो पहले-पहले उसमें मुनाफा नहीं होता है। इसलिए नई लाइन की पहली पांच साल की स्थिति अलग समझी जानी चाहिए। और बाद की पांच सालों की अलग अवस्था समझी जानी चाहिए। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ। वह यह है कि केवल इतना ही नहीं देखना चाहिए कि नई लाइन कितना नफा देती है या नुकसान देती है। उसके नफे का अनुमान लगाने के लिए यह भी आवश्यक है कि आप उस मुनाफे का हिसाब भी लगायें जो कि इस नई लाइन के बनने से उस बड़ी लाइन को हुआ है जिससे कि यह मिलती है। ये जो नई लाइनें होती हैं ये बड़ी लाइनों की फीहर होती हैं। और इनके जरिये से जो मुख्य लाइन को फायदा पहुंचता है उस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता। इसलिए पहले पांच साल का अलग से विचार करना मुझे श्रेयस्कर नहीं मालूम देता। मेरा ख्याल है कि रेलवे मिनिसटर के पास जितनी भी नई योजनायें हैं उनमें से कोई योजना भी ऐसी नहीं होगी जो कि उनको मुनाफा न दे। उनमें हर एक योजना ऐसी है जो कि बराबर मुनाफा देगी और इस लिहाज से अगर शुरू से

ही उसके ऊपर २.१९ प्रतिशत के बजाय जनरल रवेन्यू में ४ प्रतिशत दे दिया जाय तो कोई नामुनासिब नहीं होगा। मेरा विश्वास है कि जिस प्रकार हमारा देश प्रगति कर रहा है और जिस प्रकार यहां उद्योगों का उत्पादन बढ़ रहा है और जनता का जीवन स्तर ऊंचा हो रहा है उसको देखते हुए कोई भी ऐसी नई लाइन नहीं होगी जो कि मुनाफा न दे। हमारा ख्याल है कि हर नई लाइन आपको बराबर फायदा देगी। सवात सैफ यह है कि उससे जो मुनाफा है उसका अनुमान सही सही होना चाहिए।

कुछ मित्रों ने इस तरफ ध्यान दिलाया है कि जहां तक एमोनिटीज का सवाल है नीचे के लोगों की उतनी एमोनिटीज नहीं मिलती है जितनी कि उनको मिलनी चाहिए। पहले यह काफी हद तक सही था लेकिन नये माननीय मंत्री के आने के बाद इसमें बड़ा अन्तर पड़ गया है। अब तीसरे दर्जे के मुसाफिरों को भी काफी सुविधायें मिलने लगी हैं। फिर भी अधिक सुविधाओं की आवश्यकता है और इसीलिए मैंने चाहा है कि जो तीन करांड की रकम है वह केवल मुसाफिरों की सुविधा के लिए ही रिजर्व कर दी जाय। और दूसरों के लिए हमारा जो मुनाफा हो उसके लिहाज से और रकम दी जा सकती है।

एक यह ख्याल जाहिर किया गया है कि हम बचत करके रखें जो कि नई लाइनें बनाने के काम आवे। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक नहीं होगा। अगर ऐसा किया गया तो रेलवे पर आवश्यकता से अधिक भार डालना होगा। जो डेवलपमेंट के खर्च दिखाये जाते हैं वे वास्तव में खर्च नहीं होते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ डेवलपमेंट के नाम से जो नई लाइनें निकाली जायें उनका लिए नई पूंजी ली जाय। नफे की जो रकम बचती है उसको पूंजी में परिवर्तित करना मैं समझता हूँ कि उचित नहीं होगा। ऐसा करने से जनहितकारी कामों के लिए हमारे पास रकम कम रह जायेगी। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम जितनी नई योजनायें लायें उनके लिए हम जनरल रवेन्यू से नई पूंजी ले लें और उसके ऊपर चार पर सेंट दें।

[श्री हेडा]

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि भविष्य में जो विवरण दिया जाय वह तफसीलवार होना चाहिए और जो काम हम कर रहे हैं उसके बारे में उस विवरण से लोगों को सही कल्पना मिलनी चाहिए और लोगों को सारी चीज स्पष्ट होनी चाहिए। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए जैसा कि इस दस्तावेज में है जो कि आज हमारे सामने है। इसको तो बहुत ध्यान से देखा जाय तो कोई चीज समझ में आती है और इसके साथ साथ संदर्भ के लिए बहुत से कागजात निकाले जायें तो चीज समझ में आती है। अगर ऐसा नहीं किया जाता तो किसी चीज का पता ही नहीं लगता। इसलिए मेरी आशा है कि भविष्य में जो हमारे पास इतना बड़ा उद्योग है उसकी जो रिपोर्ट आयेगी वह तफसील से होगी।

**Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda):** I have a feeling that I am not quite competent to make any observations about the financial policy that is involved in this matter. But I have gone through the report fairly carefully and I find one or two doubts in my mind which I want to place before the Minister and the Government and have a clarification or an assurance in that regard.

I can agree that the railway system is not necessarily a commercial venture, but must also be a utilitarian concern. Therefore, to be constantly concerned with the utility portion of it alone may not be justifiable. Yet, when you are now laying down a policy that is to guide your actions for a period of five years from now on, and that five years also synchronises with the next Five Year Plan or a greater part of it, I fear whether the real purpose of that Plan would not be affected by the policy that we are now laying down particularly in regard to the expansion or the construction of new lines.

I find in paragraph 32 that you have now set up a standard for what is called remunerative projects, viz., that it must yield a five per cent. income. The estimate of the percentage of yield

will depend upon the kind of estimates and the rates you choose to base upon and the real rates and the actual cost that it might later on turn out to be. Apart from this, we also know that economic conditions may be changing over a period of five years. Therefore, to set up a standard of a minimum return of five per cent. might almost work out to be a hindrance against undertaking the construction of any new lines. Particularly as I have been a representative from the backward areas, I have, every time an opportunity came, stressed and placed before the House the need for the construction of one or two new lines in our area, where to see a train, a man has to go nearly eighty to hundred miles. If you set up this kind of a standard, it might probably work out against such expansion. When I read paragraphs 29 and 30, I found that you have a Development Fund, out of which such things may possibly be undertaken. I, therefore, feel a little doubt in this regard, and it is not quite clear to me whether this remunerative project standard that you have set up will not come in the way of new lines which might possibly have to be constructed. No doubt you have said and you have also expressed a fear in the Report, that in the years to come, much money may not be available for the Development Fund at all. Therefore, I only wish that the matter be made perfectly clear, though the Report as it is does not exclude the possibility of something being done from out of the Development Fund. I wish to know definitely and categorically whether this standard of remunerative projects will not really stand in the way of new lines for purposes of utility or for purposes of developing parts of the country which really deserve such help.

**श्री सिंहासन सिंह (जिला गोरखपुर—दार्जिलिंग):** आज जो विषय भवन के सामने उपस्थित है वह बड़ा सुन्दर और प्रभावशाली विषय है। मुझे मैं कितना हक रलवे दे यह विषय विचारणीय है। जो कमेटी की रिपोर्ट भवन के सामने है उसको देखने से पता चला कि कमेटी के सामने जो

आंकड़ें रिलवे बोर्ड ने रखें उन पर केवल तीन दिन की बैठक में विचार किया गया और उस के बाद उस की रिपोर्ट इस भवन के सामने पेश हुई। और अब भवन से यह आशा की जाती है वह जो मसलें कमेटी के सामने थे उन को बगैर दर्लें हुए ही एक मत से या भिन्न मत से अपनी राय दें। कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट के पंज १ पर रिलखा है :

"A review of the financial prospects of the railway undertaking for the next five years on the basis of the present rates and fares furnished by the Railway Board disclosed that if the Railways were to continue to pay dividend at 4 per cent. during the five years...."

प्रजेन्ट रेट्स और फेअर्स और फ्यूचर प्रास्पेक्ट्स के ऊपर रिलवे अपने रेट आधारित करेगी। वह प्रजेन्ट रेट्स और फ्यूचर प्रास्पेक्ट्स क्या हैं और रिलवे बोर्ड ने क्या चीज सबमिट की वह हमारे सामने नहीं है। उस को बिना सामने रखें हुए ही हम अपनी राय देने जा रहे हैं कि रिपोर्ट बिल्कुल सही है या गलत है।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Has not the memorandum of the Railway Board been circulated to hon. Members?

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** No. At least a summary of that should have come to us. ता हम भी समझते कि क्या बात है हमारे सामने केवल रिपोर्ट है।

दूसरी बात इस रिपोर्ट में है कि माइनर एडजस्टमेंट्स के लिये सम्भव है। कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में है कि क्या होगा। पंज ७ पर है :

"This shortfall, the Railway Board hope, could be made up partly by a moratorium in respect of the payment of dividend to the General Revenues on new lines during the development stage and partly by minor adjustment in fares and freights without having recourse to a general increase in them. They, however, stated

that this would leave no funds to be appropriated to the development fund for financing development expenditure during the next five years unless the tariff rates were raised generally or the quantum of the dividend liability was substantially reduced by bringing down the rate of dividend."

हमारे सामने एक प्रश्न रक्खा गया है कि डिविडेंड रेट कम कर के या रिलवे प्रेट का रेट बढ़ा करके डेवलपमेंट फंड को बढ़ाया जाय। लेकिन उन्होंने रेट को बढ़ाने का कोई तरीका हमारे सामने नहीं रक्खा है। रेट के बढ़ने की जरूरत है या नहीं है यह भी हमारे सामने नहीं है न यही है कि डिविडेंड कम करने के क्या सुझाव हैं। इन बातों की कमी के साथ हमें अपनी राय देना है कि यह रिपोर्ट सही है या नहीं। इस के साथ डिविडेंड ४ परसेन्ट रक्खा गया। कमेटी ने कागजात को पहली अक्टूबर को रिलवे बोर्ड से मांगा और तीन दिन १२, १३, और १५ नवम्बर की बैठक में.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The matter was before them for a month or two months.

**श्री सिंहासन सिंह :** हम रिपोर्ट दर्लें रहे हैं। सौभाग्य से हमारे उपाध्यक्ष जी उस कमेटी के सभापति हैं। तीन दिन ही तो कमेटी की बैठक हुई। आप के सामने यह विषय कभी से रहा हो, लेकिन आप ने कागजात पहली अक्टूबर को मांगे और मुझे पता नहीं कि वह आप के पास कब आये, लेकिन बैठकों की जा रिपोर्ट है उस में तीन ही तारीखें दी हैं। १२, १३ और १५ नवम्बर को बैठ कर कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट भवन के सामने दी और उस रिपोर्ट को दर्लने से मालूम होता है कि जैसा मेमोरैंडम रिलवे बोर्ड के फाइनेंशियल कमिश्नर ने दिया था वस्तुतः उसी की रिपोर्ट को ले कर इस के अन्दर यह आया है.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** If any hon. Member wanted the memorandum, the annexures or other material on

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]  
which the Report was based, he could have easily asked for them.

**Shri Raghavachari:** With your permission, I would like to say that what invariably happens is that when a thing is circulated, we could read it only a day or two before it comes up for discussion, because on other days, we have other work to prepare for. When we read 24 hours or 48 hours before, we find, this or that is not there; and it becomes too late to ask for it.

**श्री सिंहासन सिंह :** जो कुछ भी हो, अपनी निजी राय और सही राय देने में जो हमारी अक्षमता है मैं उस को बता रहा हूँ कि कौन-कौन से कारणों से हम अपनी सही राय नहीं दे सकते, लेकिन जो रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने है उस के ऊपर अगर हम अपनी राय आधारित करें तो मैं एक बात सरकार के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने गत वर्ष जो कमीटियाँ बनाई थीं उन कमीटियों की रिपोर्ट भी हमारे सामने नहीं हैं। दूसरी कमेटी रेलवे भूदाचार का पता लगाने के लिये निर्धारित की गई थी कि रेलवे में किस तरह का भूदाचार प्रचलित है, उस से रेलवे की आमदनी पर क्या असर पड़ता है और क्या नहीं पड़ता है, उस भूदाचार का सम्बन्ध जनता से ही होता है या रेलवे की आमदनी पर भी प्रभाव पड़ता है। अगर वह रिपोर्ट भी हमारे सामने होती तो आज हम तुलना के साथ कह सकते कि यह रिपोर्ट सही है या नहीं है। हमारा डिवाइडेंड बढ़ सकता है या घट सकता है।

इस रिपोर्ट में यह भी राय है और उस के अन्दर सुझाव है कि किराया बढ़ाया जाना चाहिये। लेकिन यह सुझाव कहीं नहीं है कि खर्चा कम कर के हमारा डिवाइडेंड बढ़ सकता है या खर्चा कम कर के आमदनी ज्यों की त्यों रह सकती है। जो चौरियाँ होती हैं उन को बन्द कर के अगर हम सब बातों को ज्यों का त्यों भी रखें, सब बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए अपने काम करें तो भी खर्चा घट सकता है इसीलिये अगर वह रिपोर्ट आ गई

होती तो हम सही तरीके से राय देते कि सब बातें किस तरह से होनी चाहियें। जो खर्च फूटल हो रहे हैं उन को भी हम कम कर सकते हैं।

इस में एक बड़ी चीज हमारे सामने है कि २५,००० तक रुपया न्यु माइनर वर्क्स में डाला जायेगा। बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि जब कि मजदूरों का काम २०, २५ हजार रुपये में बनता है तो वह काम माइनर वर्क्स में डाले जायेंगे। इस से मजदूरों का भला होगा और उनके काम में सद्दुलियत होगी। अभी रेलवे बोर्ड नया बना है और इस रेलवे बोर्ड से मुझे बड़ी आशा है क्योंकि उस के अन्दर एक ऐसे व्यक्ति है जिन को मैं जानता हूँ और जिन के हृदय में कम से कम यह अहसास है कि यह मुल्क मेरा है और इस मुल्क की तरक्की करने की मेरी जिम्मेदारी है।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** सब की हैं।

**श्री सिंहासन सिंह :** सब की हैं, जिस दिन मुल्क में यह अहसास होगा वह दिन सौभाग्य का होगा। यहाँ रट और खर्च की बात की गई, लेकिन जो रेलवे मजदूरों के क्वार्टर बने हुए हैं उन की ओर आप का ध्यान नहीं है। बड़े आदिमियों के बंगलों की बात तो आप के हृदय में है लेकिन मजदूरों के मकानों की छतें चूर रही हैं, उन के बैठने की जगहें बेंसी ही हैं तो क्या हम इस वेल्फेअर स्टेट के सामने उन की बात भी निवेदन न करें। वह यहाँ पर नहीं है। इस लिये इस में जितनी चीजें हैं सब देखने में बड़ी सुन्दर दिखाई देती हैं। लेकिन वाकई में जो सब स्थानों पर उन के मकानों का रूप है जब हम उस पर विचार करते हैं तो हमें बड़ा खेद होता है। मैं माननीय रेलवे मंत्री महोदय से पहले भी कह चुका हूँ और आज भी कहता हूँ कि आपकी जिम्मेदारी बहुत बढ़ गई है। अगर प्रत्येक बात को इक्कठा कर के देखा जाय तो आज वाकई बहुत तरक्की देखने को मिलती है। नई लाइनें खाल्डूई हैं, रेलवे स्टेशनों की संख्या बहुत बढ़ गई है, बिजली उन पर लग गई है, पानी का इन्जाम हुआ है। लेकिन हम को इस पर विचार करना

होगा कि इस से देश कितना आगे बढ़ा। मैं चाहता था कि कमेंटी अपने सामने दूसरा दृष्टिकोण रखती डिविडेंड को तय करते हुए। अभी यहाँ यह कहा गया कि हमारा देश का आर्थिक ढांचा सोशलिस्टिक होगा। इस के द्वारा केंद्र के जितने व्यवसाय हैं वह राज्य के नियंत्रण में आयेंगे। अगर इन व्यवसायों के जरिये हम अपनी आमदनी न बढ़ा सकें तो और कौन से जरिये होंगे जिन से हम राजस्व की आमदनी बढ़ायेंगे। अगर वास्तव में हम नें व्यवसायों को राज्य के अधिकार में ले लिया और सारा काम राज्य के जरिये चला और सब से यही २ परसेंट २ परसेंट डिविडेंड मिलने लगा तो राजस्व नीचे गिर जायेगा। और हम को टैक्सेशन बढ़ाना पड़ेगा। आज हम दखते हैं कि वैसे ही टैक्सेशन के कारण हाहाकार मचा हुआ है। संयोग से मुझे रूस का बजट देखने को मिल गया। उस को पढ़ने से मालूम हुआ कि उन के राजस्व का ६० फीसदी केवल व्यवसाय से आता है। केवल १० परसेंट दूसरे तरीकों से आता है। वहाँ पर ६० परसेंट आमदनी व्यवसायों से होती है। अगर हम अपनी आर्थिक प्रणाली सोशलिस्टिक करने जा रहे हैं तो हमारा व्यवसाय से राष्ट्र का खजाना निर्मित होना चाहिये। लेकिन वह तो हम नें सिर्फ ४ परसेंट रक्खा है। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि यह ४ परसेंट से और ज्यादा बढ़ जायेगा।

दूसरे इस रिपोर्ट में लिखा है कि रेट को बढ़ाया जाय। तो बढ़ाने का बीसस क्या हो? इसको हम मानें कि उससे मुनाफा होता है। मुनाफे का हमने आंकड़ा रक्खा कि पांच फीसदी मुनाफा हो तो समझा जाय कि मुनाफा होता है। पहले पांच फीसदी मुनाफा नहीं था, ४.९७ परसेंट था। अब इस रिपोर्ट में पांच परसेंट कर दिया है। पांच परसेंट मुनाफा हो तब तो चार परसेंट है, अगर पांच फीसदी से कम मुनाफा हो, तो डिविडेंड कुछ नहीं है। अब आप विचार करें कि पांच फीसदी मुनाफे की केवल रेलवे से उम्मीद की जाती है। समझ में नहीं आता कि

रेलवे अधिक से अधिक मुनाफा क्यों नहीं कर पाती। हम दखते हैं कि जो निजी व्यवसायी होते हैं, मिल वाले हैं, वह अपने व्यवसाय में बीस बीस परसेंट तक मुनाफा करते हैं, आखिर क्या वजह है कि जब सरकार कोई व्यवसाय चलाये और कोई काम करे तब मुनाफा कम हो और प्राइवेट एंटरप्राइज में अधिक। जब प्राइवेट कंपैटिस्ट लोग उसी काम को चलायें सब काफी मुनाफा होने लगता है। जब गवर्नमेंट व्यवसाय शुरू करे तो घाटा हो जाय और प्राइवेट लोग उसी काम को करे तो मुनाफा हो जाय। मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की इस रेलवे अंडरटैकिंग में जो ४.९७ या पांच फीसदी का मुनाफा आंका गया है वह कम है और मुनाफे में कमी की वजह यह है कि हमारा शासन सूत्र में कहीं कुछ खराबी या कमजोरी है और इसमें हम सही तरीके से उस आदमी को जो देश के पैसे को बर्बाद करता है, उसको पकड़ नहीं पाते हैं और अगर पकड़ भी पाते हैं तो सजा नहीं कर पाते, इसीलिये हमारा सामने कमी है। मैं यहाँ साफ बतला दूँ कि इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ कर मुझे कुछ हर्ष नहीं हुआ, कुछ खेद ही हुआ क्योंकि हम देश के भावी रूप और उसके विकास के बारे में कैसे आगे बढ़ेंगे और उसके लिये जो सामग्री होनी चाहिये उसके बारे में रिपोर्ट हमें आगे नहीं ले जाती, उसके सम्बन्ध में रिपोर्ट कुछ दबी दबी सी मालूम होती है और एक मजबूरी की सी दशा का हमें मान होता है कि रेलवे बोर्ड जो कर रहा है सही कर रहा है और हम चार परसेंट से आगे बढ़ नहीं सकते-रेलवे भी बढ़ा कर तीस करोड़ से ३५ करोड़ कर दिया गया है ताकि रेलवे इन्फ्रीमिटीशन, एफिशियेंसी और एमिनैन्टीज प्रांवाइड कर सकें और अपना आब्लिगेशन इनके सम्बन्ध में पूरा कर सकें। मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ और यह बढ़ना चाहिये था लेकिन हमें यह भी देखना चाहिये कि वाकई लोगों को सद्दलियतें पहुँचती हैं और वाकई हम कितनी चीजें मजबूत और दृढ़ बना रहे हैं। अब एमिनैन्टीज प्रांवाइड करने की बाबत बात तो बहुत की जाती है लेकिन मैं वतलाऊँ कि जनता को बजाय इसके कि आर

[श्री सिद्दासन सिंह]

स्टेशन शानदार बनायें अगर उसको गाड़ी जल्दी और घंट घंट पर मिले तो यह उसके लिये ज्यादा सहायित्व होगा बनिस्वत इसके कि स्टेशन शानदार बनाया जाय या उसको बड़े ठहरने के लिये जगह मिल जाय लेकिन अगर उसको गाड़ी न मिले और वहां पर चार घंटा वॉटिंग रूम में ठहरना पड़े तो मैं नबदीक यह कोई आप मुसाफिरों को सहायित्व नहीं दे रहे हैं, क्योंकि अगर उसे वक्त पर और जल्दी गाड़ी मिल सके, तो वह वहां ठहरना पसन्द नहीं करेगा और फौरन गाड़ी पर सवार होकर जाना चाहेगा। आज रेलगाड़ियों में भीड़ कम करने के उपाय हो रहे हैं और नई रेलें बढ़ायी जा रही हैं ताकि ओवरक्राउडिंग रेलगाड़ियों में न हो। हमने १५०० मील नयी रेलवे लाइन के निर्माण की योजना बनायी है। उन योजनाओं से मुनाफा नहीं लिया जायगा, और रेलवे के बढ़ाने में जो कर्ज लिया जायगा उस पर जो सूद होगा वह भी रनरल फंड बढ़ाकर करेगा। हमारे देश में रेलगाड़ियों की कमी है और नये रेल मार्गों का विस्तार अति आवश्यक है। अभी मैंने एक जगह पढ़ा था कि तीस हजार मील रेलवे लाइंस जो जर्मनस ने गत युद्ध में खराब कर दी थीं उनको रूस की जनता व सरकार ने छः वर्ष में पूरी तरह बिछा दिया और रेलगाड़ियां चालू कर दीं तो क्या कारण है कि हमारे देश में भी उसी उत्साह और लगन से यह काम न हो सके मैं तो अपने रेलवे मंत्री से कहूंगा कि पन्द्रह सौ नहीं बल्कि पन्द्रह हजार मील रेलवे लाइन बनाने के लिये जितना रुपया उनको दरकार हो वह उन्हें मिलना चाहिये लेकिन रुपये मिलाने में लोगों के सामने यह चीज रहती है कि इसमें मुनाफा कितना मिलता है, क्योंकि यही एक खास इंडस्ट्री गवर्नमेंट की है जो राष्ट्रीय इंडस्ट्री कही जाती है। नेशनलाइजेशन इंडस्ट्रीज का इस देश में हो कि नहीं, नेशनलाइजेशन की ओर यह पहली इंडस्ट्री है जो नेशनलाइज्ड है लेकिन इस इंडस्ट्री से भी पूरा मुनाफा जितना गवर्नमेंट को मिलना चाहिये नहीं मिलता है। यह बड़े दुःख और खेद की बात है कि गवर्नमेंट

जिस किसी काम को, अपने हाथ में लेती है तो उसमें गड़बड़ होती है और काम ठीक से नहीं होता और रुपये का अपव्यय होता है। क्या सिद्धी की रिपोर्टें, पट्टे और क्या फाइनेंशियल कारपोरेशन की रिपोर्टें पट्टे सार कामों में रिपोर्टें में मिलता है कि गड़बड़ी है। मैं अपने रेलवे मंत्री की सेवा में निवेदन करूंगा कि वह रेलवे का शासन प्रबन्ध लौह इस्त से चलायें जिससे इस में कोई गड़बड़ न रहे और देश को इस इंडस्ट्री से अधिक लाभ मिल सके। रेलवे में गड़बड़ की बातें पहले अक्सर सुना करते थे लेकिन अब उम्मीद है कि चीक यह मुहकमा उनके हाथ में है और नये रेलवे बोर्ड का संचालन हो गया है तो वह गड़बड़ दूर होगी और इस चार परसेंट मुनाफे को अपने समय में ही आप आठ परसेंट कर के दिखा देंगे। चार परसेंट से भला नहीं हो सकता, हमें अपने मंत्री महादय से आशा करनी चाहिये कि वह दो वर्ष के अन्दर इसको आठ परसेंट तक बढ़ा कर ले जायेंगे और इसको बढ़ा कर ले जाने की क्षमता उनमें विद्यमान है। इसके अतिरिक्त इस रिपोर्ट में वतनों के उच्चतम स्तर को कम करने की ओर कहीं संकेत नहीं है, हमें वतनों की समस्या पर भी गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिये। इस सम्बन्ध में गांधी जी के पास एक पत्र में लिखा था कि आज क्या ब्रिटिश राज्य की ही तरह कांग्स राज्य नहीं हो रहा है और क्या ब्रिटिश काल की तरह आज भी गवर्नर और दूसरे ऊंचे सरकारी पदाधिकारी वही लम्बे लम्बे वतन और भते जोड़ नहीं पा रहे हैं, गांधी जी ने उसके सम्बन्ध में लिखा था कि मुझे तमाम आंकड़ों के सम्बन्ध में पूरी जानकारी नहीं है, इसलिये मैं नहीं कह सकता कि यह आंकड़े सही हैं या गलत लेकिन अगर उनमें कुछ भी आधार हो तो मैं आपकी बात से सहमत हूँ कि हम ठीक दिशा में नहीं जा रहे हैं। हम उधर भी देखें कि हम कुछ खर्च कम भी कर सकते हैं या नहीं कर सकते हैं और मैं यह मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ कि इस में खर्च कम नहीं किया जा सकता।

अधिक न कहते हुए मैं सिर्फ यही कहूंगा कि यह जो रिपोर्ट आई है यह तो पांच वर्ष के लिये पास ही करना है लेकिन पांच वर्ष के भीतर आप फिर कमेटी बिठाइये और साथ ही यह जो भूदाचार कमेटी बैठे हुए हैं उसकी भी रिपोर्ट अपने सामने रखकर आप डिबेटिंग को और अधिक बढ़ा सकें तो देश का बड़ा कल्याण होगा और उससे राष्ट्रीयकरण जो हो रहा है उसमें और अन्य सब विषयों में प्रगति होगी और अगर इसी एक राष्ट्रीय व्यवसाय में जो आज हमारा है हमारी तरक्की नहीं होती और हम मुनाफा नहीं करते तो हम नेशनलाइजेशन के लिये अच्छा नमूना पेश नहीं करेंगे। मैं शास्त्री जी से बहुत उम्मीद रखता हूँ और मुझे आशा है कि वह अपने लोह हाथों से कड़ाई के साथ इसका काम चलायेंगे और नई पार्लियामेंट के आने के पहले पहले दो वर्ष के अन्दर ही चार परसेंट से पांच परसेंट और छः परसेंट करके दिखा सकेंगे।

दूसरे यह जो रिलेज में क्लेम्स आते हैं इनके बारे में भी काफी गड़बड़ पायी जाती है, अक्सर झूठे क्लेम्स आते हैं। माल रक्खा हुआ होता है लेकिन उसका क्लेम ले लिया जाता है और क्लेमेन्ट और क्लेम्स आफिसरमिल करक्लेम का रुपया बांट खाते हैं और फिर दो वर्ष के बाद माल पांच रुपये में नीलाम कर दिया जाता है। यह सारी गड़बड़ियाँ आजकल रिलेज विभाग में हो रही हैं और मैं मंत्री महाशय से चाहूंगा कि वह इन सब अनियमितताओं को रोकें जिससे रिलेज विभाग की आय बढ़े। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ। जहाँ तक इस मौजूदा रिपोर्ट का सवाल है, इसका समर्थन तो करना ही है और मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि आप विभाग का संचालन उत्तम रीति से करेंगे।

**Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Mavelikkara—Reserved-Scheduled Castes):** I have gone through this Report very carefully and I am very glad to say that it has been completed sooner than was expected.

I remember that in 1950 when I spoke on the railway budget in the Provisional Parliament, I had made certain suggestions regarding the reorganisation or reformation of our railways.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon Member may stop now. He may resume tomorrow.

5 P.M.

PREVENTION OF DISQUALIFICATION (PARLIAMENT AND PART C STATES' LEGISLATURES) SECOND AMENDMENT BILL

**The Minister in the Ministry of Law (Shri Pataskar):** I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Prevention of Disqualification (Parliament and Part C States Legislatures) Act, 1953.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Prevention of Disqualification (Parliament and Part C States Legislatures) Act, 1953."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Pataskar:** I introduce the Bill.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday the 16th December, 1954.*