

12.48 hrs.

ARREST AND CONVICTION OF A MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that I have received the following telegram dated the 12th September, 1958, from the District Magistrate, Barabanki:—

"I beg to intimate that Shri Ram Sewak Yadav, Member, Lok Sabha, was arrested today before the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Fatehpur, at 3-30 P.M. under section 480, Criminal Procedure Code, for contempt of Court by interrupting the said Court while sitting in a stage of judicial proceedings. He was tried and convicted under section 228, Indian Penal Code. Letter follows."

12.48½ hrs.

ARREST OF A MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that I have received the following telegram dated the 14th September, 1958, from the District Magistrate, Kheri Lakhimpur:—

"Shri Khushwaqt Rai, Member, Lok Sabha, arrested in Lakhimpur, today, under sections 151/107/117, Criminal Procedure Code, for causing apprehension of breach of public peace, in connection with food agitation. Letter follows."

12.49 hrs.

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL—
contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume discussion on the motion for consideration of the Merchant Shipping Bill, 1958, as reported by the Joint Committee, moved on the 12th September, 1958, and also the amendment for recommitting the Bill to the Joint Committee moved by Shri Tri-dib Kumar Chaudhuri on that date. Out of 5 hours agreed to by the House

for general discussion, 4 hours and 13 minutes now remain.

After the general discussion is over, clause by clause consideration and third reading of the Bill will be taken for which 3 hours have been fixed.

Shri Raghunath Singh may continue his speech.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कल कह रहा था कि सन् १९४७ की गिपिंग पालिसी सफल नहीं हुई। इसको कारण यह है कि उस नीति के अनुसार हमें सन् १९५४ तक २० लाख का टनेज पूरा करना था, लेकिन सन् १९५४ तक सिर्फ ४ लाख टन के ही हमारे पास जहाज दुये। इस तरह से १६ लाख टन का गैप रहा। इसलिये सन् १९४७ की नीति के आधार पर कोई नीति बनाना उचित नहीं होगा। गिपिंग कम्पनियों ने इस पीरियड में अपने इंटरनल रिसोर्सेज में कोई प्रगति नहीं की। कोई फारेन कैपिटल यह कम्पनियां नहीं लाई। सिर्फ उस समय में जब कि युद्ध के पश्चात् थोड़ा वार रिजर्व फंड था, उस फंड से कुछ जहाज लाये गये, लेकिन उस के पश्चात् कोई प्रगति नहीं हुई। फर्स्ट फाइव इअर प्लैन में इन कम्पनियों के देने के वास्ते २३ करोड़ ० का लोन रखा गया था। लेकिन इस २३ करोड़ ० में से केवल १६ करोड़ ० इन कम्पनियों ने लिया। इस का फल यह हुआ कि फस्ट फाइव इअर प्लैन का जो टार्गेट था उस टार्गेट को हम दूसरी फाइव इअर प्लैन में प्राप्त कर सके। सरकार ८५ प्रतिशत गिपिंग कम्पनियों को लोन देनी है। ऐसी अवस्था में भी कम्पनियों ने लोन नहीं लिया। और हमारा टार्गेट पूरा नहीं किया। सेकेण्ड फाइव इअर प्लैन का टार्गेट ८ लाख टन का रखा गया है। इस टार्गेट के लिये ३७ करोड़ ६० रखा गया था। पाटिल साहिब कहते हैं कि जो ३७ करोड़ रुपया रखा गया था वह पहले वर्ष में ही समाप्त हो चुका

है। उन के भाषण से यह आहिर हुआ कि अभी हमारे पास जो कुछ जहाज हैं वह सब, और आर्डर्स को भी ले कर, करीब ७ लाख ८१ हजार टन होंगे। १ लाख टन को पूरा करने के लिये १ लाख २० हजार टन बाकी बचता है। उस के लिये २३ करोड़ ६० कहां से आयेंगा। इस के वास्ते पाटिल साहब ने हाउस के सामने कोई स्कीम नहीं रखी। पाटिल साहब कहते हैं 'येन क्रेडिट' 'येन क्रेडिट' की बात जो हम ने अखबार में देखी है जो कि जापान दे रहा है उस से कुल ४ या ५ जहाज आ सकते हैं। उन में १ लाख टन का टार्गेट पूरा नहीं होगा।

वर्ल्ड टनेज आज क्या है? दुनिया में ११ करोड़ टनेज के जहाज हैं। उन जहाजों की तादाद २३,८०४ है। जब युद्ध समाप्त हुआ था उस समय से आज हमारी हालत खराब है। युद्ध के बाद हमारे पास वर्ल्ड टनेज का २५ परसेन्ट था। लेकिन आज जो विश्व का टनेज है उसका कुल ०५ परसेन्ट ही इंडिया का टनेज है। युद्ध के बाद जो हमारा टनेज था उस से भी आज खराब है। यह भी हालत तब है जब कि शिपिंग कम्पनियों को लोन दिया गया है, अगर लोन न दिया गया होता तो जो प्रगति टनेज ने की है वह भी नहीं हो सकती थी। आप देखिये कि वर्ल्ड ट्रेड के मुकाबले में हमारा परसेन्ट क्या है। आज वर्ल्ड के ट्रेड का ३ परसेन्ट हमारा ट्रेड है। जब हमारा ट्रेड ३ परसेन्ट है तो हमारे पास टनेज भी ३ परसेन्ट होना चाहिये अर्थात् हमारा टनेज टार्गेट ३० लाख टन का होना चाहिये। पाटिल साहब ने कहा टार्गेट २५ लाख टन का होना चाहिये। लेकिन उन्होंने यह बात जाहिर नहीं की है कि वह २५ लाख टन के कंबलूजन पर कैसे पहुंचे। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि हमारा टार्गेट ३० लाख टन का होना चाहिये। लेकिन अगर वह मान लिया जाय कि २५ लाख टन ही हमारा टार्गेट होना चाहिये तो उसके लिये भी रुपया कहां से आयेंगा?

आप कहते हैं कि बर्डे फाइव इमर प्लैन से बर्डे फाइव इमर प्लैन की बात सोचनी चाहिये। शायद हम सन् १९६६ के अन्दर जो हमने सन् १९४७ में २० लाख टन का अपना टार्गेट रखा था, उसे पूरा कर सकें। उसके बाद हम को करीब करीब १५७ जहाजों की आवश्यकता होगी और २२ करोड़ रुपया प्रतिवर्ष, १९५९ के बाद, बर्डे फाइव इमर प्लैन के वास्ते चाहिये। तब हम २० लाख टनेज को पूरा कर सकेंगे। हमारे सामने कोई स्कीम नहीं आई है। हम सन् १९५९ के बाद प्रति वर्ष २२ करोड़ ६० कहां से लायेंगे। इसके पश्चात् आप देखिये कि सन् १९४७ का जो २० लाख टन टार्गेट को पूरा करने का प्रयोजन था अगर हम उसे पूरा करना चाहें तो सन् १९६६ तक हमें १५४ करोड़ ६० की आवश्यकता होगी।

मैंने एक स्कीम रखी है जो कि "part of the record" समझी जाय। यह बहुत बड़ी स्कीम है किस तरह से १९७५ के अन्त तक हम २५ लाख टन के टार्गेट को प्राप्त कर सकते हैं। लेकिन अगर इन कम्पनियों पर छोड़ दिया जायगा तो यह कम्पनियां एक साल में ४०,००० टन से ज्यादा टनेज नहीं बढ़ा सकती। मैं अब आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आखिरकार रुपया हमारे पास कहां से आयेंगा। पाटिल साहब ने इस के लिये हमारे सामने तीन माधन रखे हैं। वे कहते हैं; इंटरनल रिसोर्सेज, इंटर-नेशनल लोन्स, ईक्विटी लोन अर्थात् फोरेन पार्टिसिपेशन। जहां तक इंटरनल रिसोर्सेज का सवाल है, आज तक जो जहाजी कम्पनियां हैं वह रुपया नहीं ला सकीं। अपने रुपये से वह शिपिंग की तरक्की नहीं कर सकीं। उन्होंने सिर्फ सरकारी लोन्स से तरक्की की है, जबकि हम उनको ८५ परसेन्ट लोन देते हैं। अगर कोई व्यापार करना चाहे और उसको १०० में से ८५ २० कर्ज मिल जायें तब फिर क्या है? हर आदमी व्यापार करना चाहेगा। यह स्थिति इस समय हिन्दुस्तान की शिपिंग

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

कम्पनियों की हैं। पाटिस साहब ने कमेन्ट किया है कि फोरेन पार्टिसिपेशन बहुत रिस्की है। उन्होंने कहा कि सन् १९४७ में जो २५ परसेन्ट रखा गया था उस को भी लोगों ने पूरा नहीं किया। आज फिर हमारे ऊपर २५ परसेन्ट क्यों छोड़ा जा रहा है। या तो यह कहिये कि फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन होना चाहिये, या फिर उस को इन्फ्रिज नहीं करना चाहिये। हिन्दुस्तान चाहे जैसी भी पालिसी बनाये, लेकिन जो पुरानी चीज हमारे लिये फायदेमन्द साबित नहीं हो सकी उस को दुबारा लाना कोई बुद्धिमानी की बात नहीं है।

आगे चल कर आप देखेंगे कि हमारे मामले में च्यायस क्या है। वह है लोन यानी फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन। मैं लोन के सल्ट खिलाफ हूँ। आज इण्डिया पर २४३ करोड़, ९३ लाख रु० के करीब प्राचीन लोन है। ४२ करोड़ २५ लाख रु० का लोन रेलों के वास्ते लिया गया है। हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर कुल कर्ज है २८५ करोड़ रुपये का। हिन्दुस्तान कर्ज से दबा हुआ है। अभी २०० मिलियन डालर की फूडग्रेन्स के वास्ते एड मिल रही है। आखिरकार जब इस तरह से बाहर से रुपया ले रहे हों तो कहीं ऐसा न हो कि लोन की बाढ़ से हिन्दुस्तान को एक दिन अपने को बहाना न पड़े। हिन्दुस्तान उसी तरह से बिक जाय जिस तरह से कि मिस्र बिक गया था। पराधीन हो गया था, थर्डलेण्ड में चार महीने पहले लोन के कारण वहाँ की गवर्नमेंट फेल हो गई। त्रिपुल संग्राम को भाग जाना पडा। लोन हम लें, लेकिन इतना ही लें जितना कि हम आसानी से ले सकें। इतना न लें कि हिन्दुस्तान की गरीब जनता उसे लौटा न पाये, उसे हम लोग किसी तरह से ही न दे सकें।

एक स्कीम निकली है। सेक्रेड फाइव इयर प्लैन में ५६६ करोड़ रुपये का फारेन एक्सचेंज का गैप है। उस गैप को पूरा करने के वास्ते ५६६ करोड़ रुपये का फारेन एक्स-

चेंज आये तब जाकर हमारी सेक्रेड फाइव इयर प्लैन पूरी हो सकेगी। वह फारेन एक्सचेंज आयेगा कहाँ से? कम फिर कर हम जा पहुंचते हैं लोन्स के ऊपर। अभी हमारे ऊपर २८५ करोड़ रु० का लोन है, ५६६ करोड़ रु० का लोन चाहिये सेक्रेड फाइव इयर प्लैन को पूरा करने के वास्ते। आखिर इन लोन्स का कहीं अन्त भी तो होना चाहिये। आगे आप देखेंगे कि आज शिपिंग में स्लम्प आया हुआ है। जो जहाज पहले ६० लाख रु० में मिलता था वह अब २० लाख रुपये में मिलता है। इस स्लम्प पर आपने गौर किया? आखिर यह स्लम्प आया कैसे? यह आया लोन के कारण। शिपिंग वर्ल्ड की सबसे बड़ी शिपिंग मैगजीन में से मैं कोट करना चाहता हूँ। लोन के पीछे हमारी सरकार दीड़ रही है, उसका हथ क्या होगा। 'फेअर प्ले' ३ जुलाई सन् १९५८ में है :

The slump of the 1920's and 1930's was bad, but the capital at stake in those days was considerably less than that involved today. Furthermore, the bulk of the cost of the ships was capital subscribed by the investing public, whereas today many of the ships are being built against loans which have to be paid annually from the income. That income is now insufficient to pay the daily running costs."

13 hrs.

आज दुनिया में हो क्या रहा है। दुनिया में बहुत से देशों ने इस लोन की पालिसी का अनुकरण किया। लोन लेकर जहाज बना लिये। लेकिन अगर आज २० करोड़ रुपये का आपने जहाज बनाया और अगर उसके लिए आपको ४ करोड़ रुपये बाहर से लोन लेना पडा, जैसे रेलवे के लिए लोन लिया सवा ६ परसेंट इंटररेस्ट पर, अभी तीन ही दिन की तो बात है कि रेलवे के लिये सवा ६ परसेंट इंटररेस्ट पर लोन लिया है और उस हिसाब से अगर ४ करोड़ रुपये भी आपने कर्ज लिया

तो २५ लाख रुपया सात बतौर ब्याज और फिस्त के धापको देना पड़ेगा । इसके अलावा जो फारेन लोन की मियाद ७ वर्ष से ज्यादा नहीं होती है और उसको धापको इंस्टाल-मेंट्स में पे धप करना पड़ेगा । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि धाप उसको कहाँ से और कैसे पूरा करेंगे । उसकी कोई स्कीम धाप हमारे सामने क्यों नहीं रखते ? मैं धापको सावधान कर देना चाहता हूँ कि इस में जो लोन की बात है, यह एक बड़ी गहरी खाई है और यह लोन टी० बी० के जर्म्स के समान है । किसी देश का नाश कर देती है । किसी बोडी पालिटिक्स को नाश करने के लिए पर्याप्त है । उससे हमको बचना चाहिए । दुनिया में कोई व्यापार लोन लेकर नहीं होता । लोन लेकर दुनिया में कोई काम नहीं हुआ है । दुनिया में अगर ध्यापार हुआ है तो वह पार्टिसिपेशन से हुआ है, पार्टनरशिप से हुआ है और कम्पनी प्लोट करके हुआ है और अपने रिसोर्सेज से हुआ है । आज तक कर्ज लेकर दुनिया में कोई धमीर नहीं हुआ है ।

अदर रीजन्स की जो बात कही गई तो मैं उसकी बाबत धापको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया में आज स्लम्प क्यों है । दुनिया में स्लम्प इसलिए है कि जापान में जितने जहाज बने सब लोन के आन्वार पर बनाये । जापान में शिपयार्ड हैं और उनके पास कोई कमी नहीं है लेकिन चूँकि लोन से जो जहाज लिये तो जो महाजन है वह अपना रुपया मांगता है । जहाजी कम्पनियों के पास चूँकि रुपया नहीं है लिहाजा दुनिया की सारी जहाजी कम्पनियाँ धाज अपने अपने जहाज बेचने को तैयार हैं । हमको शिपिंग का बाएर्स मार्केट नहीं बनना है कि आज हम लोन लेकर जहाज खरीदें और कल फिर हमको कर्ज चुकाने के लिये जहाज बेचने पड़ें ।

पार्टिसिपेशन के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा गया है । मैं उसका समर्थक हूँ । जोरों से

उसका समर्थन करता हूँ । इसके अलावा मैं फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन के सिद्धान्त को मानता हूँ । फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन होना चाहिए । बाहर से जितना भी रुपया इसके लिए धाक-षित किया जा सके वह किया जाय । फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन के सिद्धान्त को मानते हुए धापके सामने सवाल यह है कि उस फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन का परसेंटेज क्या होना चाहिये । इस सम्बन्ध में जैसा मैंने कल कहा १९२३, २४ में हमारी पालिसी यह थी कि मेजॉरिटी आफ वी शेयर्स इण्डियन होने चाहियें । सन् १९४७ में धापकी पालिसी यह हुई कि ७५ और २५ का परसेंटेज होना चाहिए जिसका कि नतीजा यह हुआ कि कई कम्पनी कोई फारेन पार्टिसिपेंट और कोई बाहरी आदमी हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हाथ मिला कर शिपिंग कम्पनी खोलने के वास्ते नहीं आया । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब ऐसी हालत है और जब धापको कोई रिसपोस नहीं मिला तो फिर उसी पुरानी पालिसी पर चलते रहने से क्या फायदा है ? मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट ने अब तक इस चीज को बखूबी रिप्लाइज कर लिया होगा कि फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन के लिए यह ७५ और २५ का परसेंटेज रखना ठीक नहीं है । इंडस्ट्रीज में धापने क्या किया ? इंडस्ट्रीज में फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन के लिए १९४९ में जो पालिसी रखी उसके मातहत ५१ और ४९ का परसेंटेज रखा अर्थात् ५१ अगरे हिन्दुस्तान के हों तो ४९ दूसरे के हों । इसके अलावा अमरीका की जो तीन आयल रिफ़ाइनरीज यहाँ आई उनका सेंट परसेंट कैपिटल फारेन है । अलबत्ता धागे चल कर हम उसको ठीक कर सकते हैं । हिन्दुस्तान में कितनी ही कम्पनियाँ ऐसी हैं जिनमें कि फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन इंडिया की अपेक्षा ज्यादा है । क्या कारण है कि शिपिंग के वास्ते इस फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन का धाज विरोध किया जा रहा है और जो पालिसी हमारी फ़ेल हो चुकी है उसी पालिसी की तरफ हमें फिर लटकाने रखना चाहते हैं ।

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

अभी हमारे वित्त मन्त्री महोदय श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने इस चीज को बहुत अच्छे तरीके से कहा है :

"Foreign capital will find in India a dynamic atmosphere for investment which the Indian Government intends to maintain by means of all suitable policies at our command."

यहां से दस हजार मील की दूरी पर तो यह कहा जा रहा है कि हम डाएनेमिक ऐंटमोसफिअर पैदा कर रहे हैं और यहां लोक-सभा में बैठ कर हम स्टैटिक ऐंटमोसफिअर तैयार कर रहे हैं। डाएनेमिक ऐंटमोसफिअर पैदा करने के लिए क्या १९४७ की इस स्टैटिक पालिसी पर हमें चलते रहना होगा? आखिर दुनिया हमारी इस स्टैटिक पालिसी को देख कर हमें क्या लहेगी? आज दुनिया हम पर हंस रही है क्योंकि शिपिंग के बारे में हमारी सही नति नहीं है।

इस के बाद सन् १९५७ में आप देखेंगे कि बजट स्पीच में यह चीज कही गई कि ५१ और ४९ का परसेंटेज बड़ा अच्छा है और अगर कोई अफर हां तो हमें उसे मान लेना चाहिये। उस के बाद २७-२-५८ को इस बिल को पेश करते वक्त शिपिंग के मिनिस्टर साहब की जो स्पीच हुई उस में भी यही कहा गया कि भाई ठीक है, मैजोरिटी आफ दो शेयर्स इंडियन होने चाहियें। मचेंट शिपिंग बिल की जो हमारे सामने रिपोर्ट है उस में आप देखेंगे कि पाटिल साहब ने यह कहा कि बिल में तो मैजोरिटी शेयर्स इंडियन हों, ऐसा नहीं है। एक प्रपोजल आया कि ६६ और ३६ रखा जाये, दो तिहाई और एक तिहाई रखा जाये, २२ तारीख को यह प्रपोजल आया और न मालूम क्या हुआ यह बड़े आश्चर्य की बात है कि उस के एक दिन के बाद, ७५, २५ का प्रपोजल आया और उस के बाद फिर हम उलट गये और सन् १९४७ की पालिसी पर चले गये अर्थात्

डाएनेमिक से स्टैटिक हो गये। मैं यहां इस चीज को बिल्कुल साफ तौर से कह देना चाहता हूं कि अगर स्टैटिक बात हम को पसंद है तो यह जहाज की तरफ भी स्टैटिक रहेगी और जहाज की तरक्की डाएनेमिक नहीं हो सकेगी।

हमारे पाटिल साहब ने दो तीन बातें धीर कही हैं। उन बातों को कहने के पहले मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी जो थी उस के अनुसार आप देखेंगे कि एक दर्जन से ज्यादा फार्मसियुटिकल कम्पनियां ऐसी हैं जिन में ५१ शेयर्स इंडिया के हैं और ४९ फारेन शेयर्स हैं। यही परसेंटेज हैबी एंड लाइट इंजीनियरिंग इंडस्ट्रीज, मोटर्स ट्रक में, टाइपराईटिंग कम्पनीज, कलरडाई कम्पनीज और स्टील सेफस इंडस्ट्रीज में हैं। आसाम में जो आयल रिफाइनरीज खोलने जा रहे हैं उन में ७५ परसेंटेज शेयर्स आप ने फोनस को दिये हैं और वह आयल रिफाइनरीज तो आप के पबलिक सेक्टर में है। आखिर जब आप पबलिक सेक्टर में आसाम में इन रिफाइनरीज को खोलने के वास्ते ७५ परसेंटेज फारेन शेयर्स रख लेते हैं तो फिर आप को इस शिपिंग में इस के लिये क्या ब्राबजंक्शन हो सकता है। अगर जहाज-रानी की तरक्की फारेन रुपया लगा कर के, फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन ले कर के हो सकती है तो उस के लिये आप के पास क्या ब्राबजंक्शन हो सकता है? इस के लिये कोई कारण और कोई हेतु अभी तक हमारे सामने नहीं आया है कि यह ७५, २५ किस कारण से रखा गया है? अगर हम को फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन करना है तो फारेनस का जितना ज्यादा से ज्यादा रुपया हो सके, हमें हिदुस्तान में ले आना चाहिये ताकि उस से हमारे देश की तरक्की हो।

इस के बाद शिप बिडिंग गार्डेन्स को हम अपने देश में बनाने जा रहे हैं तो उस के लिये अगर हमें कोई फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन

का आफर मिलता है तो हमें उस को लेना चाहिये। जापान ने आफर किया है। शायद एक और किसी ने आफर किया है। हमें तो फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन का स्वागत करना चाहिये। जब फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन आयल रिफाएनरीज में हो सकता है और दूसरी दूसरी कम्पनियों में हो सकता है तो शिपिंग में क्यों नहीं हो सकता? इसके लिये सिर्फ दो कारण दिये जाते हैं। कहा जाता है "दिस इज रिस्की"। और वह रिस्की इसलिये है कि अगर शिपिंग में फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन होगा तो सम्भव है कि वार टाइम में अगर दूसरे फारेन एलीमेंट्स इस में शामिल रहेंगे तो हमारे हाथ से जहाज निकल जायेंगे। तो जब हमारे हाथ से जहाज निकल जायेंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान भी निकल जायेगा। जब हमारे अन्दर अपने जहाजों को रखने की ताकत नहीं रहेगी तो हिन्दुस्तान को भी रखने की ताकत हमारे पास नहीं रहेगी। तो यह बात भी सोचने की है।

मैं आप को कुछ और सुनाना चाहता हूँ। हमारे सामने कहा गया कि दुनिया में कहीं पर भी शिपिंग में फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन नहीं होता। लेकिन एक किताब में जो अभी हाल में निकली है "लाज कंसरीनिंग दी नैशनैशिटो आब शिप्स" उस में आप देखेंगे कि दुनिया में ६६ मैरीटाइम नेशन्स हैं उन में से ३९ नेशन्स में शिपिंग में फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन है। इंग्लैंड तक में जो कि सब से बड़ी मैरीटाइम नेशन है फारेन पार्टिसिपेशन होता है। मैं आपको सुनाता हूँ। जो पाटिल साहब ने कहा कि रिस्की है मैं उसका उत्तर देना चाहता हूँ। पेपर में लिखता है :-

"It is also asked how can foreign participation in a shipping company to the extent envisaged be reconciled with the role of shipping as a second line of defence, for in times of emergency ship-owners are invited for consultation by the Board of Trade, Foreign Office, etc., on account of

the fact that shipping companies have close contacts with a number of foreign ports. It should be underlined here that whatever validity this point might have apparently, the fact that a shipping company has a minority foreign interest in its capital and one or two foreigners on its board does not detract from its national character. For example, even in the United Kingdom, foreigners without any hindrance are allowed to be shareholders in British shipping companies."

Same is the case with America also

An Hon. Member: That is not the case with America.

Shri Goray (Poona): What is their proportion? (Interruption).

Shri Raghunath Singh: I have got documents to show that foreign participation is allowed in British shipping companies; if you have documents to the contrary you may show them. It is also said there:

"One more point very frequently advanced to shut out foreign capital into shipping is that divided loyalty, divided ownership, divided control and divided management are likely to create new problems for the country. This scare based on loyalties is meaningless because minority shareholding and a few directors on the board cannot change the complexion of the Indian organisation unless all the Indians connected with it are men of straw and the non-Indians men of great moral strength."

हम इस को मान कर नहीं चल सकते कि हमारे हिन्दुस्तानी लोगों की मारेलिटो इतनी गिरी हुई है कि ऐसे समय में वह हिन्दुस्तान को भोखा दे सकते हैं। जहाँ हमारा ६० परसेंट होगा, जहाँ पर हमारे सेयरों की मेजारिटो होगी, वहाँ हम यह कैसे मान सकते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तानी अपने देश के भक्त नहीं होंगे बल्कि अपने देश को दूसरे

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

लोगों के हाथों बेच देंगे। मैं इस प्रिंसिपल को मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ। हम हिन्दुस्तानियों के आचरण को उतना ही ऊँचा समझते हैं जितना कि दूसरे देशों के लोगों के आचरण को ऊँचा समझते हैं। मैं सिलेक्ट कमेटी में ६० और ४० के पक्ष में था। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस में कोई रिस्क नहीं है। कैसे ६० परसेंट हिन्दुस्तानी ४० परसेंट फारेनर्स के हाथों में खेल सकते हैं यह बात हमारी समझ में नहीं आती। मान लिया कि इस वक्त आपका चार करोड़ की कम्पनिया है। चार जहाज आप को चाहिये। तो चार जहाजों के वास्ते आपको चार करोड़ पया चाहिये। अगर आप लोन लेते हैं तो लोन में आप को ६ परसेंट सूद देना पड़ेगा। इस का अर्थ यह होता है कि सिर्फ चार करोड़ के जहाजों के वास्ते आप को ८० लाख पया प्रति वर्ष सूद और किस्त के रूप में देना पड़ेगा। अगर आप का फारिनर्स का ४० परसेंट का पारटिसिपेशन हो तो हमको उनसे इन चार जहाजों के लिये फारेन एक्सचेंज मिल सकता है। इस वक्त फारेन एक्सचेंज हमारे पास नहीं है। अगर फारेन पारटिसिपेशन होगा तो विदेशों का जो रुपया होगा उससे तो हम जहाज खरीदेंगे और जो हमारा रुपया होगा उससे हम रनिंग कास्ट मीट करेंगे। इसलिये मैं नञ्जता के साथ कहता हूँ कि जब सरकार ने और उद्योगों में फारेन पारटिसिपेशन को मंजूर किया है तो इसमें भी करना चाहिये और हम को फारिनर से ज्यादा से ज्यादा फायदा उठाना चाहिये। हम को अपने जहाजों की तरक्की करना जरूरी है। आप किस दुनिया में हैं? आप देखें कि हम प्रतिवर्ष १५० करोड़ रुपया फारिन एक्सचेंज का दूसरे लोगों को दे रहे हैं। आपको इस तरफ भी खयाल करना चाहिये। एक तरफ आप प्रति वर्ष यह १५० करोड़ रुपया विदेशों को दिये जा रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ आप फारेन एक्सचेंज

के लिये खिलाते हैं, उसके वास्ते दुनिया में चारों तरफ बूमती है। यहां पर अभी तक कोई ऐसी स्कीम हमारे सामने शिपिंग मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से नहीं आई है कि किस तरह से हम इस १५० करोड़ रुपये को बाहर जाने से बचा सकते हैं। अगर यही हालत रही तो आप की इकानमी कमी स्टेबिल नहीं हो सकती। आप कर्ज ले कर सूद देना चाहते हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि आप सूद क्यों देते हैं। आप फारिन पारटिसिपेशन क्यों नहीं करते जिस में वह लोग लाभ और हानि दोनों में शामिल होंगे। जो कर्ज देगा वह तो सिर्फ प्राफिट का हकदार होगा, लेकिन जब पारटिसिपेशन होगा तो उस में तो प्राफिट और लास दोनों में सामा होगा। उस रुपये पर भी हमारा अधिकार रहेगा। वे लोग कहते हैं कि हम हिन्दुस्तान में आ कर काम करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन हम कहते हैं कि हम तुम को नहीं चाहते। यह बाहर भेजने वाली मनोवृत्ति यहां पर हजारों बरस से चली आ रही है। यह मनोवृत्ति बदलनी चाहिये। बाहर वालों से हाथ मिलाना चाहिये।

एक बात में और कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों ने यह प्रोजेक्ट किया है कि सेंट परसेंट भारतीय होना चाहिये। मैं उन को इस के लिये दोष नहीं देता। यह उन की नीति के अनुसार है। वह उन का स्टैंड है। जिस पर वे खड़े हैं। वह सोचते हैं कि जब तक फारिन पारटिसिपेशन नहीं होगा तब तक हिन्दुस्तान के जहाजों की तरक्की नहीं होगी। लोन हिन्दुस्तान को मिलने वाला नहीं है। जापान लोन देने को तैयार है लेकिन एक शर्त के साथ वह कहता है कि जो जहाज बनेंगे वे जापान के शिपयार्ड में बनेंगे। आप को रुपया हमारे एजेंट से लेना होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनिया में कहीं भी कोई बेश शिपिंग के वास्ते लोन देने को तैयार नहीं होगा। जापान इस

बास्ते तैयार हुआ है कि अगर उस की शर्त मान ली जाती है तो उस के अपने शिपयाइ चलाते रहेंगे। लेकिन कम्युनिस्ट भाई कहते हैं कि सेंट पर सेंट अपना पया होना चाहिये। उन का उद्देश्य यह मालूम होता है कि जब प्राइवेट सेक्टर सफल नहीं होगा तो वे कहेंगे कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर सफल नहीं हुआ है इसलिये इसका नेशनलाइजेशन किया जाये। इसीलिये वे फारिन पारटिसिपेशन का विरोध करते हैं। जब मैं अपना अमेन्डमेंट पूरा करूंगा तो मैं इस बात पर प्रकाश डालूंगा कि हमारा क्या परसेंटेज होना चाहिये।

मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक फारिन पारटिसिपेशन का सम्बन्ध है, हम को इसे ज्यादा से ज्यादा लेना चाहिये और अपने जहाजों को उन्नति करनी चाहिये। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि भारतवर्ष की जो लक्ष्मी है उस को सुन्दर साड़ी पहना कर, उस की मांग में सिंदूर दे कर, सोने का कड़ा पहना कर, १५० करोड़ रुपये उस के अंचल में रख कर उस को विदेश भेज दें। यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है। यह एक दम बन्द होनी चाहिये। भारत की लक्ष्मी भारत में ही रहनी चाहिये। हमें इस के लिये प्रयास करना चाहिये, और वह तभी सम्भव हो सकता है जबकि हिन्दुस्तान की जहाजी कम्पनियों की तरक्की होगी। लोन ले कर यह तरक्की नहीं हो सकती और लोन आप को मिलता भी नहीं है। पांच बरस से हम विल्ला रहे हैं, लोन, लोन, लोन। लेकिन लोन कहीं से नहीं आया। लोन आया केवल जापान से जोकि अपने यहाँ जहाज बनायेगा तब आप को लोन देगा। वह अपने टर्म्स पर आप को लोन देने को तैयार है। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि इस विषय पर आप गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करें। आप ६० और ४० का परसेंटेज स्वीकार कर लें, नहीं तो परसेंटेज का सवाल हमेशा के लिये धोपन रखना चाहिये।

eloquent speech of the hon. Member who preceded me, I am unable to agree with him about the percentage question that he has referred to. He seems to be under the impression that because in respect of the Assam Oil Companies the percentage of foreign participation is 75, in some other places it is up to 49, there is no reason why it should not be the case with regard to shipping, which is not based on *terra firma*, but which is on the broad seas. I would only point out to my hon. friend and to this House that shipping is quite different from all these companies and firms. These companies and firms, as he put it, are on *terra firma*; they are in our own country itself and they cannot be carried away anywhere. But a shipping organisation is something floating on the high seas with centres everywhere in the whole world, with seamen and officers who may belong to different nationalities. Therefore, it should be treated as a different thing from the oil refineries, etc.

Apart from this, I would also make a submission to the hon. Minister and to Government to reconsider this Bill from a view-point which they had totally ignored in their deliberations, as we find from the Joint Committee report and other records, viz., the requirements of defence. You know that in these times, the cost of defence is so great that in order to strengthen the defence organization at a minimum cost, we should see that other allied organisations are used for defence in emergencies. It is always the policy of every Government in every country to make some of these organisations second lines of defence. On the air force side, you have got the Airlines Corporation, the flying clubs, the glider clubs and the air wing of the NCC which are all auxiliary to the air force and which strengthen the air defence in times of need and the necessary personnel should be trained for it.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam): Mr. Speaker: Sir, even after the very

Similarly on the army side, you have got the various semi-military

[Shri U. C. Patnaik.]

organisations which are being encouraged in every country and which are being built up with a view to strengthen the reserves and the defence potential of a country on the military side. On the naval side, there are two organisations which are always considered in every country as auxiliary to naval defence. One is merchant shipping and the other is deep-sea fishing. Some countries have given more weightage to the former and some others to the latter, but these two organisations are always considered as auxiliary to naval defence. In fact, it is these two organisations that are part and parcel of the naval defence of a country which pay dividends during peace time. That is a special point of view from which these second lines of defence are to be considered, not like the territorial army, which does not pay dividends in peace time, nor even the flying clubs and glider clubs.

Before I come to the main principles that should guide us and the ideas that should be taken into consideration in order to frame our shipping policy, I will begin with the merchant-shipping policy of one particular country and then I will point out what others have been doing. I begin with the United States of America. The U.S. Shipping Board was created in 1916 and its purpose was

"to encourage, create and develop a naval auxiliary, naval reserve and merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the U. S."

In 1936, the U. S. Maritime Commission was created by the Merchant Marine Act, it was intended further:

"to foster the development and encourage maintenance of a Merchant Marine for the national defence and for development of foreign and domestic commerce."

So, its purpose was to promote American commerce and to provide for national defence at the same time. Its objectives were (a) to develop commerce, (b) to serve as naval and military auxiliaries in times of emergencies, (c) to be owned and operated under the U. S. Flag by citizens of U.S.A. (manned with a trained and efficient U.S. crews, to be formed from American citizens only) and (d) to be composed of the best-equipped, safest and most suitable types of vessels constructed in the U.S. to be used for commerce, capable of conversion for naval use if requisitioned in emergencies. These were the four objectives. One is national defence in emergencies and another is to have swift, useful, modern kinds of ships which can be converted or commandeered for military purposes. Another very important requirement is that the ships are owned and operated under the U. S. Flag by citizens of U.S.A. and manned with trained U. S. personnel.

Then again, on 7-2-1942, two months after Pearl Harbour, a War Shipping Authority was established with the duty and authority as follows:

"to control the operation, purchase, charter, requisition, maintenance, insurance and use of all vessels (except combat vessels, etc.) and to collaborate with the Federal Departments and agencies concerned to ensure the most effective use of U.S. shipping in the prosecution of war."

Again in 1950, on 24-5-1950, the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration were created. These are to control the type, size, speed and other requirements of ships, the requirements for installation of defence measures on ships, reserve of ships and training of licensed and unlicensed sea-going personnel. Grants and loans are made to private ship-building concerns, cent per cent American-owned and cent per cent

American-manned, on very favourable terms, provided they conform to patterns and designs from naval architects, for ensuring speed, for gun-enplacement in times of war, for enabling ships to be immediately converted on requisition by Government for naval use, etc.

The approach of the U.S.A. to merchant shipping has been enunciated in the following para:

"The merchant marine is the only arm of our national defence that is an earning asset in times of peace.... The British have always understood the principle of an active merchant marine as part of military sea-power. The Germans and Italians have understood it. The Japanese understood it and undertook the building of a commercial fleet especially adapted to wartime use; It is the special duty of our merchant marine as a necessary adjunct to our naval power, not only to serve the ocean-borne foreign commerce of U.S., but to provide as well for national defence."

These are the principles on which the merchant marine is being built up in America, which is expanding every day and which is providing an efficient adjunct to their naval strength.

13.29 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Then, we come to USSR at the other extreme. You will find that even during the time of the Czars, merchant shipping was being given very great importance, because it could be utilised for defence purposes. In fact, a Britisher visiting Russia in those days has spoken of one of their merchant vessels as being eminently fit to be an auxiliary cruiser in time of war. That is how even during the time of the Czars, they were building ships. After the USSR was formed, they have given the highest importance to merchant shipping. During the first Five Year Plan in Russia it

was not so much on naval vessels that they were concentrating upon as they were on merchant shipping. Their tonnage, which in 1924 was 4,12,459 tons increased in 1936 to 1,217,709 tons and in 1946 to 2,156,987 tons, and in one year alone, in 1938, USSR spent 25 million roubles on purchasing merchant vessels from abroad.

It is not only USA, and USSR but other countries also like Italy, Germany and Japan were concentrating upon shipping as part of their naval defence and naval organisation. In England, I need not repeat the romance of the merchant shipping mediaeval and modern times. It was the merchant ships of those days, call them pirates, call them buccaneers, call them colonisers, it is those ships which spread the Union Jack from country to country and it is they who were responsible for what was, till recently, called "Britannia rule the waves". It is mainly because of the capacity of these ships, which formed the nucleus....

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I think we are discussing Indian shipping.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: May hon. predecessor referred to it and that is why I am continuing it. England founded its naval power upon its merchant shipping.

Probably, the hon. Minister does not like the phrase "naval power". He has put it, if I remember right, not as 'naval power' but 'maritime mindedness' or 'maritime nation'. To my mind, both are synonyms. It is only a question of the objective: whether it is the maritime capacity of the people or the naval power which we want. Both are inter-related and inter-dependant. I would submit that the Minister has to reconsider the question from the naval defence point of view, which has so far not been considered, I hope that instead of surrendering our rights to foreigners or to foreign interests to any extent, we

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

will have our own organisation; be it by loans, be it by any other means, we will have our own organisation, because the merchant-navy differs from the other organisations referred to by the hon. Member, Shri Raghunath Singh. These ships go round about the world. It is a question whether, with the foreigners, be they one-fourth or less, being in a position of influence, we can requisition our ships in times of war. It is a question of our allowing foreign ships, or Indian ships with foreign management, be it one-fourth or less, or Indian ships with foreign seamen, whatever their numbers may be, to carry on the coastal trade and overseas trade and put in close touch with the nation. Well, we cannot allow that in times of war. On the other hand, we must have the power to requisition these ships. We should take over the training and manning of these ships. They should be so fitted while they are being constructed that we could take them over and find them useful in national emergencies.

So, I would request the hon. Minister to consult his counterpart in the Defence Ministry, to consult, if necessary, the Prime Minister and see that something is done, which has been overlooked in the Bill, because he has to look at it from a broad national point of view, because he has to look at it from the country's future point of view. We are now spending more than 60 per cent of our revenue on defence, including the supplementary demands, and still our defence position is not as strong as we wish it to be. Hence, I would request the Minister, through you, Sir, and through this House, to reconsider the question from posterity's point of view, and not merely from today's point of view of the ship-owners, who could not get foreign participation even to the extent of 25 per cent during the last so many years, who are now again going to give so many facilities to foreigners in our shipping concerns; who were not able to train

our Indian personnel for our shipping organisation; nor have they ploughed back into the industry the profits that they have been making.

A ship can be very easily sabotaged. It is not easy to do an act of sabotage in a big city, but in a ship even one single member of the crew can scuttle it. It is easy for one man, one of the officers in the ship, to manage to steer the ship somewhere outside. We have, therefore, to look at the shipping problem from the national point of view. The question is whether the hon. Minister will be pleased to discuss the matter with the other departments concerned, with the other Ministers concerned, and, if necessary, even with the Prime Minister, because this is a matter of very prime national importance for the future of the country. And I am sure the Ministers concerned will earn the thanks of this country if they can revise and revitalise this Bill with a new approach, an angle which has not been taken into consideration till now, namely, the defence of the country.

The Minister of Transport and Communications (Shri S. K. Patil): May I tell the hon. Member that the Defence Department has been consulted about it?

Shri U. C. Patnaik: If the Defence Department has been consulted, I am afraid, it has not given the right advice, because.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is quite a different thing. That we shall take up some other time—whether they were correctly advised.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Sir, I would add one word. If the Defence Ministry, has been consulted, and has not given the right advice, I wish that this Ministry itself will look into the matter.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why should you presume that they have not given the right advice?

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Because, in the Select Committee....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The advice might not have been accepted. How are you sure that the advice was accepted?

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Yes, one of the two.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore, no comments are necessary for the present, so far as that advice is concerned.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: Therefore, my submission is that this is a measure which cannot easily be changed. Once you accept this and follow up with a block of 25 per cent, they can create any amount of trouble. They can also capture some of our 75 per cent.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When the speech is once finished, it should not be resumed now.

Shri Parulekar (Thana): Before I proceed to deal with the provisions of the Bill, as revised by the Joint Select Committee, I would like to offer some observations on some preliminary issues which are very important. The Joint Select Committee prevented the Government from committing the crime of national betrayal and came to the rescue of the country and saved it from a national disaster. If the Joint Select Committee had not succeeded in rejecting the definition of the term "Indian shipping", which was given in the original Bill, this measure would have been a measure of great national calamity, both economic and political, and an act of national shame. I will give briefly a few reasons for the severe words of condemnation which I am now offering.

The definition of the term "Indian shipping", as was given in the original Bill, re-opened the doors for influx of foreign capital. If you read clause 12 of the original Bill and

analyse its implications, you will find that a shipping company with hundred per cent foreign capital can register its ship as an Indian ship, can fly the Indian flag and carry on the Indian trade of shipping. Sir national betrayal was writ large on the face of it, because this definition ignored the important and the vital role of the shipping industry in the economy of the country and in the defence of our country.

What is the role of the shipping industry in our economy? It must be remembered that it is a basic industry. It must be remembered that it is a key industry. It must be remembered that it is a strategic industry and in time of crisis it is the second line of defence. The hon Minister yesterday waxed eloquent on the importance of the shipping industry, but I do not know how he forgot it when the original Bill was drafted. He may not have been in charge of shipping then, but whoever may have been in charge forgot all these aspects of the shipping industry and the vital role which the shipping industry was playing in our economy and the defence of the country and came forward with the definition of Indian ships which opened the doors for the influx of foreign capital.

There is another aspect which must also be taken into consideration in this respect. It is an industry which can earn foreign exchange if it is developed, but if it is not developed it will cause a drain on the foreign exchange, because as we all know, the annual freight charges which the country has to incur comes to about Rs. 150 crores.

I will state another reason. The definition threw overboard the principles of the policy statement, which were stated in the Policy Resolution of 1947. In this connection, I would like to read a few lines from that policy statement.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now that it has been set right by the Joint Committee, we might congratulate them and welcome this decision.

Shri Farulekar: No, Sir. I am going to say that I am not satisfied by it.

Shri Raghunath Singh: They want cent per cent.

Shri Farulekar: It is the policy of the Government which is under review and we do not know when it will change and retrace its steps.

"The Government of India agree that the definition of Indian Shipping as shipping owned, controlled and managed by Indian nationals, as recommended by the majority of the members of the Committee, would be the ideal one and should be the ultimate objective."

It proceeds to say:

"The Government of India have accordingly come to the conclusion that in present conditions the criteria to be satisfied by companies to qualify them for treatment as Indian shipping companies should be as follows:—

- * * * *
- (b) At least 75 per cent of the shares and debentures of the companies should be held by Indians in their own rights;
 - (c) All the Directors should be Indians;
 - (d) The Managing Agents, if any, should be Indians."

So, eleven years after this Resolution was adopted, the Government of India instead of approaching towards the goal of hundred per cent capital in Indian shipping came out with a proposal of hundred per cent foreign capital in the shipping industry. This was reprehensible. But what is still more reprehensible is that they have not a word of explanation to offer, a word of regret to offer, a word of apology to offer in the statement of objects and reasons which was attached to the Bill. What is the explanation for this mysterious

silence? Was it by accident or was it by design or was it because the Government lacked even that much of intelligence as not to know the vital importance of the change which they were introducing or was it because that they did not want to draw the attention of the people to the vital change that they were introducing and that they wanted to introduce it by the back door? Whatever it may be, what I have stated so far will be enough to show to what low depths the Government had descended in this respect.

I will now come to the other issue. The Joint Select Committee has rejected the plea of a certain influential section of the companies interested in shipping industry to raise the share of participation of foreign equity capital in this industry. Their plea was that it should be 51 and 49 per cent of the total capital. Since this had become a controversial issue in the Joint Select Committee and since this is likely to be debated in a slightly modified form in this House, it requires to be considered. An hon. Member, who spoke just a little while ago, is in favour that it should be in the proportion of 60 : 40. That is why this question is a very important question and needs to be debated a little and considered by this House. Those who advocate a higher share for foreign equity capital in the shipping industry advance three arguments. They are alluring arguments, no doubt, but they are deceptive and treacherous.

One of the arguments that they advance is, that there is difficulty of foreign exchange. If participation of foreign capital is allowed we will get the foreign exchange immediately by which we will be able to purchase the tonnage immediately. Their argument is that foreign capital is not willing to come and help us on the basis of 75 : 25, but it is prepared to come on the basis of 51 : 49. The champions of the shipping companies who gave evidence before the Joint

Committee said that they had ascertained from the foreign capital that it would be willing to come if the basis is revised and therefore they argued that in order to induce, foreign capital to participate on the basis of equity capital in our industry, in order to give maximum inducement, its share should be raised to 49 per cent. This argument needs to be considered at a little length.

It is true that there are difficulties of foreign exchange. It is also true that without foreign exchange we will not be able to develop our shipping industry. But it is not true that we cannot have foreign exchange without allowing foreign equity capital to participate in the shipping industry. I will deal with this question a little further at length, but at this stage it will be enough for me to say that any approach to this problem which does not take into consideration the vital role of the shipping industry both in our economy as well as in the defence of the country, is harmful to the country and, I would say, is anti-national.

They advance another argument. They say that Indian capital was shy. Indian capital would be available if foreign capital was allowed to participate in the shipping industry. I would like to read a few sentences so that we will know exactly what they say. On page 14 of the volume of evidence which has been distributed to us, this is what the representative of that section of the companies says:

"Whenever there is collaboration with a reliable foreign concern, national money is more easily forthcoming than otherwise,...."

Our Indian capital is shy, but the shyness disappears in the company of foreign capital. That is what it says. You do not often come across with so naked a confession of capital that it is patriotic so long as patriotism pays. History is not lacking in instances to show that capital throws

off its garb of patriotism the moment it sees that patriotism is not profitable.

There is another argument which they advance for a higher share of participation of foreign capital in the shipping industry. They say that in some industries we do allow a higher share of participation for foreign capital and the instances which they have quoted are the biscuit industry, the Parker's ink, the chocolate industry, etc. I will only say this much—that this argument only betrays how their self-interest has made them blind to national interest. They have become so blind that they do not see the vital difference between the shipping industry and the biscuit industry, the shipping industry and chocolate industry, the shipping industry and Parker's ink industry.

Having said this much, I will now proceed to examine the provisions in this respect in the Bill as amended by the Joint Select Committee. Clause 21 of this Bill replaces clause 12 of the original Bill and says that we will allow participation of foreign equity capital in the shipping industry in the proportion of 75 and 25 per cent. This is the crux and the crucial issue in this Bill, and that is why it needs to be carefully considered.

The question before the House for consideration will be whether it is in our national interest to allow this proportion, whether it is harmful. My submission is that it is harmful to our national interest. We are opposed to the participation of foreign capital in the shipping industry. I will state briefly the reasons why we are opposed.

The first reason is, that past experience has shown that foreign capital will not participate in the shipping industry on the basis of proportion which we have provided for in the Bill. Though we had allowed 25 per cent participation of foreign capital in the shipping industry, not a pie of

[Shri Parulekar]

foreign capital came forward in this industry. Perhaps some might say that things have changed and it might come today. But those who think that on this basis we will get foreign capital do not know either the economics or the politics of foreign capital. In this connection I will read a small passage from the evidence itself of one eminent person.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): If it does not come, there is no harm.

Shri Parulekar: I am reading from page 82 of the Evidence tendered before the Joint Select Committee:

"If foreign capital comes in, it is not for the love of India or Indian shipping. It will come in with a definite purpose and that purpose will be to preserve its rights in a particular place from which it is gradually eliminated, to make as much profit in as short a time as possible and to serve its own purpose and not ours."

This will be the role of the foreign capital if it is allowed to participate. Past experience has shown that it will come to serve its own purpose, and therefore it should not be allowed to participate.

The second reason which I want to advance is that it will be very harmful to the national interests to allow foreign equity capital to participate in the shipping industry. I will in this connection read a few sentences from one who is not today connected with any shipping industry but who knows and who was connected with the shipping industry for forty years; that is, Mr. M. A. Master who has given evidence before the Joint Committee. On page 76 this is what he says, and it is very important:

"I would examine it from various viewpoints—strategic viewpoint, international viewpoint,

commercial viewpoint, export drive viewpoint, etc. Taking the entire picture, I am definitely of the opinion that it will not be in national interest to invite any foreigners to start any combine here."

One who knows the shipping industry and who had to deal with the shipping industry for forty years comes out with an authoritative statement, which we should accept. He says that it is not in the interests of the nation to allow participation of foreign equity capital in our shipping industry. It should also be remembered that if we allow it, we would be allowing—because the law today allows—it to remit the profits out of the country, to repatriate the capital which they have invested along with the capital gains.

There is a third reason why we are opposed to the participation of foreign equity capital in the shipping industry. An influential section of capital interested in the shipping industry itself is opposed to the participation of foreign equity capital. It is suggested by some—if you read the Minutes of Dissent in the Report of the Joint Select Committee on this Bill, you will find that it is suggested by some—that is, is the self-interest of the capital which has promoted and actuated it to oppose the participation of foreign equity capital in the shipping industry. I will concede it. I will not insult capital by accusing that patriotism is the motive which has actuated it to take up that stand! Even so, the fact remains that the narrow self-interest of capital in this industry coincides with the national interest. It always happens that whenever native capital opposes foreign capital, its narrow self-interest coincides with the national interest. That is no reason why we should grumble and reject the appeal of the capital which is opposed to the participation of foreign equity capital.

Fourthly, my submission will be that participation of foreign equity capital in the shipping industry is absolutely unnecessary for attaining the target of the Second Five Year Plan as well as the target of the Third Five Year Plan. The target of the Second Five Year Plan, as stated by the hon. Minister, is 9 lakh tons; the target of the Third Five Year Plan is 2 million tons. My submission to the House will be that it is not at all necessary to allow foreign equity capital to participate in the shipping industry to attain our targets either of the Second Five Year Plan or of the Third Five Year Plan.

My first argument is, that foreign exchange can be secured, by resorting to what is known as the self-financing system. This is the system which was advocated by those who appeared before the Joint Select Committee and who championed the cause of foreign participation and said that it should be 49 per cent. They themselves have admitted that it is possible to get foreign exchange, of course to a limited extent, by resorting to the self-financing system. We can get foreign exchange if we are able to deposit in banks its equivalent in terms of rupee. That is admitted by those who advocate the participation of foreign equity capital in the shipping industry.

Secondly, there is another factor which we must take into consideration. That is, we can raise loans easily. And in this connection I would like to draw the attention of this House to the fact that there is recession in the world market, in the market of the capitalist world. Capital is idle, and when it is idle it cannot dictate terms; it will come, you need not beg for it; it will come of its own. And that is why the mission of our Finance Minister got an easy response in America and elsewhere. If you look to the recession which has developed in the shipping industry, out of a total tonnage of 110 million tons on the 1st June, 1958, 14 per cent of the total tonnage was lying idle in the ports of U.K. alone. Many of the or-

ders for ship-building had been cancelled, and orders are not forthcoming. So, as a result of the recession which is developing in the world and which is engulfing the capitalist world, it is possible today to get the loans easily, and that can be one of the methods by which we can get foreign exchange.

There is a second way of getting loans, that is from the World Bank. In this connection I would like to read a few sentences from what the hon. Minister said before the Joint Select Committee itself.

On pages 22 and 23 this is what he says:

"The Government of India never made any approach to the World Bank to include shipping."

Further on, he says,

"We have not approached the World Bank for shipping is not in the core of our plan."

I really fail to understand how the Planning Commission committed this blunder of not giving top priority to the shipping industry, taking into consideration its vital role. It is a serious blunder. I would leave it at that.

14 hrs.

Further, it must be remembered that the Chairman of the World Bank had offered loans for developing our shipping industry. We did not take advantage of it. Now, there is an opportunity by which we can take advantage of the World Bank loans and get loans and foreign exchange for developing our shipping industry.

The last reason which I want to advance is that the market is favourable. Prices are tumbling. If today we pay 25 per cent of the price of a ship in cash, we can get a ship and we can pay the rest by instalments. For the reasons which I have given, it will be realised that without allowing participation of foreign equity capital

[Shri Parulekar]

in shipping, we can attain our target of 900,000 tons of the Second Five Year Plan and of 2 million tons of the Third Five Year Plan. I would like to state one more reason why we are opposed to the participation of foreign equity capital. It has not been our practice to allow the participation of foreign equity capital in key industries, in basic industries. We did not allow it in the steel industry; we did not allow it in the railways; we did not allow it in the air lines because of the vital role which they play both in the economy as well in the defence of the country. There is, therefore, no justification whatsoever for allowing participation of foreign equity capital in the shipping industry, which should be 100 per cent Indian.

There is one more point to which I would like to refer briefly in this connection. It is in connection with our policy. My submission is that the Government should undertake the responsibility of developing the shipping industry instead of entrusting it to private capital. That policy would be suicidal. Why do I say this? What has been their performance in the past? Government offered to give them loans at a very cheap rate of interest. At that time, the foreign exchange situation was very favourable. Yet we find that the shipping industry did not develop and did not take advantage of the loans and the foreign exchange situation to increase our shipping. That was their past performance. We cannot therefore rely on private capital to develop the industry. I am not saying that we should nationalise the industry. That is not what I say at present.

Shri Raghunath Singh: After some time.

Shri Parulekar: After some time, many things will happen.

What is their demand for developing the shipping industry? They want money from the Government. They

want foreign exchange from the national pool of foreign exchange. They want cargo to be given by the Government. Their job will be to earn profits. Their demand is to give us peoples money to earn our profits. That is why I say it should be the primary responsibility of the Government to develop the shipping industry and Government must not entrust it to private capital to develop it. If we do that after some years, we will come and repent for having taken this decision. Besides it is not our practice to allow private capital to have its own way in key industries and basic industries.

There is another black spot in this Bill and that is, this Bill allows representation of foreign capital on the Board of directors. Here I only wish to point out that it is a retreat from the Policy statement which was issued in 1947 which did not allow any foreigner to be a member of the Board of directors. This is a retreat. Apart from that, it is harmful to our interests. In this connection, I will read a small passage from page 62. This is an important issue and that is why it is necessary to cite that. This is what Shri M. A. Master says:

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. This is an important Bill.

Therefore I say.....

Shri Parulekar: I know the difficulties.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very large number of Members want to speak.

Shri Parulekar: That is a justification for extending the time instead of curtailing the debate.

Anyhow,

"Even if there is a very small minority of the foreign company in the management or in the board, you would not be able to carry out

the policy which you have in view. Let me give another hypothetical illustration. Supposing our Government were to tell us that we should not go to a particular port of a country with which we may not be friendly and another foreign director is on the board. His country may be friendly to that Government and it will not be possible for us to discuss this. Suppose we are thinking of opening new branches where the British people are interested and we have got one British director on the board. It will not be possible to discuss this. So, it is our view as practical businessmen that it is not possible to discuss these things with them. There are various other considerations. These are the considerations arising from the viewpoint of defence strategy, and the discharge of international obligations."

That is why I say it is absolutely harmful to allow any foreigner to be a director on the Board of directors. This retreat from the Policy resolution shows only the anxiety of the Government to woo foreign capital in the shipping industry at the cost of our national interests.

I will only refer to another black spot in the Bill. There are several clauses in the Bill which deal with the conditions of seamen. It is not possible within the short time at my disposal to deal even with one of them. I will therefore say only this. There are about 70,000 seamen who are engaged in the shipping industry. The clauses which have been incorporated in this Bill are practically bodily lifted, with a minor change here or there from an Act which has become outmoded, an Act which was framed by the British imperialists, and an Act which treated the seamen as slaves. Those same clauses happen to be incorporated in this Bill with a minor change here or there. Look at their

wages, their conditions, their accommodation, their hours of work. You will find that it is a horrid tale. I do not know how the hon. Minister who is supposed to be very able, did not care to look at the recommendations of the Royal Commission on labour which had investigated into their conditions and to incorporate at least some of their recommendations in this Bill. On the ship, the seaman is a slave of the master. On a foreign ship, he is a slave of the foreigner. The Minister ought to have taken care to incorporate at least some provisions which will ameliorate their conditions, which will enable them to live an honourable and a decent life. I do not know whether the hon. Minister has ever visited the place where seamen live in the ship. The seamen are roasted there. Twenty-five people are huddled together in a small space. I do not know how the Bill was drafted and how much care was given to this Bill. Perhaps the only point which attracted their attention was that of allowing participation of foreign capital to the extent of 100 per cent.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri (Nabad-wip): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, when we look at Indian shipping.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Members will try to restrict to the time limit of 15 minutes.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: I will try my best. You have given so much time to others. You must also give some time to me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That exception has been made by the hon. Speaker in the case of the first speaker in a party or group or leader of a party. If she can claim that status, certainly I will allow that much of time.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: I do not claim any status except that I wish your chivalrous outlook!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Of course, can assure her that.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when we look at Indian shipping, we must look at it from the national point of view. We cannot think of the capitalists, foreigners, this, that and the other, because international shipping is rooted in the necessity for large-scale exchange of commodities, exchange of ideas and exchange of cultures.

Now, our ocean highways have increased and our horizons have increased, and we must see that Indian shipping attains a status and holds its own in the world.

I would like to refute some of the arguments that have been placed before us over this foreign participation question which seems to be the core of the Bill and the core of the controversy. May I point out to the House that it is a fact that wherever there has been a lot of foreign participation, Indians and Indian shipping have stood to lose? Look at what happened in the dark days of the war when there was nothing to save the refugees. There were 84,000 refugees from Burma during the last war. There was no ship to bring them back. It was only the Indian ships which could do it. No foreign ship provided their rescue. During the time that famine stalked India, if we look back, we had Indian ships, but there was no foreign ship that brought us foodgrains to save our starving millions. It was the Indian ships at that time that saved the situation. They brought foodgrains and fed thousands in India, and at least enabled us to save a certain number of lives.

If we have foreign participation in a key and vital industry like shipping, how can we help harming ourselves? My Hon. friend Shri Raghunath Singh said that there are so many countries that allow foreign participation, but I would bring to the notice of the House that may be in

their laws it is allowed, but in practice it is not so, not to the extent that one would want to make out.

Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha (Aurangabad—Bihar): What has happened in practice here?

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: In practice here we do not want any more participation than the gesture of keeping the door open, that is 25 per cent, because we do not want to isolate India and that is about all we wish to do.

If foreign participation is really for the good of India and if we consider one or two things, then I think foreign capital should come on the terms of 25 per cent participation. For instance, if we said that the taxation should not be doubled, we can gain in revenue from the profits that they made in India. I hope foreign capital would be willing to come on those terms because then we might reduce their double taxation in their own countries. That is a question which I hope the hon. Minister will look into and see if that cannot be done.

The formula of 60—40 has really no meaning because no foreign capital would really want to come without having control and power, and we do not want foreign control and power in our shipping.

There are many points to be looked into this Bill. I am glad that we have codified the Indian shipping law and brought it to this stage, but there are one or two things which we could do. For one thing, foreign capital would not be necessary if we can procure the foreign exchange that the need through loans. It has been procured for so many industries in India, and I do not see why it cannot be procured for shipping. I think the hon. Minister was good enough to say even during the deliberations of the Joint Committee that there was quite a possibility of getting loans if we

should want and there should be no very great difficulty about that. There would also be no need for such a lot of foreign loans because as it is, shipping is the quickest earner of foreign exchange. Already shipping gives Rs. 9 to Rs. 10 crores or more of our foreign exchange. During the Second Plan period all that we need is another Rs. 20 to 23 crores. During the next three years, 1958 to 1960, more ships would come in and our earnings would go up, and we would be able to earn Rs. 16 or Rs. 17 crores easily, and if some of this earning is released for us to obtain new ships, then I am sure just for a gap of Rs. 3 to Rs. 6 crores we do not need to sell our prestige nor our Indian ships to foreigners, because a gap of Rs. 3 to Rs. 6 crores can be made up by any Government at any time should the country feel the need of it, and the 900 millions tons of target should easily be acquired by our private shipping who have done a good job of work all these years.

I do not agree with the hon. Member opposite who said that private shipping companies have not fulfilled their targets. They have; and they have faced difficulties, and they have stood by the trade of India, and they have done a good job of work. I think it is time India recognised that because it is not only by nationalising anything that we can go forward. We have also to take the capital of India with us, and because they are capitalists is no reason that they would not be able to serve India. If foreign capital is not coming and if foreign exchange is not to be had, there will be Indian capital available from the capitalists of India, because I am sure that it is not only their own pockets they are seeking to fill, they will be helping to make a big industry which will be the price of India in times to come.

I happen to be a Member of the Seaman's Welfare Board and we have submitted a report. There has been some controversy about the jurisdiction of that board and the report has

not yet been considered. I hope the hon. Minister will look into the report and the recommendations made therein because it has taken into consideration the welfare of seamen, and many of the recommendations I am sure can be implemented if the Ministry looks into it.

There is also the welfare of the deck passengers. I happen to be a Member of that committee also. In our last meeting we found there was great need for a poor box to help the deck passengers who have suddenly come to grief after landing. For instance, there was the case of a young girl who suddenly died and there was no fund to cremate her. There was no money, there was no food to give to the other children. The Deck Passengers Amenities Committee has passed a resolution that it is going to approach the Central Government, and I hope the money for the poor fund will be forthcoming.

Shipping deals with all sorts of aspects. When we were in Calcutta particularly, the Port Commissioners brought to our notice the great danger that the navigation of the Hooghli is facing. I hope the Ganga Barrage will be a possibility within the Second or Third Plan to save the town of Calcutta and to make the Hooghli once more the navigable river it was, because Rs. 3 crores practically every year are spent on just preliminary dredging to keep it workable. We can save the Rs. 3 crores if the Ganga Barrage project could come into being and the whole port of Calcutta could be saved.

Lastly, we must look at shipping from the national aspect, and when we think of capitalists, let me ask this are Indian capitalists so bad? Foreigners who are going to participate are also capitalists, and certainly a known devil is better than an unknown one, if devils they be, because it may be that in times of stress foreign capitalists will not allow our Indian shipping to do the work which

[Shrimati Na Falchoudhuri]

it is really supposed to do, and will also debar us from raising our voice in the right manner in the liners' conferences. As it is, in these liners' conferences it is very difficult to get a place, and when we have divided loyalties, what will our representative there do who is a foreigner and yet has ships registered under the Indian flag?

There are three aspects of shipping: economic, political and sentimental. From the political aspect, foreign participation cannot be safe. From the economic aspect it cannot be good for our trade, and from the sentimental aspect, all that I can say is: who can be proud when he sees the Indian flag on a ship—that is not Indian? There are flags of convenience like Panama and Liberia where the people of the country are only crews and coolies in those ships. They have no say in the governance of trade and industry. In that case, can their minds swell with pride when they see the Panama flag on a foreign ship? Neither can our mind do so when we see the Indian flag on a ship which is bought and bartered for with foreign money and foreign exchange. So, I would always say that let us have our own ships. So far as welfare is concerned, welfare in India has always meant the welfare of all and not only individual welfare. Even from the days of the Rig Veda, it is clear that we have prayed to Jananath, the God of the seas, to take us across the ocean safely and to bring us back to the shores for our welfare.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: (Hapur): Now, the hon. Member goes by air.

Shrimati Na Falchoudhuri: We may go by air, but we can never do without the seas. I hope Jananath will always protect our seamen and our ships and take us across the ocean.

When the whole shipping policy is looked at, I hope it will be looked at from the point of view of our seamen

and sailors who through the long ages have written a brilliant history of Indian shipping, and who have brought India fame and glory as a maritime country. As the Minister has very rightly said, we do not wish to make India a maritime power, but we want her again to be a maritime country, with her shores open to all trade, and her own ships going out to distant lands and playing her trade.

व्यापार वसति लक्ष्मी

That *vyapar* must be with India in her own ships and under her own flag.

Shri Goray: Sir, the activities that have been carried on in the Lobby of the House and outside in the city by the representatives of the shipping interests and the representatives of the seamen's unions testify to the fact, if testimony were needed at all, that the legislation under discussion is very important.

The other day, while moving for consideration of this Bill in this House, the hon. Minister told us that he did not want this country to be a maritime power, but he wanted this country to be strong so far as the merchant navy was concerned. I do not know why Shri S. K. Patil was so modest. Outside, we know him to be a very militant man, and not at all averse to power. But, here, it seems that after coming to Delhi, he has turned himself into a pious grass-eater, and he has started talking in terms of piety.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Here, he finds himself confronted with more militant men.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Grass-eaters are militant members, but my hon. friend is trying to condemn grass-eaters. For instance, my hon. friend over there is a grass-eater.

Shri Goray: The sentiments expressed by the hon. Minister were a little amusing, and also, I thought, were a little bit distressing. After all, what

is the target that he is aiming at? The target that he is aiming at by the end of the Second Five Year Plan is only 9 lakhs tons and even in the rosy picture that he has painted, he could not go beyond 25 lakhs tons. If we compare these targets with the targets that have been already achieved by other countries, I do not think that India will be considered to be a maritime power even if we attained the target placed before us by the hon. Minister to be achieved at the end of the Third Five Year Plan.

There is a report of the Estimates Committee which has pointed out that two or three years back, Japan already had a tonnage of 37 lakhs tons, and Germany which was shattered by the war had reached a tonnage of about 26 lakhs tons. No, let us not be deluding ourselves by saying that even if we attain the target of 25 lakhs tons, we shall be called a maritime power; we are not going to be called that at all. The other thing is that let us not try to avoid words like 'maritime power'. Maritime power does not mean necessarily that we are going to be aggressive. I hope that a time will not come in this country when we shall not hate the words like steam power or electric power. These are simple words, and let us tell the world that we are going to increase our maritime power, and we are going to attain enough maritime power so that all the trade that we want to carry from the shores of our country to the shores of the other countries and *vice versa* will be handled by us and not by anybody else.

This Bill, I find, was being discussed in a rather lop-sided way. It is a very bulky legislation Sir, comprising about 461 clauses and split up into eighteen parts. So far as the structure of the Bill is concerned, I would have liked that we had made it a more handy affair and had helped the mariners or the sailors, by isolating all the clauses

that pertain to them, and incorporating them in a separate Bill. I was told that in countries like Norway, Sweden etc. they had small legislations, which told the seamen exactly what their responsibilities were, what their rights were, what had been done for them by Government, and what Government expected them to do. But in a Bill of this nature, it becomes very difficult to find out the various clauses, to sort them out, and to fix responsibilities, and to understand what particular clause applies to the one or the other.

Having said that in regard to the structure, I would also like to point out that there are two or three authorities that have been created by this Bill. One is the Shipping Development Fund Committee; the other is the National Shipping Board, and the third is the Director-General of Shipping. The objective of the Bill obviously is consolidation, expansion and streamlining the administration. But I fear that these three authorities might sometimes overlap each other, and may be, there may be a clash of interests between the three. I think that precautions should have been taken to see that their functions and their powers were made as distinct as possible.

The major part of the debate on this Bill has concentrated round the fact of 25 per cent participation of foreign capital in our shipping industry. I do not know why so much importance was being attached to this. I thought that we were all of one mind that after attaining Independence, a vital industry like the shipping industry, would be reserved hundred per cent for our capital. Just now, I was surprised to hear the arguments that were put forward by Shri Raghunath Singh. I cannot imagine to myself accusing Shri Raghunath Singh of betrayal of national interest to which Shri Parulekar had referred. He could never be anti-nationalist, but in his anxiety to build up the shipping

[Shri Goray]

industry as quickly as possible, he thought that even participation by foreign interests up to 40 per cent need not be ruled out. I thought that would be a great mistake because this industry cannot be compared with the other industries to which reference has been made. I think the whole confusion is the result of putting this industry on a par with other industries like oil, or pharmaceuticals or food-stuffs etc. This is an entirely different industry and as my hon. friend Shri U. C. Patnaik has pointed out, it is almost a subsidiary or auxiliary of the Navy. If we appreciate that particular fact, then I suppose it will be very clear even to Shri Raghunath Singh that we must not allow foreign capital to interfere in the affairs of our shipping industry.

Another point which he overlooked when he quoted the instance of U.K. and other countries is that U.K., France, Canada and U.S.A. have been allies for centuries. They hardly have quarrelled with each other. They have always co-operated with each other whether it was in war or in other times. That being so, there may be less danger of their coming together, allowing some participation, say to the extent of 5, 10 or 15 per cent of the other country. But situated as we are, when we are taking a stand which does not permit us to identify ourselves with either this or that group, I suppose it will be in our best national interests if we do not get involved in foreign participation.

Then if we do not want foreign participation even to the extent of 25 per cent, where do you get the money from? I agree with my hon. friend, Shri Parulekar, that it is possible to approach the World Bank and it is possible to reserve some of the money earned by the shipping industry to be ploughed back into the industry, to make it possible for them to utilise

that money. After all, it has been pointed out by the Estimates Committee that they are giving us about Rs. 10 crores of foreign exchange per year. Will it not be possible to reserve this and see that it is utilised for building up more and more tonnage? The more tonnage we get, the more foreign exchange we will earn. So it is a system which I would also describe as a self-financing system and if this is tried, whether it is in the private sector with private capital or whether it is in the public sector with the Government in the field, I think, for the present, it will solve our problem and it will be possible for us to reach the target which have fixed for ourselves; otherwise, I am very doubtful whether the target that was fixed in the Second Five Year Plan or the target that was announced on the floor of the House by the hon. Minister's predecessor would ever be reached. You will remember that Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri said that we wanted to reach a target of 10 lakh tons. But I do not think that we could reach that million-ton target if we take to a policy by which we dole out small sums of money for buying tonnage. After all, Rs. 36 crores is not a big sum at all. We will have to increase our financial assistance and I think it can be done without harming our country's economy if the foreign exchange that is earned by these ships could be diverted to the purchase of tonnage.

As regards registration of ships, I do not want to take long, but I would point out that the '25 per cent.' clause also should be removed if possible and the proviso to clause 22(2) which says:

"Provided that any ship registered at the commencement of this Act, at any port in India under any enactment repealed by this Act shall be deemed to have been registered under this Act and shall be recognised as an Indian ship".

should be deleted. I am referring to ships that belong to the Moghul Lines. I do not want these ships to be considered as part of our shipping because they were in existence at the time the Act came into being. To be very plain, so far as our trade is concerned, I do not want any foreign participation at any level.

Having said this about registration, I would say that even in the definition we have been unnecessarily very modest; we have tried to limit the field of home trade from Kandla to Burma. I think the coastal trade of India should be naturally extended from the Straits of Malacca to Aden. This is our sea and it has been Indian sea all through the centuries. The definition "home trade ship" means a ship not exceeding three thousand tons gross which is employed in trading from any port or place in India to any other port or place on the continent of India or from ports or places in India to ports or places in Ceylon, Maldiv Islands or Burma" should not have been there at all. I would suggest that this be dropped and the Indian-owned trade should be extended from Aden down to the Straits of Malacca, as has remained for so long.

Now, I would say that we need not concentrate too much on these clauses. In the Shipping Bill, there are other equally important classes. There are, for instance, officers, ratings, or seamen; there are passengers. What about that aspect? No body seems to be discussing about these things at all. So far as the officers are concerned, I find that a very legitimate grievance has been made out by the Maritime Union of India calling our attention to the fact that injustice has been done in clause 80(1) which deals with certificates to naval officers. They say that even a naval officer, if he wants to act as the master of a merchant ship, must be subjected to examination, because, as they validly argue, that the duties of an officer of the Navy and those of a master of a merchant ship are entirely differ-

ent. A naval officer manning a naval unit has got so many officers on the bridge while the master of a merchant ship has not so many officers; he has to look to so many other things like handling cargo and passengers. These are things which are entirely different and need entirely different training. Therefore, they say that naval officers should not be brought straight to the merchant navy. They say: 'It does not matter if you bring them. They are disciplined and the education and training that they have got may be useful to us, but considering the fact that the merchant navy demands altogether different qualities and more attention to cargoes and passengers, which a naval officer is not used to, the examination should be there'. Therefore, I would say that when Government are thinking of bringing in a naval officer to a merchant ship after his retirement or otherwise, he should take the examination and if he passes it, he should be allowed to be the master of a ship or other officer.

As regards amenities to sailors, at the time the Bill was originally discussed, I had pointed out that the sailors were a very unfortunate lot. People think that they earn a good deal, much more than a common railwayman or people engaged in other industries earn. But we must remember that the sailor works only for 7 months in a year. There are so many snags in the way of re-employment that sometimes has to remain unemployed for a long time. Therefore, I would say that it will be worthwhile if Government considered the appointment of a Committee of Parliament to investigate the service conditions of these people and find out how difficult it is for sailors to get a job, how difficult it is for them to keep it and how difficult it is for them to have common amenities.

Then there is medical examination of the seamen. When the sailor is discharged, it is always easy to get a medical certificate, because if he is medically unfit, the company will have

[Shri Goray]

to bear the expenses. Therefore, they always see to it that he gets a medical certificate on discharge. If he gets a certificate at the time of signing off, then, for six months it should be valid. Otherwise, he has to take another certificate and there is the snag. He has to go to the doctors and there are so many other influences. Therefore, my submission is that the whole system of employing sailors and signing them off, their amenities of living and medical examination etc. have all to be investigated. Let us make the sailor of our country a proud sailor; a sailor who can compare his lot with the lot of any other sailor anywhere else.

I am really afraid to find so many foreigners not only in the Merchant Navy but also in our Navy. A few days back I had put a question and I was told that in the docks and on the ships there are hundreds and thousands of Pakistani ratings and seamen.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Twenty-five thousand.

Shri Goray: It is not good for the health of the Merchant Navy or of our Navy. Let us consider and find out whether it is not possible for us to set up training ships. (Interruption) I am not adverse to Muslims; please do not misunderstand me. I am saying that there are people who are Pakistani nationals. I cannot imagine any country which admits on such large scale nationals belonging to any other country to be in the service of its Merchant Navy.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Portuguese also.

Shri Goray: Therefore, I would like to say that the Ministry in charge of Shipping should try to set up schools and train up sailors—laskars and officers, whatever that may be. All along the coast there must be schools

at various places so that when we are ready with our target of 22 million tons—within the next five or six years—let us not find ourselves in a ridiculous position where we shall have to say that we have ships but we have no sailors. This aspect should also be taken into consideration.

Let us take into consideration the plight of the passengers also; the plight of the passengers and the care that should be bestowed on cargoes. Only recently, we came across a case where because of the remissness of the officer-in-charge or the negligence of somebody else, poison got mixed with food and there was the famous Kerala food poisoning case. Let us see that this is not repeated again. Let us have rules and regulations by which it will be seen that food stuffs and others are completely separated from things which are harmful.

I know also that on pilgrim ships and in regard to passenger ships which have unberthed passengers, we find that hardly they are treated as human beings. I can draw on the analogy of passenger trains or pilgrim trains—trains which go to Pandarpur or the Kumbh Mela. How are they packed? They are packed like sardines. I would say that when we are dealing with pilgrims and unberthed passengers, we must take more care to see that they are given human treatment and better facilities.

The last point that I would like to stress is about the power taken by Government under clause 150 which deals with disputes. The powers taken under it are completely at variance with the basic tenets of labour legislation and labour policy. What the Government is trying to here is surprising. The clause reads:

“Where the Central Government is of opinion that any dispute between seamen or any class of seamen or of any union of seamen and the owners of ships is

which such seamen are employed or are likely to be employed exists or is apprehended and such dispute relates to any matter connected with or incidental to the employment of the seamen; the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, constitute a tribunal consisting of one or more persons, and refer the dispute to the tribunal for adjudication.

It is surprising that where the dispute is between owners and seamen who are employed and who are likely to be employed, the Government should intervene. I do not understand how there can be any dispute between seamen who are likely to be employed and the owners. If you take these powers, then what happens? The dispute is referred to a tribunal and the tribunal gives its decision.

Again, Government says that such of the decisions of the tribunal as it deems fit will be made applicable. That means that Government which may be a party to a dispute appoints a tribunal and after the tribunal comes out with its decision, it has got the power again to amend the decision. I think this is really a clause which goes counter to the labour policy that we have adopted. Again, at the end, it says:

"Nothing contained in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, shall apply to any dispute between seamen or any class of seamen or any union of seamen and the owners of ships in which such seamen are employed or are likely to be employed."

So you have taken away all the right and facilities that were conferred by the Industrial Disputes Act and appropriated all the powers to yourself. Once you have done that, it will not be proper for you to say again that the decision of the tribunal can also be amended. Either you

stand by the decision of the tribunal or do not have a tribunal at all, and leave it to the Industrial Disputes.

These are the points which I wanted to make. It was not possible to cover all other points within the prescribed time. I hope the hon. Minister will take these few points into consideration when replying to the debate.

Unfortunately, on the one side, Shri Raghunath Singh was pleading for 40 per cent foreign participation and, on the other hand, my communist friends were saying that those who drafted this Bill were betraying the interests of the nation. Between these two, it is easy for the hon. Minister to overlook the points that I have stressed. So, I would appeal to him that he should try to take into consideration what I have submitted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava; would he be able to conclude before 3 o'clock?

Shri Raghunath Singh: He may continue next day.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव (हिसार) :

जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, इस बिल का मामला ऐसा है कि जिस पर मैं सिर्फ इस बिल को पढ़ कर और जो बाहर की थोड़ी सी चीजें मुझे मालूम हैं उनको पढ़ कर मैं अपनी राय दे रहा हूँ। मुझे कोई जाती इल्म किसी शिपिंग कारपोरेशन का, या शिप्ट का, या सीमेन का नहीं है। साथ ही मैं फारिन पारटिसिपेशन पर जो कुछ प्रश्न करूंगा वह ऐसी बज्हात पर कि जो ग्राम तौर पर लोगों को मालूम है और जिन के वास्ते कोई खास तजरबा या खास इल्मियत मुझ को नहीं है। इस वास्ते मैं मामले में बहुत डिफीडेंस से बोल रहा हूँ।

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

मैंने दोनों प्वाइंट्स आफ व्यू सुने और इन सब को सुन कर मुझे को तो ऐसा मालूम होता है कि वह सभी साहिबान जो कि इस बहस में पार्ट ले रहे हैं उन सबका पार्ट गालिबन उतना ही ज्यादा इनफार्मर्ड है जितना कि मेरा है।

श्री मनुमनुवाला (भागलपुर) : ब्लास करके गवर्नमेंट का।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : जब मैं गवर्नमेंट की तरफ देखता हूँ और जब पिछली हिस्ट्री और प्राज की हिस्ट्री को देखता हूँ और जब यह देखता हूँ कि किस तरह से यह बिल लाया गया है तो मुझे और भी ज्यादा ताज्जुब होता है और मैं इस फेर में फंस जाता हूँ कि इस मामले में गवर्नमेंट को कोई डेफिनिट राय देना मुश्किल है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐसे हालात में तो मेम्बर साहब को ज्यादा कानफिडेंस होना चाहिये।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : मुझे इसके बारे में अगर कानफिडेंस है तो इस बात पर है कि

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : कि कोई ज्यादा वाकिफ नहीं है।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : कि इसके चलाने वाले श्री पाटिल साहब और श्री राजबहादुर साहब जोकि हमारे सामने बैठे हैं वह जो कुछ करेंगे वह इस देश के हित में होगा। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि जब यह बिल पहले आया था तो उसमें सेंट पर सेंट पाटि-सिपेथन का प्रावीजन था। सन् १९४७ में, प्राज से ११ बरस पहले मैंने देखा था कि वहां पर २५ परसेंट का पालिसी स्टेटमेंट के अन्तर लिख था। अब सिलेक्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में किसी ने लिख दिया है कि पाटिल साहब

ने खुद सजेस्ट किया था कि यह रेशो ६६-२/३: ३३-१/३ रखी जाये।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : जमान रंग बदलता है।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : प्राज हम ६०:४० की बात सुन रहे हैं। दूसरी तरफ हम यह भी सुनते हैं कि गवर्नमेंट को फोरेनर्स को पास नहीं आने देना चाहिये। मेरे जैसे आदमी के लिये, जोकि इस सिलसिले में ज्यादा वाकफियत नहीं रखता है, इससे मुसीबत ज्यादा बढ़ जाती है। मुझे यह कहने में जरा भी ताम्मुल नहीं है कि अगर मुझे यकीन हो कि हिन्दुस्तान का अपना कैपिटल इतना आ जायेगा, जिससे हमारा इंडियन शिपिंग बहुत तेजी के साथ बढ़ेगा, तो मैं सेन्ट-पर-सेन्ट अपने कम्प्यूनिस्ट फ्रेंड्स के साथ शामिल होने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि हमारे यहां फारेन पार्टिसिपेथन नहीं होना चाहिये। पटनायक साहब ने जो कुछ कहा है, उससे मुझे यह ख्याल पैदा होता है कि हमारी सैकंड लाइन प्राफ डिफेंस में फारेनर्स के शामिल होने का सवाल क्या है। हमारे देश के नेशनलज शिपिंग के जरिये १५० करोड़ रुपये हासिल कर सकते हैं। इसलिये मैं सोचता हूँ कि दुनिवा में शायद ऐसी कोई नेशन नहीं होगी, जिसने वह रुपया लेने की कोशिश न की हो जो कि फार दि गैररिंग उसको मिल सकता हो। हिन्दुस्तान के बाकी हिस्सों को तो शायद शिपिंग के बारे में ज्यादा इल्म नहीं है, लेकिन बम्बई वालों को और दूसरे कोस्ट वाले लोगों को मालूम है कि इसमें कितना गेन है और कितना रिस्क है और यह कितनी मुझीद चीज है। मैं यह देखता हूँ कि हमारी शिपिंग में हिन्दुस्तानी बहुत कम हैं। उसमें बीस हजार पाकिस्तान के लोग हैं—शायद उससे भी ज्यादा हैं। शुरू में, जब मैं कलकत्ता में था, तो उस वक्त उसमें कलकत्ता के पास पास वाले और दूसरे इंडियन नेशनलज थे। उस

वक्त तो ठीक था। उस वक्त उसमें ऐसी कौमं थीं, जिन को नाटिकल कहना चाहिए, जिनका रमान उस तरह था। मैं इस सिलसिले में यह भ्रज करना चाहता हूं कि अगर इंडियन शिपिंग हमारी सैकंड लाइन आफ डिफेन्स है, तो जहां तक मुमकिन हो, उसमें हर एक एम्पलाई इंडियन होना चाहिए। डायरेक्टर और दूसरे अफसर तो यहां होंगे और वे यहां से हुक्म देंगे, लेकिन उस हुक्म को मानने वाले अगर फ़ारेनर होंगे, तो वह कोई तसल्लीबक्शा बात नहीं होगी। मैं यह चाहता हूं कि जहां तक मुमकिन हो, इस मुल्क की सैकंड लाइन आफ डिफेन्स को बनाने वाले हिन्दुस्तानी ही होने चाहिए। वफा २१ में इंडियन शिपिंग की जो तारीफ़ बी गई है, उसमें मुझे यह कमी नजर आती है। अगर हम यह नहीं कर सकते कि हम इसमें बाहर वालों को एम्पलाय नहीं करेंगे, तो कम से कम इतना तो कर सकते हैं कि अगर सब के सब हिन्दुस्तानी नहीं हो सकते, तो बड़ी भारी मैजारिटी इंडियन नैशनल की होनी चाहिए। अगर हम चाहते हैं कि इंडियन शिपिंग उस तरह का हो, जिस का कि हम जिक्र सुनते हैं, तो यह निहायत जरूरी है कि ज्यादा परसेन्टेज हिन्दुस्तान का होना चाहिए।

जहां तक शिपिंग की हिस्ट्री का ताल्लुक है, मैं इस बहस में नहीं पड़ना चाहता कि इस बारे में अमरीका और विलायत की क्या हालत है। श्री रघुनाथ सिंह ने मुझे दो किताबें दी हैं। मैं जानता हूं कि शायद बहुत थोड़े ऐसे मुल्क होंगे, जिनमें इस तरह की सख्त कैद होगी कि बाहर का कैपिटल न आये, या बाहर के आदमी न आये। मेरे हाथ में एक कागज़ है, जिस में पच्चीस तीस मुल्कों का जिक्र है और बताया गया है कि कहीं नैशनल कैपिटल का मिनिमम परसेन्टेज ५० है, कहीं ५१ है, कहीं ६६ है और कहीं ७० परसेन्ट है, वगैरह वगैरह। जनाबे वाला, फ़ारेन पार्टिसिपेशन के बारे में गवर्नमेंट की राय साफ़ है—और वह ७५ : २५ परसेन्ट है। इस लिए

मैं इस बहस में नहीं पड़ूंगा कि यहां फ़ारेन पार्टिसिपेशन की इजाजत होनी चाहिए या नहीं। सारी दुनिया को देख कर यह बात ताल्ल मालूम होती है कि हम इतने एक्सक्लूसिव बने रहें कि हम फ़ारेन कैपिटल को नहीं रखेंगे। अगर हमको हिन्दुस्तान में ही लोन मिलता हो, तो मैं तो फ़ारेन लोन की तरफ़ देखने के लिए भी तैयार नहीं हूं। फ़ारेन लोन से हमको ज्यादा से ज्यादा रुपया मिल सकता है। मुझे तो सिर्फ़ यह देखना है—मेरे सामने तो सिर्फ़ एक ही यार्डस्टिक है और वह यह है कि इंडिया का नैशनल इन्ट्रेस्ट किस चीज में है—लोन लेने में है, इक्विटी कैपिटल लेने में है या फ़ारेनर्ज को इजाजत न देने में है। अगर इंडियन शिपिंग बढ़ता ही नहीं है, स्टेटिक रहता है, अगर वह आगे चलता ही नहीं है, हमारे कैपिटलिस्ट्स में इतना दम ही नहीं है, हमारा कैपिटल इतना धाई है, तो फिर तो शायद हम लोग डूबड़ डे तक इन्तज़ार करते रहेंगे कि इंडियन शिपिंग बढ़े। जनाबे ज़रा पुराने फ़िगरज को मुलाहिजा फ़रमायें। हमें वह जमाना याद है जब हाजी साहब कोस्टल रिजर्वेशन बिल पर बहस किया करते थे। उस वक्त गवर्नमेंट ने हमारे कई आदमियों का करोड़ों रुपये का कैपिटल जाया कर दिया। लेकिन मैं भ्रज करना चाहता हूं कि आज वह बात नहीं है। आज हमारे मुल्क में एक नैशनल गवर्नमेंट है। मेरे पास जो फ़िगरज हैं, उन की बिना पर मुझे यह कहन में ज़रा भी ताम्मूल नहीं है कि अगर हम उसी रफ़्तार से चलते रहे, जिस से कि हम चलते रहे हैं, तो मुझे डर है कि बहुत अरसे तक हम ऐसी हालत में पड़े रहेंगे, जिस में इंडियन शिपिंग कोई तरक्की नहीं कर सकेगा।

अब मैं कुछ पुरानी फ़िगरज का जिक्र करना चाहता हूं। १९४७-४८ में हमारे पास सिर्फ़ ६६ लाख टन के करीब इंडियन शिपिंग था। इस के आगे चल कर १९४८-४९ और १९४९-५० में वह थोड़ा थोड़ा बढ़ा, लेकिन किसी भी साल में मैं नहीं पाता कि वह एक

[पंजित ठाकुर प्रास. भातीब]

जाब बढ़ा हो। मैं पाता हूँ कि १९४६-४७ में ६० हजार, १९४७-४८ में ८३ हजार बढ़ा। १९४८-४९ में सैट-बैक हुआ और उस साल वह सिर्फ ३२ हजार बढ़ा। १९४९-५० में वह सिर्फ २,०१४ बढ़ा और १९५०-५१ में १९,५८३। भागे चल कर थोड़ा सा सैट-बैक हो गया। १९४९-५० में वह ३६५,६३२ था और १९५०-५१ में २६६,६४६ था। फिर पेंडुलम दूसरी तरफ चला। १९५१-५२ में ३८६,२९५ हो गया और १९५२-५३ में ३८४,०३८ रह गया। आखिर आहिस्ता आहिस्ता गवर्नमेंट ने रुपया देना शुरू किया— उस को खजाने से रुपया मिलना शुरू हुआ। ८५ परसेन्ट दिया गया और वह भी इस शर्त पर कि पंद्रह बीस बरसों तक भ्रदा करो। शरह भी सिर्फ तीन परसेंट थी। उस वक्त बहुत आहिस्ता-स्नेल की पेस पर वह बढ़ना शुरू हुआ। १९५३-५४ में वह ४२२,८५८ पर आया। १९५४-५५ में वह ४३५,९६१ था और १९५५-५६ में ४५५,३५७ हो गया। १९५६-५७ में कुछ तरक्की हुई और वह ५२१,४४० हो गया। अब, १९५७-५८ में वह ५८६,५४५ के करीब है और मुझे उम्मीद है कि अब वह किसी कदर रफ्तार से बढ़ेगा। मुझे शुबहा नहीं है कि आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब ने ९ लाख का जो टारगेट बताया है, वह पूरा हो जायेगा और उस में बहुत देर नहीं लगेंगी, लेकिन २० लाख का जो पुराना टारगेट था, उसका आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब जिम्मे ही नहीं करते हैं। क्या करें जिम्मे करके? हमारे आनरेबल मिनिस्टर कैसे फरमाये कि यह फाइव थ्रीधर प्लान का २० लाख का हमारा टारगेट हमारे कैपिटलिस्ट्स पूरा कर हेंगे? उन्होंने बुद्धत तौर पर नहीं बतलाया। वह यह भी नहीं कह सकत थे कि वह ऐसा नहीं करेंगे, लेकिन मुझे यह कहने में ताम्मुस नहीं है कि अगर हमारे कैपिटलिस्ट्स के ऊपर यह मामला रहूँ, तो १९६६ तक—बड़े फाइव थ्रीधर प्लान के आखिर तक—हम यह २० लाख टन का टारगेट हासिल कर

सकेंगे, इसकी मुझे हरगिब कोई उम्मीद नहीं है। श्री गोरे ने फरमाया कि क्या यही काफ़ी है कि हम बीस लाख टन तक पहुंचे और क्या हम बीस, पन्चीस लाख टन से भागे नहीं बढ़ेंगे। बहुत मुल्क भागे बढ़े हुये हैं। हमें शुबहा नहीं है कि हम जरूर भागे बढ़ेंगे, हालांकि हमारे आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब ने फरमाया कि हम मॅरिटाइम पावर नहीं होना चाहते हैं। मैं उनकी बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ लेकिन मुझे यह कहने में ताम्मुल नहीं है कि अगर मेरा काबू चले, तो मैं हिन्दुस्तान को एक मॅरिटाइम पावर देलना चाहता हूँ, मुझे उससे कोई डर नहीं महसूस होता है। आप कहते हैं कि हम एक मॅरिटाइम कंट्री रहेंगे। इसका मतलब यह है कि हम सिर्फ तिजारत किया करेंगे और १५० करोड़ रुपये हासिल करने की कोशिश पर इकतफा करेंगे। इस बात को तो मैं एप्रिषिएट करता हूँ कि हम किसी पर हमला नहीं करेंगे, किमी की जायदाद नहीं छीनेंगे, हम किमी को दुख नहीं देंगे। लेकिन हमको यह भी नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि हमको अपने देश के डिफेंस के लिये भी तैयार रहना है। इसलिये जिस आदमी का ऐसा खयाल हो और जो यह चाहता हो कि हमारे देश को केवल पये पैसे के मामले में ही नहीं बल्कि दूसरी तरह भी पूरे तौर से तैयार होना है, उससे मैं सहमत हुये बिना नहीं रह सकता। मैं अर्ज करता हूँ कि अगर हमको तरक्की करनी है तो गवर्नमेंट को जरूर इसकी मदद करनी होगी। और हमें हर तरह से मेरी-टाइम ताकत हासिल करनी होगी।

15-00 hrs.

इस बिल में हमने कई नए नए तरीके अपनाये हैं और उनके लिये मैं आननीय मंत्री महोदय को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ। इसमें दो नई चीजों की गई हैं। एक तो नैशनल शिपिंग बोर्ड बना है और दूसरे एक फंड कायम किया गया है जिसको शिपिंग फंड का नाम दिया गया है। इसको पढ़ने से वह भी पता चलता है कि बोर्ड

की एक-दुआकइकरी बाडी रखी गई है और इसको धरती बहुत कम मामले सॉपे गये हैं। मेरा कयाल है कि जो बाडी रखी गई है वह दिन प्रति दिन मजबूत होती जायेगी। मेरा यह भी कहना है कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया जितनी भी इसमें ताकत है वह इसमें खर्च करेगी। शिपिंग बोर्ड का जो मामला है वह आज छोटा सा ही मालूम होता है। एडवाइजरी बाडी को अभी दो एक फर्ज ही सॉपे गये हैं। यह कहा गया है कि तमाम मालों पर इनक्यूडिंग डिवेलपमेंट एडवाइज देने के लिये और जो इसको रेफर किये जायें। ये जो बोर्ड हैं ये इसी तरह से पहले पहल बनते हैं और आहिस्ता आहिस्ता से ताकत पकड़ते जाते हैं।

विस्तार के साथ इस बोर्ड की इयूटीस नहीं लिखी गई है। यह नहीं लिखा गया है कि टैकिनकल इनकम्पीटेंसी वगैरह यह देखेगा या ट्रेनिंग वगैरह का इंतजाम करेगा। लेकिन इन इयू कोर्स आफ टाइम, आगे चल कर, अगले चन्द सालों में इस शिपिंग बोर्ड की इतनी जबर्दस्त आर्गेनाइजेशन बनेगी जो हमारे देश की शिपिंग इंडस्ट्री को रेवोल्यूशन-लाइज कर देगी

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या माननीय सदस्य जो कुछ उनको कहना है, कल के लिये रख सकेंगे ?

शंजित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : जैसी आपकी इच्छा।

15-02 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SLUM CLEARANCE.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):
Sir, I beg to move—

"That the Report of the Advisory Committee on Slum Clea-

rance, laid on the Table of the House on the 30th August, 1958, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Sen Committee on slum clearance was charged with the responsibility of expediting conclusiveness and providing depth of focus on criticals, so that we could take some immediate action which could, if not impress the country, make some substantial contribution to the solution of this crying problem. Viewed just from this background, I have shrewed suspicion that Shri Sen, though widely known for his intelligence and wide experience in the field of law, could not probe into the depth of the problem and the approaches, much less all the suggestions, to this problem have been from a very wrong and vicious angle-

I should like to quote a comment which his report has invited from his very friendly party, especially to him. It has appeared in the *Eastern Economist*.

"It is a great pity that the Law Minister and his colleagues have allowed themselves to be so easily led into a field in which their experience has by no means brought any fruit".

The comment itself is self-explanatory. However be that as it may, we have to consider the basic issue involved in the growth and expansion of slums: why it has come to appear at all? What had been the material conditions and the causes which have contributed to the growth and increase of slums? I think Shri S. K. Patil, the Law Minister's colleague, must be complimented. At least he had the sagacity to understand that these slums crop up not because people are unimpaired of town life, but entirely because the material resources