THE COMPANIES TRIBUNAL (ABOLITION) BILL, 1967

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL .DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. V. RAGHU-NATHA REDDY): Sir, I beg leave . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN (Uttar Pradesh) : On a point of order, Sir . . .

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Sir, you have called me.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Sir, on behalf of Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, I beg leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the abolition of the Companies Tribunal -and for matters connected therewith.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् मेरा, एक प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: About this Bill?

श्री राजनारायण : मैंने इसके बारे में लिख कर भेज दिया था और आपको मालूम होगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): Not before he has finished.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: It is a point of order about the introduction of the Bill. I had written to the Secretary and he must have informed the Chair. श्रीमन्, 61वां रूल है, जिसमें लिखा है, "सभापति से प्रार्थना की जाने पर, वह विधेयक (उस से संलग्न उद्देश्य तथा कारण सम्बन्धी विवरण शक्ति के प्रत्यायोजन सम्बन्धी ज्ञापन और वित्तीय ज्ञापन सहित) के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन का आदेश दे सकेगा" यद्यपि विधेयक को पुरःस्थापित करने की अनुमति के लिए प्रस्ताव नहीं रखा गया हो।"

तो हमारे पास नियमावली की कापी है हिन्दी अंग्रेजी में और उसके 30 वें पेज पर 61 वां रूल पढ़ा जाय, तो उसमें लिखा है :

"The Chairman on a request being made to him may order thi.' publication of any Bill (together with the Statement of Objects and Reasons, the memorandum regarding delegation of legislative power and the financial memorandum accompanying it) in the Gazette, although no motion hag been made for leave to introduce the Bill."

श्रीमन्, हमको जो कार्यकारी एजेन्डा मिला है, उसको पढ़ते हुए हमने यह कोशिश की कि आज जो बिल इन्ट्रोड्यूस होने वाला है, वह है क्या ? वह गोजर है, सांप है, बिच्छू है और उसकी शक्ल क्या है ? तो हमने कोशिश की मगर आपके सचिवालय से हम को उसकी कापी नहीं मिल पाई। शायद इन्ट्रोड्यूस होने के बाद उस की कापी मिल सकें। मगर नियम के अन्दर हमको यह हक हासिल है कि हम आप से यहां रिक्वेस्ट करें कि आप उस के इन्ट्रोड्यूस करने के पहले ही उसकी कापी अवेलेबल करायें। इसी संबंध में श्रीमन्, मैं आपके सामने ब्रिटिश पार्लियामेंट में जो प्रेक्टिस है, उसके बारे में आपका ध्यान खीचूंगा :

"A debate may then take place not so much on the merit of the actual Bill the contents of which are not yet available to the House, but rather on the question whether legislation on the subject outlined in the introductory speech is desirable."

यह हमारे पास मेज पार्लियामेंन्टरी प्रेक्टिस है, उसमें भी इस चीज के बारे में जानकारी है तो मैं आप से यह अर्ज कर रहा हूं कि

इस वक्त जरा दिमाग से देखा जाय कि मंत्री जी क्या कह रहे हैं? वे कह रहे हैं कि मैं एक कंपनी विधेयक पेश कर रहा हूं और उसकी इजाजत दी जाय । मैं जानना चाहता हूं सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य जाने या अनजाने उसको पेश करने के बाद अगर यह भी जान न पायें कि विधेयक क्या है, तो हम कैसे कह सकते हैं कि इस विधेयक की इन्ट्रोड्यूस करने की इजाजत मंत्री महोदय को दी जाय । यह बहुत ही कांस्टिट्यूशनल और बेसिक प्वाइंट है । कांस्टिट्यूशनल, लीगल और संसदीय परम्परा को छोड़ भी दें, तो कामनसेंस का सवाल उठता है । इसमें यह दिया है :

"to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the abolition of the Companies Tribunal and for matters connected therewith."

अब यह क्या है कम्पनी ट्रिब्यूनल क्या कभी बना था और बना था, तो क्यों बना था ?

श्री अकबर अली खान (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) : रूल पढ़ दीजिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : 61 तो पढ़ दिया । 68 अब पढ़ देता हूं । हम लोगों को सुन कर के जरा रूल्स को अमेंड कीजिये ।

श्री आई० के० गुजराल : इस रूल का ताल्लुक आर्डिनेंस से है जो आप पढ़ रहे हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये 68 :

"विधेयक के पुर:स्थापित किये जाने के बाद यथाशीघ्र विधेयक, राजपत्र में प्रकाशित कर दिया जायेगा, यदि वह पहले ही प्रकाशित न किया जा चुका हो । "

अब इसका अर्थ समझना पड़ेगा । यानी पहले प्रकाशित किया जाना जरूरी है । अगर किसी गलती से पहले प्रकाशित न हुआ हो और चेयर ने विधेयक की इंट्रोड्यस करने की इजाजत दे दी हो तो यह आबली-गेटरी किया जा रहा है कि इंट्रोडक्शन के तुरन्त बाद ही उस को प्रकाशित कर दिया जायगा । यद्यपि जो लैंग्वेज इसकी है वह हैल्दी नहीं है, लेकिन अगर समझदारी के साथ इसका अर्थ लगाया जायेगा, तो इसका मतलब यही है । मैं अंग्रेजी में भी पढ़ देता हूं :

"As soon as may be after a Bill has been introduced, the Bill, unless it has already been published, shall be published in the Gazette."

कहते हैं कि अगर कोई बिल पहले ही पबलिश नहीं हुआ है और इंट्रोड्यूस हो गया तो इंट्रोडक्शन करने के बाद फौरन उसको गजट में पबलिश किया जाएगा । इसमें भी यही बात अंडरस्टुड है ।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: In other words it is not necessary to publish it before introduction.

श्री राजनारायण : यह तो मैं हजूर कह रहा हूं चेयरमैन साहब के जरिये कि आवश्यक क्यों है । इसमें भी इस बात को माना गया है कि विधेयक के इंट्रोडक्शन के पहले पबलिश होना जरूरी है । मगर यदि किसी कारण गलती से किसी जल्दबाजी में कोई इम्पार्टेंट विधेयक न हों और उसको इंट्रोड्यूस करने की बात हो तो भी रूल्स में उसकी गुंजाइश छोड़ दी गई है कि इंट्रोडक्शन के बाद उसको वे जल्दी जल्दी पबलिश कर दें । मगर हमारी ऐसी मान्यता है कि . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): After introduction.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: After introduction if already the Bill is not published.

[Shri Rajnarain.]

६८ पढ़ी न दिवान चमनलाल जी :

"As soon as may be after a Bill has been introduced, the Bill, unless it has already been published shall be published in the Gazette."

अगर यह पहले प्रकाशित नहीं होता है तो इंट्रोडक्शन के बाद फौरन प्रकाशित किया जाएगा। तो मेरा कहना यह है श्रीमन् आप से कि इस विधेयक को इस तरह आप यहां इंट्रोड्यूस करने की इजाजत न दें। हम संसदीय, कामन्सेस और ब्रिटिश पार्लिया-मेंट्री प्रैक्टिस की भी दुहाई देते हुये आप से कह रहे हैं और इसी लिये हमने पहले ही लिख कर के भेज दिया था कि हम को इसके प्रकाशन करने की इजाजत पहले आप दें ताकि हम लोग जान लें कि कैसा विधेयक है और तब हम इस पर कह सकते हैं कि सरकार को इंट्रोडक्शन की इजाजत दी जाय या न दी जाय। यह एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण प्वाइंट है।

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, may I make a submission about the point made by my friend Mr. Rajnarain? I would like to add something to what he has said. Under Rule 67 of the Rules of Procedure of this House it is open to a Member of this House to oppose a motion for leave to introduce a Bill although, as I submitted a few days back, it is not the practice in the House of Commons that a Bill at the leave stage is opposed. But fortunately or unfortunately—whatever it may be—here in this House I find that there has been a long-standing practice apart from this rule—this rule is reinforced by the practice—that the Bill at the stage of leave for introduction may also be opposed.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No; that is not the convention.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH: Thai although I made a submission that if you, Sir, agree and the House so minded, we could establish vention that thenceforward n'o motion for leave to introduce a bill would be opposed. I am sorry to say it was not agreed to. As it is, the rule is there and the practice is also there.

Now, the main question is, if it is open to a Member to oppose motion for leave to introduce a Bili, the Member must know what the Bill contains. It is not necessary that the Bill before it is brought forward here and before leave to introduce it is asked for, should be published in the Gazette. It may be published in the Gazette; before or after trie leave is asked for. But if the publication in the Gazette has not been made should be laid on the Table so that the Member knows what he is called upon to grant leave to because the right of opposition is there. How can I oppose a thing unless I know what it is. Therefore the rule is there and the practice is also there. Whether it is published previously or afterwards, the availability of fhe Bill to the Members is necessary and unless that is done the right given under Rule 67 cannot properly be exercised.

"SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Sir, the Rule of course, as Shri Triloki Singh j i has said, does give the right to oppose at the stage of introduction as well but it has been an established practice in the House of Commons and in this House that at the[1] stage of introduction it is not opposed as a matter of course, unless there is anything very fundamental or it is a question of the competency of this House as was raised in the case Of the Industrial Securiy Force Bill when it was said that that Bill cannot be considered by this House. In such cases in special circumstances there can be opposition, otherwise not.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, you will have noted that even Mr. Akbar Ali Khan conceded that. He said that unless there is

fundamental objection, normally there should not be opposition t_0 introduction. Therefore he concedes that there may be objection on very fundamental grounds. I start from there. How do I know whether a matter is fundamental or incidental?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: It is provided in Eule 67.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I shall deal with it just now. How do I know whether a matter is fundamen-apprised beforehand of what the Bill apprised beforehand of what *he Bill contains? Therefore even according to Mr. Akbar Ali Khan in order to judge whether there is valid ground, to judge on the fundamentally or otherwise of it, the Members should lie supplied with copies of the Bill or should be made acquainted with the text of the Bill. That settles what Mr. Akbar Ali Khan s"af3. Ham glad that he said it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You must remember the rule which was read out that publication is not necessary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You never said that under no circumstance* must there be opposition at the introduction stage. You said normally there -hould not be and you were vehement about it and with all your vehemence you said that there might be some fundamental objection in certain cases. So the question cannot arise unless we know what the Bill is about. Therefore even if we were to atcept your thing, we would like to kave the Bill.

Mr. Chairman, about the convention I may tell you that hundreds of Bills have been passed by this House and the other House. Well, generally we do not oppose at the introduction stage, but there does arise sometimes an occasion when we have to oppose its introduction. I know of a case when I sought leave of the House to introduce a Bill, but Government opposed its introduction. We had two, three or four occasions, when I also did oppose introduction in all fthese fifteen years or so. Therefore, by and large we have that kind of convention, but there may be a certain very atrocious Bill, which is repugnant. You cannot even look at it. The very name of the Bill, the very nature of the Bill, is horrifying. In such a case any sensible man would register his protest right at the beginning. That right should not be deni Rules provide for it. Now, here our difficulty is this. In the other House the Bills are circulated before they are introduced. In our House it has been somehow or other a convention that the Bills are not circulated before they are introduced. Therefore, there does ariso some kind of contradiction between the rule that we may object to and the practice we follow, namely, we do not know what the Bill is until it has been introduced and only then we know it. Therefore, I think the best course would be hence forth for you to direct that Members should be apprised of the contents of the Bill a day before. The Bills could be circulated, say, two days before the introduction of the Bills. The Bill could be circulated to the Members of the House, as is done in the other House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I look at this matter both as the Chairman as well as a common man. Some two years before this matter was raised in this House, but the practice was allowed to continue. I also note that the Lok Sabha is circulating the Bills among the Members before their introduction. You may kindly leave it to me to discuss 'it with the Leaders of the Parties here, and I am in favour of the suggestion. There is no question about it. Therefore, whatever the practice is, let us follow now. but certainly I shall place +he matter before the Leaders of the Parties and get it changed.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, एक िवनस्ट आपसे और करूगा । इसमें जल्दी मे न चलिये, जरा धीरज से मरे पाइन्ट को सुनिए । इसको में बहुत ही जोर के साथ और समझदा ी के साथ कहना

[श्री राजनारायण]

चाहता हूं। ऐसा नहीं है कि हमने इसे यहां ही डिस्कस किया है, यहां डिस्कस किया, उसके अलावा इलाहाबाद गए थे, इलाहाबाद के जो बड़े-बड़े एडवोकेट्स हैं उनसे डिस्कस किया और सब लोग इस बात को बता रहे हैं कि राज्य सभा में एक काम बिल्कुल चल रहा है। श्रीमन् वह यह है कि आफीशियल लेंग्वेज बिल 1963 है। आफीशियल लेंग्वेज बिल में यह है कि—

"This Act may be called the Official Language Act, 1963." Section 3 •ays . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with this matter.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Sir, just hear me. Let me say my point. It says:

"Section 3 shall come into force on the 26th day of January, 1965 and the remaining provisions of this Act shall come into force on such date as the Central Government may by notification in the Official Gazette appoint and different dates may be appointed for different provisions of this Act."

But as far as section 3 of this Act is concerned, it has taken force from the 26th day of January, 1965.

अब हमको यह देखना चाहिए कि सेक्शन 3 क्या है। सेक्शन 3, 26 जनवरी 1965 से लागू हो गया। आफीशियल लेंग्वेज एक्ट की यह बहुत ही साफ भाषा है। सेक्शन 3 क्या है :—

"Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from 'the commencement of the Constitution, the English language may, as from the appointed date, continue to be used in addition to Hindi . . ."

"Used in addition to Hindi" यह सेन्टेन्स, श्रीमन्, अच्छी तरह से समझा जाना चाहिए। इसका मतलब हम यही समझ रहे हैं कि हिन्दी के साथ साथ 15 साल के बाद भी अंग्रेजी चल सकती है, मगर हिन्दी पहले आएगी सेक्शन 3 का 'ए' . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry. I have given my ruling. Whatever may be that, I have given my ruling. I do not wish Mr. Rajnarain to continue this.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् मैं नया पाइन्ट कर रहा हूं।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not allow you.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं आपसे एक रिक्वेस्ट जरूर कर सकता हूं।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have given my ruling. What is the use of discussing a matter on which I have given my ruling?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Yes, you have done something. मगर पालियामेंटरी प्रेक्टिस में चेयरमैन को सर्वदा राइट है कि वह अपनी रूलिंग को रिवाइज कर सकता है, इसलिए मैं अर्ज कर रहा हूं। हम दो मिनट से ज्यादा समय नहीं लेंगे। सेक्शन 3 का 'ए'-"For all official purposes of the Indian Union . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: ... for which it was used immediately . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Rajnarain. I have given my ruling.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: For the transation of business in Parliament . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I gave my ruling; recently.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन, यह चीज पढ़ी नहीं गई।

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have heard you. The House has heard you sufficiently and I have given my ruling.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् मैं आप से अपील कर रहा हूं, मैं आप से अर्ज कर रहा हूं कि जब इसमें लिखा है कानून में, सेक्शन 3 के 'ब' में :– "For the transaction of business in Parliament, to introduce a Bill in Parliament . . ."

पार्लियामेंटरी एक्टिविटी है, पार्लियामेंट्री एफेयर्स का ट्रांजेक्शन है। इसलिए इस कानून के रहते, जब तक यह कानून एक्जिस्टेंस में है तब तक कोई विधेयक यहां पर नहीं आ सकता।

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will be wasting our time. After I gave my ruling, let us stop at that.

श्री राजनारायण : आप अपनी रूलिंग पर स्टिक करते हैं, उसे रिवाइज नहीं करेंगे? हमारा दूसरा पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर है। हमने प्रिविलेज का मोशन रखा है। हम जब जा रहे थे शुक्रवार को तो हमने एक लेटर भी लिखा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I got a letter from you and I am dealing with it. You can certainlv leave it in my hands.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: For how many days?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not ask me 'for how many days or how many hours'. Certainly I am dealing with it.

श्री राजनारायण : प्रिविलेज में इतनी देर नहीं होनी चाहिए क्योंकि शीलभद्र याजी यहां हैं और अनावश्यक ंग पर एक बात तमाम जगह फैलाई जा रही है।

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the abolition of the Companies Tribunal and for matters connected therewith.

The question was proposed.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् मैं इसको अपोज करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn the House to meet at 230, I must make an appeal to Members, namely, the Railway Budget will be taken up this afternoon. I would like you to sit for an hour more, so that all people can take part in the discussion of the Budget. The House meets at 2-30.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty-eight minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock. The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, जो विधेयक इंट्रोड्यूस करने की इजाजत माननीय मंत्री जी ने मांगी थी . . .

श्री **डाह्याभाई व० पटेल** (गुजरात) : अभी वही चल रहा है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You state it briefly. Before Lunch Hour also you had said something.

श्री राजनारायण : हां बहुत ब्रीफ हूं। लंच के पहले तो मैं सिर्फ उठा ही था।

श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद ने इजाजत चाही है इस हाउस की to introduce a Bill to provide for the abolition of the Companies Tribunal and for matters connected therewith यानी अब यहां एक बिल पेश किया जाय और इसको खत्म कर दिया जाय। माननीय पहले तो मैं इसका विरोध इस नुक्तेनजर से कर रहा हूं कि कम्पनीज ट्रिब्युनल क्या है सके

[श्री राजनारायण]

बारे में सरकार ने यहां कोई सफाई नहीं दी, सरकार ने यहां matters connected therewith कहा है लेकिन उस ट्राइब्युनल से कौन कौन से मैटर्स कनेक्टेड थे उसके बारे में भी कोई जानकारी नहीं दी। मुझे जहां तक बताया गया है कि एक ट्राइब्युनल बना था जो शायद टाटा के सम्बन्ध में या बिड़ला के सम्बन्ध में या और बड़े बड़े उद्योगपतियों के सम्बन्ध में जो कुछ गड़बड़ियां थीं उनके बारे में जांच करता और जांच करके जो उसमें दोष, जो उसमें अवगुण थे, उसके संबन्ध में अपनी सिफारिश करता। ऐसा लगता है कि हमारे मित्र चन्द्र शेखर और अर्जुन अरोड़ा जो आज ट्रेजरी बेंच में पड़े हुये हैं अपनी सारी शक्ति को लड़ा रहे हैं, बावजूद उनकी तमाम कोशिशों के भी इस सरकार के दिमाग में अभी वह बात घर नहीं की जिससे वह पूंजीपतियों, करोड़पतियों, अरबपतियों को संरक्षण देना छोड़े।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : यह भी साहू सर्विस की बात है।

श्री राजनारायण : मुझे यह भी जानकारी कराई गई, मैं बहुत ही अदब के साथ कहना चाहूंगा, यह ट्राइब्युनल साहू सर्विस कम्पनी वालों की बनाई, मैं चाहता हूं कि साहू सर्विस कम्पनी वालों को खत्म किया जाय जो वस्तुतः साहू सर्विस में लगे हैं, क्योंकि माननीया मैं तो भुक्तभोगी हूं, उत्तर प्रदेश एक गरीब राज्य है, उत्तर प्रदेश से 1 करोड़ 45 लाख रुपया श्री शान्तिप्रसाद जैन को देने को कहा गया . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not give comments in that running fashion. You say why you want to oppose the Bill. You say it only in two or three minutes.

श्री राजनारायण : वही तो बता रहा हूं। तीन मिनट तो आप सुन लें।

तो मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि 1 करोड़ 45 लाख उस गरीब सूबे से दुलहीपुर में साहू जैन को फैक्ट्री खोलने के लिये दिया गया, उस समय भी मैं उसका बड़ा जबरदस्त विरोधी था और मैंने इसके बारे में बराबर सरकार से मांग की थी। हमको अनेक प्रकार की जानकारी है कि किस प्रकार से उद्योगपति लोग लाइसेंस ले लेते हैं, दूसरे रोजगार को छेंक देते हैं और सारे देश के उद्योग को मार रहे हैं। ये सारी की सारी बातें हैं। तो जब तक इस ट्राइब्युनल की रपट न आ जाय, जब तक उस रपट पर सदन में विचार न हो जाय तब तक सरकार का किसी विधेयक को ला करके उस ट्राइब्युनल को खत्म करना नितांत अनुचित है, संविधान और सदन का अपमान है। उसको क्यों बनाया गया, ट्राइब्युनल के बनने पर कितना पैसा खर्च हुआ, ट्राइब्युनल के बनने के बाद उसकी कितनी सिटिंग हुई उसके बारे में अभी तक कोई रपट आई या नहीं और उस रपट पर सरकार ने कोई कार्यवाही की या नहीं, ये सारी की सारी बातें इससे उठती हैं और गोलमाल करके एक अनावश्यक विधेयक यहां पर लाने को उद्यत हो गये हैं। इसलिये मैं आपके द्वारा सदन के माननीय सदस्यों से जोरदार अपील करूंगा कि इस सरकार को इस विधेयक को इंट्रोड्यूस करने की इजाजत यह सदन कतई न दे।

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Exatcly to facilitate the very objectives which the hon. Member had mentioned in his speech we are seeking to abolish the tribunal for the purpose of quick disposal of these matters by the High Court. I wish to dispel the impression that has been sought to be created that something is happening by the abolition of this tribuna[1]. Nothing is going to happen. All the proceedings that are before the tribunal are going to be

transferred to the High Court. Instead of going through a tortuous, complicated and prolonged legal procedure, we want to avoid litigation so that the remedies which are sought for and the objects which are to be achieved from the tribunal would be achieved quickly by the procedure before the Hight Court. This is the main intention and the purpose for which this Bill is sought to be Introduced. I hope the hon. Member will agree.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the abolition of the Companies Tribunal and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Madam, I introduce the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we go to the Budget (Railways), 1967-68 Shri Ruthnaswamy.

THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS) 1967-68— GENERAL DISCUSSION

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras) : Madam Deputy Chairman, those of us who are interested in the Railway Budget must congratulate ourselves that it has at last come up for discussion. The unpunctuality that characterises the running of our railway trains seems to Have pursued the presentation of the Railway Budget in our House also. As I turn to the Railway Budget, I wonder why such a good man has produced such a bad budget.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): He is in bad company.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: I do not want to go to any metuphysical explanation like 'karma' or fate, but I think it is due to the fact that he has inherited this system from

his predecessors. He has been unfortunate enough to produce an unpopular budget, a deficit buget which he tries to cover by raising the rate of passenger fares and freight charges. All this is due to the original sin of the Railway Administration which is the convention by which a large sum 0? money is to be paid to the General Revenues. This time it is about Rs. 155 crores, in 1967-68. I have been attacking this convention from the time I began to speak on the Railway Budget year after year, and the only reply is that this convention is approved by Parliament and therefore it must be allowed to go through. As a result of this convention the Railway Administration is obliged *to* pay, whether it makes a profit or not this amount of crores agreed to in the convention, and it is this large amount that has to be paid to the General Revenues that is largely responsibile for the sins of omission, the failures of the Railway Administration *to* give us as good a railway system as the people deserve. All these tears that we have to shed on the Railway Budget is due to this original sin as I have called it. It not only accounts for the rise in our passenger fares and freight charges but is also responsible-for the lack of improvements, not enough improvements, in our railway system. For instance, we have not enough double tracks. For the speedy running of our railway trains and for increasing the number of railway trains, double tracks are absolutely necessary. So far, only 15.47 per cent, of our railway mileage has been covered by double tracks. I cannot understand it because a large quantity, of rail'; is lying idle in our steel works at Durgapur and other steel works. I do not see why such a large amount of rails should lie idle when the railway system cries for the rapid increase in double tracks. No new lines are being proposed, whereas year after year I have been proposing that there should be a direct rail connection between the Capital of Andhra Pradesh and its chief port, Vishakhapatnam.