

[Shrimati Mona Hensman.] the hon. Minister to make this a practical possibility by providing that in the case of any cuts made by the Censor, the negatives of the cuts and all copies of the same should be handed over to the due authorities so that such cuts will certainly not be reproduced again. I am convinced, Sir, that, as in the case of Broadcasting, the hon. Minister will consider appointing a Director for cinematography. Such a Director will have to be very carefully chosen and the choice should not be on an expert basis. We do not want experts in this Branch. We have and we need expert engineers for matters regarding engineering, and expert medical men for health reconstructing and experts for all technological undertakings, but we do not want expert actresses or actors and cinema fans to be on the Advisory Boards, or to be a Director of this Industry. They will have each their own preferences and favourites—doubts, fears, suspicions and jealousies which will surely influence the working of their office. We want somebody of the standing of a member of a State or Union Selection or Public Service Commission Board—the sort of person who can look at everything from an impartial point of view. We are fortunate in having a Minister for this portfolio, a gentleman who is young enough to enjoy films and old enough to appreciate the points of view that have been put forward by us, the older people. The film is a very important factor in the future of our nation and I would ask him to use this as a spearhead for the progress of the nation and not for the good of private enterprise or vested interests.

Finally I would also say that if the Government cannot produce educational films for children—the Minister has just said that public finances do not permit him to do this—we should encourage private enterprise to produce such educational films as are very necessary in our country for our children at this time. At present films for education are brought from abroad, but we should have our own films to orientate our children to Eastern not

Western ideas and ideals. Perhaps it was a ladies' day—yesterday and today—and men may be surprised at the active part we have played in the consideration of this Bill. We feel we have made our own contribution in the public interests and I hope the hon. Minister will look into all these points when he implements the various clauses of this Bill.

SHRI K. B. LALL: I want to ask one thing of the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister said that he can take certain steps with regard to exhibition and that he can have control in this matter. So far as education is concerned, when people's minds are being polluted so much by these things, I want to know whether he can exercise educative control also and whether he can take any step with regard to the educational side of the control.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: There is hardly any point raised, Sir. With regard to courts, I might say that it is not possible for us to control as to what punishment the courts should give. We can lay down what is the offence and what the maximum punishment is, and the courts, I think, can be left to decide what they consider to be the right punishment. That is all, Sir. I think no other point has been raised.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

#### THE INDIAN LIGHTHOUSE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN) : Sir, I beg to move that the Bill further to amend the Indian Lighthouse Act, 1927, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

Sir, this is a very light measure and I should not detain the House for long on this very simple measure. But for the fact that the House was occupied with a very interesting subject these one and a half days, it should have been disposed of much earlier.

At present the light dues that are levied on ships in the ports of India are mentioned in the Lighthouse Act, section 10, and the ceiling is two annas. Although the ceiling has been fixed at two annas, we have so far been levying only 1½ annas for steam-ships and half an anna for sailing vessels. Now the ceiling is sought to be raised to four annas. This has been necessitated by the development programme that we have in hand for the lighthouses. We have drawn up a very ambitious programme costing several crores of rupees, and we propose to spend Rs. 2 crores in the Five Year Plan period. The Lighthouse Department is a self-supporting one run on commercial lines, and the surplus that remains in this Department is funded into two funds known as the General Reserve Fund and the Depreciation Fund. The accumulations come to about Rs. 85 lakhs, and the increase in the dues will give us some more money. We also propose to take a loan of Rs. 80 lakhs to carry out this programme costing Rs. 2 crores.

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar): From whom?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: From Government. It has been provided for in the Five Year Plan as well.

The responsibilities of the Lighthouse Department have extended after the integration of Part B States. The lighthouses which were maintained by the former princely maritime States have been taken over. They are not in a satisfactory condition. There is a programme to improve all those lighthouses as well. That is the justification for increasing these light dues. The Central Lighthouse Advisory Committee has also agreed to the raising of this ceiling.

The extent clause is also being amended. The notification extending this Act to Part B States was issued in 1950, and section 1 of the Act also is sought to be amended. I have nothing more to say, and I move.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): Could we have some «-nugb idea as to

what exactly is the programme over which Rs. 2 crores are proposed to be spent? In what manner is the lighthouse organisation going to be improved?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: I have got the details of the programme. I can show them to my hon. friend. It is a long list, referring to the various lighthouses. We propose to purchase lighthouse tenders as well. In fact this programme extends even beyond the Five Year Plan period and stretches up to the year 1956-57. But within the Plan period we propose to spend Rs. 2 crores on the modernisation of the lighthouses. If the hon. Member is inquisitive, I can give all the details to him.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: I only want to know what the general principles are. I do not want details.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: I do not know what general principles my hon. friend has in mind, except that we want to modernise these lighthouses, and while we do it we shall take the latest discoveries in lighthouse engineering into account and carry out this programme.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): On a point of clarification. How do these charges compare with the charges levied in other countries?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Perhaps ours are the lowest. After Burma got separated they raised these light dues to 3 annas per ton, whereas we have not done so; our dues have remained the same since 1927.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Lighthouse Act, 1927, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

DR. P. C. MITRA: Just one question, Sir.

(Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha rose.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought we would be able to pass this Bill in five minutes. Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): I will take only one or two minutes.

Sir, we are heartily in agreement with the ambitious programme of Government for the modernisation and expansion of our navigational aids. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend, Rs. 2 crores have been provided for expenditure during the Plan period. Out of this, as has been stated by my hon. friend, Rs. 80 lakhs will come out of the loan from the Government, provided for in the Plan. This leaves only Rs. 1.2 crores. Now, this sum of Rs. 2 crores is to be spent in five years' time, out of which two years have already elapsed. I find from the report circulated to us by the Ministry that this Lighthouse Department has been carrying on the development and expansion programme and also the strengthening of the organisation, and they have been able to manage all this development and expansion out of the present levy of li annas. I do not know what is the total expenditure during these two\*years out of this Rs. 2 crores. The hon. Minister may be able to explain it to us. But we find that even in these two years all the development, which must be a part of the Five Year Plan programme, has been met out of the revenues that they are getting. I find from the figures given in the report that the general reserve on 31st March 1951 was Rs. 67,44,947 and the depreciation fund was Rs. 15,57,831. On 31st March 1952, the general reserve was Rs. 74,78,526 and the depreciation fund was Rs. 16,20,316. My point is this, that in spite of this development expenditure, which was of course a part of the Five Year Plan, the two reserves have increased and the development expenditure has been met out of the existing revenues. The hon. Minister has said that the reserve is Rs. 85 lakhs. I do not know whether he has taken the two figures together or one of them only—the general reserve. Now he is going to get a loan of Rs. 80 lakhs

from Government. This makes Rs. 1,65,00,000, which leaves only a balance of Rs. 35 lakhs to be raised for expenditure in the next three years. The hon. Minister has given us no indication as to how much they are going to raise by the increased levy. Of course the Planning Commission has suggested that the increase will be done by stages and at the present moment they are levying one and a half anna and what is the levy that the hon. Minister proposes to make now, we are not sure about it. And I would like to know from the hon. Minister what the levy is going to be and how much revenue is expected out of this increased levy, and how much of that increased revenue will go towards making up the deficit out of Rs. 2 crores required for the developmental expenditure, and how much will go towards strengthening the organisational side of it. The point I would like to emphasise is this that the shipping industry is also facing a depression and we should not increase the rates in such a way that the industry may be hard-hit. I would therefore submit that the Minister should take these things into consideration and I think no levy should be raised unless it is absolutely inevitable. If the funds are really required for expansion and for development, certainly I do not mind increasing the levy, but if it is not necessary and ' it could be met out of the existing inds available, then only a very smmi levy is required to meet this difference of Rs. 35 lakhs. I want a clarification on these points from the hon. Minister.

DR. P. C. MITRA: I wanted to know whether the levy is on the cargo that the ship is actually carrying or on the tonnage of the ship?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: On the tonnage of the ship.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: Sir, only two minutes. I do not know whether I would be able to get a reply to my question. I v/anted to know as to how exactly these Rs. 2 crores are going to be spent. I know it is for modernisation. But one thing I would like ta

know. Is it for new lighthouses or for renovating the old lighthouses or again to bring the lighthouses upto modern standards? Or does it mean that we are going to change the entire signal system of lighthouses? If I may explain, Sir, I take it that these also include the expenditure for setting up beacons—so far as beacons and other things are concerned, the modern trend is that a particular type of beacon should have a particular type of code-lighting. Now, I want to know from the hon. Minister if the entire lighthouse and beacon system is going to be changed and brought into a particular scheme of things or merely we are going to go in for renovating the lighthouses?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Sir, I would like to make a brief reply to the points raised. My hon. friend who spoke first raised the question of the levy hitting the shipping interests rather hard. Sir, this question was gone into in great detail by the Central Advisory Committee and on that Committee the shipping interests were also represented. It will be seen that since 1927 the working and development costs of lighthouses have increased several times along with the general increase in all-round cost of wages, materials, machinery, etc. But the light-dues have remained the same. Also in regard to expenditure that is incurred by a ship we find that the wages and allowances to staff etc. have all increased and the only item that has not increased is this light-dues.

12 NOON.

Then, Sir, as regards meeting the cost with the funds at our disposal, it is true that not much expenditure has been incurred in these one or two years, but the expenditure that we propose to incur in the coming three years will come to Rs. 2 crores. In the first instance, even though we take the power to increase the light-dues ceiling to annas four, the actual extent of increase will be decided in consultation with the Central Advisory Committee. Again it may not be four annas. During this year as well as in the next

year it may not be four annas. It may be increased to four annas later on. Then, Sir, after meeting the maintenance costs and the establishment costs of the Department, roughly the extra money that would be available to us will be about Rs. 30 to Rs. 35 lakhs and that will bring it to Rs. 120 lakhs and hence the remainder of Rs. 80-lakhs we propose to take as a loan.

Then, Sir, my friend in fact wanted details and he wanted a clarification also. He wanted to know whether it is to be spent on new lighthouses or on renovating the old ones or changing the system etc. I should, in this connection, like to say that we have to renovate the old ones and also some new ones are being thought of. This is necessary in view of the growing importance of the Kandla Port. And in Part B States also we have got a programme and all these in fact are going to cost much more than Rs. 2 crores and, Sir, that is the justification for coming before this House for the increase in the ceiling.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Lighthouse Act, 1927, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause by clause consideration. There are no amendments of which notice has been given.

Clauses 2, 3, 4, Clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Sir, I move that the Bill be passed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

j DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Bharat): Sir, I hoped that the Deputy

[Dr. Raghubir Sinh.] Minister would have thrown some light on one point at least, that is regarding the date of repeal. In clause 4 the date has been mentioned as 21st day of January 1950. I understand that this date is selected because on that day the notification bringing the Indian Lighthouse Act, 1927 into effect in Part B States was issued.

I cannot understand as to why this repeal should take place from that date. I find that in all recent legislations the Government have got into the habit of giving such a retrospective effect to their measures, two years and so on. I feel, Sir, personally that this Act has already been promulgated in the Part 'B' States under section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Laws (Extension to Acceding States and Amendment) Act, 1949. Hence I feel that it would have been much better if the repeal is to take place with effect from the date on which this Bill is finally passed. I hope that the hon. Deputy Minister will throw some light on the policy of the Government in this respect.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House has already passed the clauses.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Sir, you are too late in the day, you know it full well that I wanted to raise the point even before the first reading was concluded. Anyway, now I have put it before the House at least before the Bill is finally passed.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: The Indian Lighthouse Act was extended to all acceding States by means of a notification, dated 21st January 1950 under section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Laws (Extension to Acceding States and Amendment) Act, 1949 but a special adaptation of this sub-section was not made due to oversight when the Adaptation Order was issued. The position is now being regularised.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: The Adaptation Order was made in 1949 and this Notification was issued in 1950.

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: The Adaptation Order was issued in 1950, but this was not incorporated in the Adaptation Order, and it is being regularised now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed." The

motion was adopted.

#### ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE INCOME-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, the Chairman has allotted time till 12 NOON on Friday .....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): When you allot the time, you are assuming that this is a Money Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chairman has allotted it.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: You are the Chairman now. I want to submit that this is not a Money Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How can you do it unless the Bill is taken up?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): If you allot any time, that means that it is on the basis that the Bill is a Money Bill. We want to make a submission in this connection. It is true that the Speaker has certified that it is a Money Bill. If you will hear us even before you announce the time.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How can you do it unless the Bill is taken?

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: It has been circulated to us as a Money Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us proceed with it.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: If you say **that** your fixing the time will have no **bear-**