

purposes from the Rourkela Steel Plant.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the Visakhapatnam shipyard will be expanded for this purpose or any arrangement will be made at the second shipyard at Cochin?

Shri Raj Bahadur: It is evident that the optimum capacity at the Vizag shipyard has got to be achieved, and apart from the second shipyard that has to be set up, it is necessary to create a quantum of demand in the country which will enable us to produce the required equipment on an economic basis.

Keys for Railway Sleepers

+

*1400. { **Shri A. K. Gopalan:**
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri V. P. Nayar:

Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1104-A on the 21st December, 1959, regarding the supply of keys for Railway sleepers by a Kanpur firm and State?

(a) whether information has since been collected; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Following are the replies to parts (a) to (f) of Question No. 1104-A of 21st December, 1959.

(a) Steel keys for sleepers have been and are being supplied by two firms in Kanpur against contracts placed by the D.G.S.D.

(b) Some keys were oversized but were within the permissible limits of tolerance according to the specification.

(c) and (d). There is no information available to indicate that a complaint was made

by the Railway direct to the firm, nor of any acceptance on their part to take back the keys. The contract was between the D.G.S. & D. and the Supplier; the Northern Railway, therefore, pointed out to the D.G.S. & D. in May, 1956 that some keys supplied by M/s. Singh Engineering Works Ltd., Kanpur, against the order placed by D.G.S. & D.'s on this firm in September, 1945, were oversized. The D.G.S. & D., after making a check, found that the size of the keys was within the permissible limits of tolerance given in the specification and informed the Northern Railway accordingly in September, 1956. The keys were then accepted by the Northern Railway and the case finally closed in November, 1956.

(e) Does not arise.

(f) There are two firms in Kanpur who are supplying keys to the Railways. The value of contracts placed on these two firms by the D.G.S. & D. during different years is as follows:—

(i) M/s. Singh Engineering Works Ltd., Kanpur :		Rs.
1956-57		28,70,800
1957-58		75,24,856
1958-59		18,02,080
(ii) M/s. Kanpur Rolling Mills Ltd., Kanpur :		
1957-58		4,60,937
1958-59		17,97,576

Shri A. K. Gopalan: May I know what contracts were given to the same firm—Messrs Singh Engineering Works—during 1959-60 and for 1960-61?

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: As I said, the contract was given by another Ministry. The orders are placed by the Director-General of Supplies and

Disposals. I am not aware of what they did and what they did not do. We are only the Ministry to whom the goods are supplied. We do not go into the question of placing orders which is done by others.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Apart from the experts from the D.G.S. & D., may I know who inspected the keys and what was the report made by them?

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: Of course, we use the keys, and we reported to the D.G.S. & D. that we thought that there might be some defects in the keys. The D.G.S. & D. then held another thorough check and this is what he said:

"No doubt, some keys have been found to be somewhat oversized by 1/32" part of an inch. But, as you are aware, the difference is not beyond the permissible tolerance limits. Under the circumstances, it is requested that the keys in question may please be accepted."

This is what the Director-General of Supplies and Disposals said to the railways, and under his advice we accepted them and we used the keys. And to this day, they are being used and there has been no untoward incident.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: My question was, apart from the Director-General, whether anybody inspected the keys.

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: All the people who use the keys see them every day. The supervisory staff also inspect them frequently. The people who inspect the track every day see them.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The hon. Minister quoted what the D.G.S. & D. had said. I do not want to repeat that sentence. But even after that, the General Manager, Engineering, Northern Railway, stated as follows:

"It is hoped that in future the tolerance permitted in the stand-

ard drawings would only guide the inspecting officer".

I take it that the tolerance which was said to be permissible was not actually permissible. If so, what action has been taken on the note submitted by the General Manager, Engineering, Northern Railway?

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: The presumption of the hon. Member is quite wrong. The permissible tolerance is given, and the keys were within the permissible tolerance limit—1/32 part of an inch. If anything, it was on the thicker side. You will appreciate that no firm would like to use more metal than is entirely necessary. They would not like to use on the key more metal than necessary, because they would incur losses.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member does not pose himself to be an expert. Is it or is it not correct to say that the General Manager, Engineering, was right when he said that the tolerance level is too much and that care should be taken to see that so much tolerance must be there and so on. If it is so, it is a question as to whether any expert in the railways considered that opinion or not. That is the point of the hon. Member.

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: It may be a matter of opinion.

Mr. Speaker: Did he or did he not say so? The hon. Member wants to know whether it is a fact that the General Manager, Engineering, said in the report that the tolerance level was too much and so on.

The Minister of Railways (Shri Jagjivan Ram): I have not seen it. But if it is a fact, then it is a question of revising the specification. If the experts so decide, that the present specification allows too much tolerance, they will have to revise the specification and necessary action will be taken.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You remember, Sir, that the hon. Deputy Minister was explaining this matter in the House on the last occasion in the

course of which he said that the question was "whether the keys should be hit with a seven pound hammer or a four pound hammer and so on—minor things". Then, you, in your wisdom said:

"No body is interested in those details, whether it is hit by a big hammer or small hammer. But have the keys fallen out or not?"

Shri Shahnawaz Khan replied:

"Some have fallen. When there are millions and millions of keys, some are bound to fall".

My submission is because of the difference in the tolerance levels, and the looseness of the keys, the track on which these are laid will become unsafe. I want to know whether this matter was investigated by the vigilance department or any expert.

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: It was thoroughly investigated and for the last six years the keys have been there. There has been no accident as a result of the use of these keys. I submit that we are trying to attach more importance to this question than it deserves.

Shri V. P. Nayar: In answer to a previous question, the hon. Minister stated that when the sleepers were laid on the track, it was found that the keys, because of vibration, sometimes fell down. I want to know the total quantity and the weight of such keys that have fallen down. May I also know whether the entire supplies made are checked and certified to be of the required specification by the D.G.S. & D.? The hon. Minister said that they were replaced. I want to know to what extent the replacement was made. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I would like to explain the general question about contracts. There are certain items for which orders are placed by the railways themselves. There are a very limited number of such items. For a large number of requirements

of railway equipment and stores, tenders are placed on the D.G.S. & D. They place the contracts with the parties whom they think to be efficient or proper parties. The inspection is done by the agency of the D.G.S. & D. They inspect the goods supplied. They certify that they are fit and according to the specification and then they are accepted by the railways. Whether they inspected every key that was supplied by the party, is too much for me to say. They had a sample test checking and they certified that the keys were according to the specification.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I have allowed a number of supplementaries. Next question.

Rice Mills in Andhra Pradesh

*1461. Shri Khimji: Will the Minister of Food and Agriculture be pleased to state:

(a) whether a purchase-tax of four naye paise per rupee is to be paid by the millers in Andhra Pradesh on paddy supplied to the Central Government under the Essential Commodities Act;

(b) whether a refund of one naya paisa is allowed on rice consumed within the State;

(c) whether any representation was made by the millers or any other interested party to the Union Government to the effect that since the procurement prices were fixed when the purchase-tax was at three naye paise, there should be a refund of one naya paisa in the case of rice supplied to the Central Government also; and

(d) if so, the action taken in this regard?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas):

(a) A purchase tax of four naya paise per rupee is payable on the first purchase of paddy made in Andhra Pradesh and not consumed within the state.