

tion. He does not belong to any party. All the parties were represented in the Business Advisory Committee. In fact, we had suggested only 5 hours for this Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** In short, he does not agree to the amendment.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** Then let it be put to the vote of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right. I will now put amendment of Shri S. M. Banerjee to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That the time allotted for the Preventive Detention (Continuance) Bill be increased to 20 hours and for the Food Debate to 15 hours."

*The motion was negatived.*

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

That this House agrees with the Twentieth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 20th November, 1963."

*The motion was adopted.*

12.36 hrs.

INCOME-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL,  
1963—*contd.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up further consideration of the motion moved by Shri B. R. Bhagat on the 20th November 1963 to further amend the Income-tax Act, 1961. Shri D. C. Sharma will continue his speech.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):** Mr. Speaker, I was submitting very respectfully yesterday that in this Bill the massive and huge problem of coal production, coal washing, coal transport and other problems connected with it has been ignored. I have gone through the 32nd and 33rd reports of the Estimates Committee for 1962-63

which deal with coal, and I find they are fuller than any other literature dealing with that subject. They cover various aspects of the coal industry and a large number of recommendations are given there than in any other report.

I think this Bill is an over-simplification of that big problem. This Bill has not sought to link up that big problems with the question of development rebate. My first suggestion is that the development rebate should be tied up to the problems of housing, supply of filtered and protected water, safety of mines from accidents and proper exploitation of the coal reserves of the country. As long as that is not done, I think this Bill would be giving something without taking anything in return, so far as the nation, the workers and the national wealth are concerned. I know that we are getting some aid from foreign countries without political or economic ties today but, so far as this rebate is concerned, we must tie to it strings which are advantageous to the workers and the nation. So, my first objection is that this Bill has not sought to do it.

Secondly, in this Bill the hon. Minister has tried to introduce a kind of casteism. We want a casteless society. I do not like the idea of trying to have grades even in the matter of benefits which we give to these persons. For instance, there is one rate of rebate for those who have started the machinery after the 1st day of April 1961. There is another rate of rebate for those who have started their machinery before the 31st March 1961. There is yet another clause in the Bill which refers to 20 per cent of the actual cost of the plant and machinery. I want to know the rationale of this classification. Of course, the hon. Minister will come forward with a glib explanation and will try to satisfy the House, but I think this kind of economic discrimination should not be practised. In this case I would have liked that there should have been a flat rate of 20 per

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

cent so far as the development rebate is concerned and there should not have been anything more than that.

My third objection is that while in the light or in the context of the emergency we have brought down the level of the taxable income in the country, we are not justified very much in raising the level of the taxable income which these persons get. Of course, it will be said that mechanisation is the cry of the day; modernisation is the need of the hour. All those things will be said. But, I think, it is not a case of social justice that while you tax even those persons whose level of income is very low, you try to give this kind of rebate to those persons who belong to the upper income brackets or to the highest income brackets in this country.

Moreover, I would like to know how the Government is going to know that the rebate that they are going to give will be spent on the machinery. I know, bogus challans are produced; faked price goods are purchased. It may be said that we shall import the machinery and there shall be no trouble like that. But I would like to know what guarantee is there that every penny of this rebate will be spent upon mechanisation and modernisation of mines. What machinery has the Government got? What apparatus has the Government got to see that some persons will not defraud the Government on account of getting this rebate? Of course, I will be told that we have got an inspectorate wing and all that kinds of things. But I know that in these matters one can never be too careful. So, while we are giving them this liberal concession, we have every right to ask that every penny or every naya Paisa that the taxpayer is going to pay to them will be spent wisely and well and will be spent in the interest of the nation and not in the interest of any entrepreneur or any coal producer or any coal merchant.

Another point that I want to make is this. We are always told that we are short of foreign exchange to import the necessary materials. We are always told that we are hard-up so far as foreign exchange is concerned and therefore so many of our projects are suffering for lack of implementation. Of course, I know that we are now making attempts to manufacture machinery of our own kind. I want to know from where this machinery has been or is going to be imported, whether the Government will be responsible for the import of this machinery or whether it will be the persons who will get the rebate and whether the Government will see as to the workability of the machinery that will be brought. If that is not done, I do not think this rebate will help anybody.

I would also like to say one thing more and it is this. How far will this rebate improve the production of coal in our country? So far as the production of coal is concerned, I think, we are lagging behind. Has the Government made any assessment as to what the percentage of increase will be in the production of coal in this country? How far will this development rebate bring us nearer the target of coal production? How far will this benefit that we are going to give to these persons enable us to realise our targets so far as this thing is concerned? Has any assessment been made or are we groping in the dark and are throwing away money without knowing as to what its return will be? I do not think this is a kind of proper accountancy, a kind of proper budgeting, a kind of proper use of national money that we are going to give away. The nation has a right to know this from the hon. Minister who has brought forward this Bill so as to see how far this concession is going to benefit the nation so far as the realisation of our goals is concerned. If no assessment has been made so far, I think, this Bill has been drafted in sleep and it is being passed in a state of semi-sleep. This Bill has not

got a proper amount of either financial backing or social backing or welfare backing behind it. It is a bill which has been produced under those pressures to which we are subjected and of which we know sufficiently.

Of course, I do not want that our industry should suffer in any way, though I would like that this coal industry should be nationalised. A day will come when the whole nation will demand the nationalisation of the coal industry but since we are a democratic country and are functioning as a democratic country we have to follow the policy of gradualism. I believe, this policy of gradualism will one day have to be done away with because the proprietors of these private collieries will not be able to deliver the goods. But I do not plead for the nationalisation of this industry straightaway. However, I want that the Ministry should have the final picture in its view, I mean the final picture when we shall be able to own the sources of fuel in this country. By "we" I mean the nation. Fuel is the most important thing in the national economy, whether it is domestic or national, whether it is peacetime economy or wartime economy. Fuel makes the world go. This is one of the big sources of fuel in our country. This is a big source of keeping the machines of our industry going. I have no doubt that the Government will appoint a committee to see whether the nationalisation of the coal industry will not do the greater good than this mixed economy, partly Government-owned and partly private-owned, partly nationally-owned and partly owned by private persons. I do not want to give any categorical answer to this question but I think, the Government will be well-advised in making a scientific study of this problem, not in the interest of this ideology or that ideology, of this dogma or that dogma but only in the interest of national good, of conserving the national sources of fuel and of making the best use of them. So far as I know, the private owners

have not always given a good account of the custody of this national wealth which they have got and sometimes they have tried to overdo this thing. But I do not want to generalise on that question. The only thing I can say is that this question should be scientifically studied and the Government should come to a definite decision. It is no use being told that you should nationalise it and it is no use being told that you should not nationalise it. It should be studied in a proper way before coming to a final decision.

This Bill is all right as far as it goes. But I would like to know what will be the life of this Bill. Are we going to commit the nation to this kind of development rebate for all time to come? I want to know the period for which we are committing ourselves to this kind of development rebate. Of course, he will say that the duration will be upto 1st April, 1966 and that after that this Bill will cease to operate. I will be very glad to know that. I do not want that this Bill should be permanently put on the statute book and should be permanently a kind of dole-giving Bill. The hon. Minister should tell us point blank, in clear words, as to what would be the period.

**The Minister of Planning (Shri B. R. Bhagat):** Three years. It is in the Bill itself.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I am glad to hear that. I am very happy to hear that from the hon. Minister whom I congratulate on being promoted. He deserves the promotion richly and I wish it had come earlier. But anyhow it has come to him. In this world the laws of justice do not always prevail. But it has anyhow come.

**Mr. Speaker:** After giving him so many congratulations, there is the word 'anyhow'.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I say that this Bill should be implemented with due

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

precautions, with due safeguards and in the spirit that it is implemented to the maximum good of the nation.

**Shri V. B. Gandhi** (Bombay Central South): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question that is before this House for discussion today is not whether the principle of allowing development rebates is good or bad for we have already accepted the principle of allowing these rebates. The rebate has been there for a number of years. We all know that this rebate which we have been allowing in recent years has been responsible for some of the striking industrial progress that this country has made. In the present stage of this industrialisation, I am convinced that such an incentive for investment and its continuation is necessary. I support this Bill.

In this connection, we have to consider two important points. One is whether such a rebate is required for the coal mining industry and the other is whether the rate of rebate that is proposed, namely, the new rate of 35 per cent, is a fair rate and a reasonable rate. Well, I for one, have considered that it is not only necessary that this rebate should be allowed to the coal mining industry but also that the rate should be considered as a reasonable one. The coal mining industry all over the world has been the problem industry. There is no objection to this House considering its nationalisation when it so chooses. There are certain features of this industry which render it more appropriate than any other industry for taking up nationalisation in respect of this industry.

There are a few features in connection with the system of rebate which we should remember. Firstly, this rebate is allowed only on actual purchases, that is to say, on new machinery and new plant actually purchased. Secondly, the rebate is always allowed as a percentage of the cost of new machinery. Thirdly, the rebate

is allowed in respect of the year in which new machinery or new plant is installed. Finally, sufficient care is taken to see that the reserves credited, I mean built out of these rebates, are utilised for the purpose for which these reserves are intended, namely, for the use of the business of the undertaking, that is to say, the funds or the reserves will not be utilised for any business other than the business for which rebates have been allowed and reserves built.

It is also provided that these rebates or the accumulation of reserves are not used for giving away dividends or distribution of profits. It is a very important provision. You will thus see that the Income-tax department takes pretty good care to see that these rebates are properly used. We all know that the Income-tax departments all over the world have a reputation of not being over-generous and our department is no exception.

There can be no two opinions that in this country that the productivity generally is of a low order, that is, productivity in all industries, and particularly in the coal mining industry, the situation is not very different from that in the generality of the industries. We also know that this productivity is related to investment, and it is through investment that steps can be taken for modernisation of machinery and plant. Productivity is not just a matter of whether it is in India or whether it is in Wales or England or whether it is in Pennsylvania in the United States. It is a matter chiefly having to do with the investment made in the machinery and plant in the industry.

13 hrs.

I know that the coal-miners in Wales were wondering why the coal-miners in Pennsylvania in the United States were receiving much higher wages for a number of years or for generations. So, a deputation was sent over to the United States to study the problem.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member may resume his seat for a minute.

I have received intimation from Shrimati Gayatri Devi that she wants to make a personal explanation. But, in between I cannot allow her. I have got the notice, and when she comes back after lunch, she can make it.

**Shri V. B. Gandhi:** They returned with the information, which they already probably knew before they went out that in the Pennsylvania mines in the United States, the amount of capital invested per miner and the amount in the shape of implements and tools and organisation etc. was much higher than what was there in Wales. That is the reason why, as I said, it is a very important problem. This problem of productivity is important, and we can neglect it only at our cost. Therefore, all steps that are calculated to increase our productivity in all industries and particularly in the coal-mining industry must be supported.

We must also give some attention to the quality of the coal that we are turning out. In that connection also, this modernisation, and this incentive to the coal-mining industry for building up reserves for modernisation is very important.

About targets, it has been said in this House that we are having sufficient stocks of coal, and, therefore, there is no need to offer any further incentives to the coal industry to increase production. I do not agree with this view at all. We not only are far from reaching our targets, both in the private as well as in the public sector, but it certainly would not do for us to be looking at the pre-Bhilai targets, or the pre-Rourkela targets or the pre-Durgapur targets or the Bokaro targets; we have to do much more than that. It is very essential to do much more than that. From that point of view, again, this need for modernisation and this need for offering incentives for further

investment in the coal-mining industry is further emphasised.

The Bhoothalingam Committee came to certain decisions, but with due respect, I would suggest that the conclusions of the Bhoothalingam Committee probably were all right in the context and at the time they were made. Now, the whole situation has changed not only in respect of the coal-mining industry but in respect of all industries, and, these conclusions, therefore, have to be modified or accepted in a revised form. There is a certain dynamic situation in our industrial field, and there is acceleration all round, and we certainly cannot safely trust to accepting the Bhoothalingam Committee's report or its conclusions at this time.

I would say one word more, and that is about the World Bank loan. From certain speeches made in this House, it appeared that the World Bank loan came through the Government, and it was a loan made to private coal industry, and that it was a kind of a gift to the coal industry. It is very easy to understand that it cannot be a gift. In whichever form the loan has come, it is a loan and has to be repaid, and repaid by the industries which have received the loan and used the loan. And it can be nothing short of a tragedy if we remain content with our present progress and do not take active and adequate steps to help the industry which has made some progress.

**Shri P. R. Chakraverti (Dhanbad):** Yesterday, in the course of the discussion, from the other side, Shri Indrajit Gupta raised some fundamental questions, but I think that the significance of this Bill does not attach itself to the import of those questions, which are no doubt connected with the coal industry.

Coming as I do from the most important production centre of coal in India, namely Dhanbad, I have had a chance to go into the mysteries of the coal industry, and being a member

[Shri P. R. Chakraverti].

of the wage board also, I claim to know something. But those questions are not directly connected with the Bill before the House.

So, in endorsing the Bill, I want to raise one or two points. My first point is regarding the question of the productive efficiency, as has been ascribed to the private sector *vis-a-vis* that of the public sector, namely the NCDC. The NCDC had its own quota, and so also the private sector. In the Third Five Year Plan, the target has been fixed as 97 million tons. The hon. Minister who had resigned earlier had said that we would rather have another 7 million tons, so that the total would be 104 million tons. The private sector pointed out that they would be in a position to fulfil their quota provided they were allowed to have certain improvements in the productive apparatus. Naturally, the question comes how far they can improve the efficiency of production unless some new machinery, which is not today indigenously produced but which will have to be imported from outside India is employed for the purpose. So, an arrangement was made whereby they might have some matching grant, and the World Bank would advance money to that extent. Unfortunately, before the Emergency started, they had not availed of the opportunity, and pressure was brought upon them, or rather, persuasion was brought to bear upon them, so that they might be prompted to import more machinery in terms of the loan granted to enable them to fulfil the targets. But the contention of the private sector is that they must have some facilities made available to them and also some assurance that the industry will be allowed to go in for further production and for stepping up its efficiency so that it can find itself on a par with its counterparts in other countries of the world. Indeed, to day we have to face foreign competition. When this comparison between the two sectors comes in, we must not forget the fact

that both of them are getting equal facilities. Also nobody has been barred from producing at his best and reach the target he is expected to fulfil. The NCDC, is now undertaking certain ventures of a novel type, like deep mining, which fortunately falls in my area, the Sudamdi colliery, aided by a Polish team. In the initial stage, very heavy investments are being made. The prospects of production may appear to be not so bright, and offer fair possibilities of fulfilment of the target. But that does not underrate the aspect of productive efficiency and its potentiality at a particular date.

As regards this target, we found ourselves faced with certain bottlenecks, which Shri Indrajit Gupta also mentioned, that is, the bottleneck of transportation. That has also been taken into serious account by the Government of India, so much so that in my constituency I got an assurance that a sum of Rs. 17 crores and 13 lakhs had been allotted to improve road traffic so that coal could be transported easily from Jharia and also Ranigunj to the other centres.

A fresh difficulty presented itself because of the over-estimation of demand from the consumers. Bokaro is to come into operation, may be two or three years hence, as has been assured to us by the Minister. With the initial product of more than one million tons considerable quantity of coal will be required by Bokaro itself. But where is Bokaro today? This has caused a lessened demand of coal. In this way, there are other consumers who gave estimates of their requirements, but ultimately it was found that the demand did not come into practical shape when the coal was produced. So the coal accumulated at the pitheads in different centres, in Jharia and in Ranigunj.

Today it is a question of correctly estimating the demand from the consumers' side, not only the railways

and heavy industries but also other industries. It is said that the private sector gave an exaggerated estimate because they wanted the transport facilities to be made available to them. The Railway Ministry has now placed sufficient number of wagons at their disposal. New forms of wagons are there. So that this bottleneck will be removed.

Now it is admitted that some incentive should be given. At least it imposes an obligation on the part of the producers to introduce improved machinery and ultimately go in for further production. When we visit the colliery areas, what do we find? Here I share the views of Shri Indrajit Gupta that the living and working conditions of the colliery workers present such a bad sight to us that we sometimes feel that we must go in for some other system of production, instead of leaving the initiative in the hands of the private sector. Today, if under the present process of production, the private sector fails to give at least the minimum requisites of life to the colliery workers, who run into a number which exceeds 4,50,000 in India, naturally the question poses itself, whether we shall allow these people to accumulate profits at the cost of the colliery workers who are the real producers; though the colliery owners call themselves producers, the real producers are those who are directly connected with production, namely, the workers. They are denied these facilities. As a result, this question comes up with considerable force.

But we must not confuse one issue with the other. While ensuring efficiency of production, when we find them denying the workers the facilities which must be made available to them, we can charge them with the fulfilment of certain conditions and say 'Look here, we have made all these facilities available to you. But what about product efficiency? How far you have ensured good and better living and working conditions to

these poor workers, who have been denied so long the essential requisites of life?

So I would request Members on the other side not to bring in those factors which may be really very fundamental, but which do not fall within the purview of the Bill. As such, I endorse this Bill and say that this will give them a new incentive for having better systems of production. We have to stand in competition with foreign production. For that, we must have improved machinery to see that the productive apparatus is brought into full operation as best as possible within the limited resources at our disposal.

Some form of assurance was demanded by Prof. Sharma, before this development rebate was granted to the colliery workers. It is provided in the Bill, that this privilege will continue in cases

"where the machinery or plant is installed after the 31st day of March 1963 and before the 1st day of April 1966".

So that there is a time factor provided for the instalment of new machinery for the purpose of accelerated mining of coal. Naturally, we shall have time to watch the results of the operation of this Bill and find out how far we have been justified in extending this benefit to the producers. So we should not be perturbed over the question of giving them a permanent lease irrespective of the results and also assuring them that we are not going in for the other system of production. May be, we may have to think of nationalisation. Why not? I do not know if the Government has given some assurance. If so, it may be for this definite period. But there is no general assurance as such. At least we are not in a position to accept it unless we find that really the productive efficiency has been brought into operation at a level which gives the workers, I mean the colliery workers, satisfaction of their

[Shri P. R. Chakravarti]

felt needs and also a fillip to production. Then we may consider how far we shall allow the private sector to have a full say in the matter.

Shri Indrajit Gupta also referred to some statement made by the President of the Indian Mining Association relating to Government assurance. He might have brought up this issue with other factors. We are not concerned directly with those here. He thought that there might be some attempt to intrude into the domain of the private sector, and was probably trying to ridicule the performance of the public sector before the Wage Board, pointing out that the public sector did not fulfil the target whereas the private sector did.

We know the other side of the picture also. But I do not know whether Government was competent to give that assurance. Nor has the Wage Board anything to do with it. I feel that here we are directly concerned with an industry which employs 4,50,000 and more people and which is now having a target of 104 million tons to be produced by the end of the Third Plan. Quite likely, we shall have to increase our target in the Fourth Plan and relating to that some picture has already been placed before us.

What we want to be sure on this score is that the machineries which are installed, the improved machineries, are in a position to bring about the desired results. That is what we are directly concerned with. But as regards the principle of making this rebate, which is called development rebate, available to the colliery owners it is certainly not a permanent feature. A limitation has been prescribed. It will extend upto 1966. That is why objection has come from the colliery owners themselves. They say that they are the real producers and that they are fulfilling all the targets. But that we are making a discrimination by giving in 1963 one form of facility and after 1963 another form of facility. Accord-

ing to them the boot is on the other leg. They say discrimination is against them and uniform standard ought to have been prescribed. Here we are concerned with productive efficiency, and so we must see that they have no grievance on the score of adequate facilities not being made available to them. That is what is now attempted to be ensured by the passage of this Bill, and as such, I endorse this wholeheartedly.

श्री गौरी शंकर कक्कड़ (फतेहपुर) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल पर जो बहस हो रही है उसमें एक यह विषय प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पब्लिक सेक्टर के विवाद का उठ खड़ा हुआ है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस विवाद की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। मुझे तो केवल यह कहना है कि जहाँ तक इस स्ट्रिप का सम्बन्ध है कि ज्यादा उत्पादन करने पर सरकार द्वारा प्रोत्साहन दिया जाय, यह तो सरकार का कार्य सराहनीय है परन्तु एक बात अवश्य देखनी है कि कुछ सरमायेदार जो अपना व्यवसाय करके करोड़ों रुपये और लाखों रुपयों का फायदा उठाते हैं और उन को इस प्रकार का प्रोत्साहन दिया जा रहा है, वहाँ लेबर की क्या हालत है। एक चीज का ध्यान नहीं रखा जा रहा कि उनके व्यवसाय और घंघों में कर्मचारियों की क्या दशा है? मैं समझता हूँ कि यह न्यायसंगत नहीं है।

जैसा कि बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने इस सदन में कहा है, कोएलरीज में काम करन वाले जो कर्मचारी हैं उनकी दशा बहुत शोचनीय है। उन के रहने के लिये मकान और साधारण सुविधायें भी उनको नहीं दी जा रही हैं तो मेरा तो यह ख्याल है कि उत्पादन बढ़ान के लिये प्रोत्साहन तो दिया जाय परन्तु उस के साथ साथ इस दृष्टिकोण को भी सामने रखा जाये कि यह प्राइवेट सेक्टर द्वारा, जो कर्मचारी हैं, उन का शोषण तो नहीं हो रहा है और अगर शोषण हो रहा है तो



उसको भी दूर करने के लिये सुविधायें देने के लिये वह किस हद तक कामयाब हुए हैं ?

मैं तो इस संशोधन को बहुत बधाई के साथ देखता अगर इसमें प्रोत्साहन इस प्रकार दिया जाता । अगर कोयला खान में काम करने वाले मजदूरों की दशा सम्हाल ली गई है और उनको सुविधायें उनके द्वारा दी जा रही हैं और इस बात की जांच करने के बाद वह भी इस प्रकार के रिबेट के मुस्तहक होते । श्रीमन्, जैसे आंकड़े इस सदन में रखे गये, इसमें कोई शुबहा नहीं कि कोयला आजकल के युग में एक बड़ी आवश्यक वस्तु है । परन्तु कोयले के अतिरिक्त और भी बहुत सी आवश्यक वस्तुएँ हैं और अगर इस प्रकार का प्रोत्साहन कोयला खान के मालिकों को दिया जा रहा है तो और जो आवश्यक वस्तुएँ हैं उन के लिये भी इसी प्रकार का प्रोत्साहन होना चाहिये । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि क्या परिस्थिति सरकार के सामने है कि एक तरह का पक्षपात और डिस्क्रिमिनेशन एक विशेष व्यवसाय-में जो काम करते हैं जो मालिक हैं, उनके साथ किया जा रहा है? इसमें तो कोई शुबह नहीं कि जो हमारी मिक्सड एकोनोमी है उस में हम को यह भी ध्यान देना है कि प्राइवेट सैक्टर को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाय ताकि जो उनका घन है, कैपिटल है, वह शाई न होने पाये । परन्तु एक सीमा सरकार को निर्धारित करनी है और वह सीमा इस तरह पर निर्धारित करनी है कि जो मुनाफा यह व्यवसाय करने वाले कमाते हैं और जो घन एकत्रित करते हैं, मुनाफे के रूप में, उस की भी कोई सीमा निर्धारित होनी चाहिये । अभी आंकड़ों के अन्तर्गत यह देखा गया है कि कोयले की खान के जो मालिक हैं उनको काफी मुनाफा हुआ और यह भी देखा गया है कि उत्पादन जो हो रहा है अभी तक एक दिक्कत थी वहां से हटाने की, तो मैं यह देखता हूँ कि पिछले कई महीनों से जब से यह डिजैल के इंजन चल

गये हैं, मालगाड़ियों द्वारा अब कोयला आता है । बहुत सी जगहों पर यह एक समस्या उठ खड़ी हुई है कि कोयला इस कदर ज्यादा तादाद में इकट्ठा हो गया है कि उस का प्रयोग नहीं हो रहा है । ऐसी दशा में मुझे यह संशोधन विधेयक जो आया है, उसमें केवल एक ही आपत्ति है कि प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने के साथ साथ लेबर की सुविधायें और लेबर वेलफेयर जितना बढ़ना चाहिये था वह नहीं बढ़ा है । यह देखना होगा कि जो कर्मचारी या लेबर वहां पर काम कर रही है उनका शोषण न हो । इस चीज का भी ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिये ।

एक बात इस विषय में मुझे और कहनी है । यह सही है कि उन्नतिशाल यंत्रों का प्रयोग होना चाहिये । यह भी सही है कि जिस कदर ज्यादा इस तरह के यंत्रों का प्रयोग होगा, उत्पादन बढ़ेगा परन्तु यह देखना है कि जो सरमाया कुछ मुट्ठी भर लोगों के हाथों में इस देश में है वह दो, चार लाख और बढ़ाया जाय या उसमें कम से कम जनता को भी लाभ हो ? मैं यह समझता हूँ कि प्रोडक्शन के बढ़ने के साथ साथ इस पर भी ध्यान देना चाहिये और यह नियम सरकार को बनाना है कि अगर प्राइवेट सैक्टर को इस प्रकार का इनकरैजमेंट दिया जा रहा है तो जो काम करते हैं उनको भी उस मुनाफे का हिस्सा मिले, बोनस के रूप में मिले अथवा सुविधाओं के रूप में मिले । इस चीज को भी अवश्य ध्यान में रखना है । इसलिये श्रीमन्, मैं ज्यादा समय न लेकर सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि भविष्य में जब कभी इस प्रकार का प्रोत्साहन का प्रश्न उठे तो उस में सरकार को इस चीज को अवश्य देखना है कि जो लेबर, मजदूर तबका काम करता है, उनको सुविधाओं, उनके आराम का ध्यान किस हद तक रखा गया है । प्राइवेट सैक्टर में भी वे लोग इन सुविधाओं और इस तरह के प्रोत्साहन पाने के मुस्तहक होना चाहिये जिन्होंने वास्तव में लेबर को हर तरीके से

[श्री गौरी शंकर कक्कड़]

खुश रखा है और उनकी जो एलीमेंटरी डिमांड्स हैं वह पूरी कर दी गई हैं। इसदृष्टिकोण को सामन रखना चाहिये। इन शब्दों के साथ में इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

**श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कोएलियरी का काम तो ऐसा है कि आज देश में कोयले के कोने कोने में मांग है। आज गांवों में डेवलपमेंट करने के लिए, मकान बनवाने के लिए कोयला चाहिए, ईंटें पकाने के लिए वह नहीं मिलता है। आज गवर्नमेंट और सैक्शन न करके मदद नहीं देगी तो स्थिति के जल्दी सम्वलने की आशा नहीं की जा सकती है।

यह जो २० से ३५ परसेंट किया है यह उत्साह बढ़ाने के लिए किया गया है ताकि बिजनेसमैन अपना पैसा इनवैस्ट करें। उस से जो इनकम होगी और मनाफ़ा होगा उसका कुछ हिस्सा लेकर के बड़ी हुई वेजेज की शकल में देना होगा। इसके लिए वेज बोर्ड्स बने हुए हैं, बड़ी बड़ी कमेटियां बनी हुई हैं। मेरे मित्र ने अभी कहा कि वर्कर्स का रुनाल किया जाय। मजदूरों की भी यूनियन्स हैं जो कि उनके हित का सदैव ध्यान रखती हैं। जाहिर है कि यह गवर्नमेंट भी उसमें जो इनकम होगी, पैसा पैदा होगा, तो वह इसको जरूर देखगी कि लेबर को भी कुछ शेर मिले। यह बड़े संतोष और प्रसन्नता का विषय है कि हमारी आज जो मौजूदा गवर्नमेंट है वह स्वयं ही अपना क्रम सोशलिस्टिक पेटर्न आफ सोसाइटी की तरफ बढ़ा रही है। हम भी चाहेंगे कि आगे चल कर इसको वह नेशनलाइज कर ले किन्तु आज नहीं कर सकत हैं क्योंकि इतना पैसा गवर्नमेंट के पास आज नहीं है। गवर्नमेंट को मौका देना चाहिए। गवर्नमेंट ने एक सुंदर क्रम उठाया है, गलत क्रम नहीं है। आज मुस्क में जिधर देखिये कोयले की डिमांड है। आज बड़े बड़े नहरों में कानपुर, इलाहाबाद आदि में, जहां भी देखिये रोख आये

दिन कोयले की सप्लाई की समस्या बनी रहती है। कोयले की सप्लाई को लेकर आये दिन हाउस में सवाल होते हैं कि उसको ढोने के लिए नावें नहीं मिलती हैं, ट्रक नहीं मिलत हैं और रेल के वैगंस नहीं मिलत हैं। मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी गांवों में कोयले की बहुत जरूरत है। गांवों में मकान बनाने हैं, इमारतें बनानी हैं। हमारा फाइव इयर प्लान चल रहा है उसमें कोयले और लोहे दोनों की बहुत अधिक जरूरत है। जरूरत इस बात की है कि कोयला अधिक उत्पादित हो। इस के लिए उत्साह बढ़ायें और प्रोत्साहन दें। इसी दृष्टि से गवर्नमेंट ने इनकम-टैक्स के लिए ३५ परसेंट किया है लेकिन इनकम-टैक्स तो तभी लगेगा जब इनकम होगी। जरूरत इस बात की है कि जो मिलप्रोनस और बड़े बड़े उद्योगपति जैसे की टैक्स की चोरी करते हैं उसकी कम से कम एक चैकिंग हो। इनडाइरेक्ट गवर्नमेंट की चैकिंग है कि वे चोरी न करें और इससे उनकी हिम्मत नहीं होगी और सही हिस्सा बखेंगे। गवर्नमेंट को मेरा सुझाव है कि उनके एकाउंट्स को देखने के लिए आप की तरफ से रजिस्टर्स इश्यू होने चाहिए। उन को फ़र्जी हिस्साब किताब और डबल बहियां रखने की इजाजत नहीं दी जानी चाहिए। वह गलत बात है। इसकी पूरी चैकिंग होनी चाहिए और जो भी इनकम टैक्स बाकी है, वह वसूल किया जाना चाहिए। इस वक्त सरकार ने १५ परसेंट डेवलपमेंट रीबेट और दिया है। इस पर मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, लेकिन इनकम टैक्स को वसूल करने के लिए उचित प्रबन्ध किया जाना चाहिए। प्रश्न यह है कि इस देश में कुल कितना इनकम टैक्स बाकी है, जो कि वसूल किया जाना है। उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में मैं जानता हूँ कि कानपुर में गवर्नमेंट का लाखों रुपया इनकम टैक्स के सम्बन्ध में बाकी है। गवर्नमेंट को इस की चेकिंग करनी चाहिए और वह रुपया वसूल करना चाहिए। ३५ परसेंट के स्थान पर ४० परसेंट डेवलपमेंट रीबेट दिया जाये, लेकिन इनकम टैक्स के बकिया को वसूल

करने की पूरी कोशिश करनी चाहिए। यह बहुत जरूरी है, ताकि मुल्क का डेवलपमेंट हो।

13.30 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

लेबर की जैविक मांगों की तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिए और उनको पूरा करने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिए। यह बड़ा कठिन काम है। वे लोग जेरे-जमीन काम करते हैं, जहां उनको पता नहीं होता है कि वे कहाँ हैं, जहां वे आस्मान और तारे नहीं देख सकते हैं। वे अपने बाल-बच्चों को बाहर छोड़ कर और अपनी जान को खतरों में डाल कर खानों में काम करते हैं। इस लिए उन को सब सुविधायें उपलब्ध करने की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। उनके लिए मैडिकल फ्रैसिलिटीज़ और अन्य सुविधाओं का इन्तज़ाम करना चाहिए।

हमारी नीति वन-साइडिड नहीं होनी चाहिए। इस मुल्क में इस बात का बड़ा प्रचार है कि यह गवर्नमेंट वन-साइडिड पालिसी पर चलती है और कैपिटलिस्ट्स की मदद करती है। लेकिन ऐसी बात नहीं है। कल कम्प्यूनिस्ट सदस्य, गुप्ता जी, बोले थे। उनका अपना एक एंगल है, लेकिन हमारा एंगल यह है कि हम दोनों तरफ देखेंगे और सब वर्गों के हितों की रक्षा करने का प्रयत्न करेंगे। हमारे यहां अमीर और गरीब सब रहेंगे। इस मुल्क में सबको खाना, कपड़ा और मकान देने की जिम्मेदारी इस गवर्नमेंट की है, जिस के लिए हम कदम उठा रहे हैं। हम उस तरफ मार्च कर रहे हैं। हम वन-साइडिड काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। हम पक्षपात नहीं कर रहे हैं। हम कैपिटलिस्ट्स से पैसा ले रहे हैं। हम उनको छोड़ नहीं रहे हैं। उनका पैसा निकल आया। अगर वे नई मशीनें लगा देंगे, तो हम उसको चैक कर सकते हैं। अगर वे गवर्नमेंट में आयेंगे,—

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (बाराणसी) : वे नहीं आ सकते हैं। हम आने नहीं देंगे।

श्री शिव नारायण : वे इस का ख़ाब देख रहे हैं। लेकिन यह बहुत मुश्किल है।

श्री विश्वाम प्रसाद (लालगंज) : चंद्रभान गुप्ता से पूछ लिया है ?

श्री शिव नारायण : चंद्रभान गुप्त की गवर्नमेंट है। माननीय सदस्य क्यों परेशान होते हैं और घबराते हैं ? हमारे पी० एस० पी० के माननीय मित्र को यहां पर चंद्रभान गुप्त दिखाई देने लगे हैं।

हम को मिसाल याद आती है कि शुरू में जब चाय का प्रचार होने लगा, तो लोग एक एक प्याली चाय पिलाते थे, ताकि लोगों को पीने की आदत पड़ जाये। वही यह गवर्नमेंट कर रही है। यह तो थोड़ा सा डोज़ है। यह गवर्नमेंट थोड़ा नशा दे रही है। यह गवर्नमेंट ३५ परसेंट डेवलपमेंट रीबेट दे रही है और इस से गाड़ा हुआ करोड़ों रुपया बाहर आया, उस की महीनें लगाई जायेंगी और उससे बिजनेस किया जायगा। इससे मुल्क का डेवलपमेंट होगा, मुल्क का कल्याण होगा, देश में कोयला पहुंचेगा और हमारी डिमांड्स की पूर्ति होगी।

इस लिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बिल मुनासिब है, अनुचित नहीं है। सरकार ने यह बहुत सुन्दर कदम उठाया है। मैं इस की सराहना करता हूं और इस का समर्थन करता हूं।

Shri B. E. Bhagat: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, hon. Members who spoke yesterday and today raised a number of points, some of which are too large for the issue under discussion. For instance, the question of amelioration of labour conditions, or the nationalisation of mining industry, or the discussion about private or public sector in this industry may be very important and they come before us in different shapes from time to time but they are not very germane to the present

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

issue. If I do not deal with them, it is not out of any discourtesy to the hon. Members but in my opinion they are not very relevant here.

While hearing the speeches made by some hon. Members, I got the impression that some of them were of the view that raising the rate of development rebate from 20 to 35 per cent would affect the price structure and the prices will increase. I think the hon. Member who initiated the debate said.....

**Shri Indrajit Gupta** (Calcutta South West): I never said so; nobody said so. I said that the prices have already been raised.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I am glad that he does not mean that. He is trying to establish a link between the price structure and the rebate. I do not want to touch it any further as the hon. Member says that he does not mean it. The object of the development rebate is an additional tax concession besides normal depreciation; this rebate is available on the cost of the new plant and machinery installed in a particular year. This concession is given once only; it is not available over and over again. 75 per cent of the development rebate is actually debited to the profit and loss account and credited to a reserve account to be utilised by the assessee during the period of eight years for the purpose of the business only. This is important because the hon. Member said that production is good today but demand is not there and that coal is accumulating at the pit-heads and so there is no urgency about it. We have to look ahead over a period of seven or eight years. The demand may be less today because, maybe, due to some slackening in the activities in the industrial and other sectors or the railways may be going in for dieselisation. It does not mean that over a period it would not go up. We may even find a situation where there is shortage in terms of demand. The demand is bound to go up. So this

development rebate is for a period for eight years during which he can make use of it any time he installs a new machinery or plant. That is why this amount is credited to a reserve fund. To say that this will increase the profit margin or prices is not correct. The price structure committee went into it and if after sometime, some five years, the price is to be revised, this question of rebate and tax concession will be taken into account by the committee. This money will be credited to the reserve account and he could not use it for declaring dividends or showing higher profit yields. So, any committee which goes into the question at any future date will consider the concession as also other concessions and all the minus and plus sides; all that calculation will be gone into by them. Therefore, there should be no apprehension in the minds of the hon. Members that the price structure will in any way be vitiated.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** You are putting words into my mouth. I am sorry you have attributed that argument to me. I said that the price of coal had been raised even in 1962 in violation of what the Boothalingam Committee had laid down.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** That is a different matter. That is not connected with this. My difficulty is that a large number of points have been raised which have nothing to do with the subject-matter of the Bill. I am only trying to establish that this is not going to affect the price. That point was in my mind as a result of the speeches. But it may not be in the hon. Members mind, I want to make it absolutely clear that this is not going to affect the price structure which is present today.

Then there was another point made: that this will benefit the bigger group of companies like Bird & Co., or Andrew Yule & Co., or McNeill Berry, etc., which are large combines and not the medium and the small

mines. This may be partly true; I do not dispute the fact that a larger and better-organised unit may have more capital resources or they may have more funds and may utilise them better, but the fact of the matter is that as a whole the coal industry is very much under-capitalised. The hon. Member referred to the high profit margin of some of these groups. That is also because of the fact that they have a very small capital base; the machinery is old and therefore they are able to declare on that small capital base a very large dividend. If you take the industry as a whole, the profitability of the industry though it may be considered to be reasonable, is not high.

Some time back, a study of a 100 companies was made,—that was in 1960—by the Reserve Bank of India, and the profit after tax in the case of coal was 8.6 per cent. That was the profit after tax in the case of coal as a proportion to the net worth: 8.6 per cent of the net worth. As I said, if you take the capital base, a small capital gives you a high percentage, and net worth means capital as well as block. This is a rather more realistic basis for giving the profitability.

**Shri Prabhat Kar** (Hooghly): What is the return on capital?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat**: I was saying that the return on capital is high because the capital base is small, and to make it high it is necessary that you must give them some facilities. That is the reason why the development rebate is proposed to be increased so that it will enable them to invest more on capital by way of plant and machinery and they will go in for a larger capital base. That is the reason why I am trying to stress this point. In other industries, the Reserve Bank came to the conclusion that the percentage of profit to net worth varies between 9 and 21, particularly in the case of chemicals, textiles, iron and steel and paper. It was pointed out that because of the low capital base, the dividend declared is high

and the profit percentage is higher, but in actual fact, on assessing the finance on a more realistic basis, it may be described as reasonable but not high. The earnings of the coal industry are not going up. Actually they are declining.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta**: The Boothalingam Committee said that after allowing for development reserve at the rate of Rs. 1.70 per ton, they should not earn a profit of more than 11 per cent. It was considered reasonable, but the other development reserves are being built up.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat**: I do not think the profit is more.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta**: How much money is coming? You are giving them added facilities.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat**: Some of the bigger companies or companies which own better mines may have some reserves. I am coming to that point. Although the third Plan target, in all likelihood, is not going to be reached, and there is a doubt that we may not need 97 million tons in 1965-66, there is no doubt that the consumer demand will at least be of the order of 88 million tons and we have to achieve this target through the private and the public sectors. I am one with the hon. Member that the NCDC must be encouraged; it should also be facilitated by this; it must be encouraged because they are also paying taxes; and they are commercially accountable, and they must be encouraged to produce more and more. I am absolutely one with the hon. Member on that point. But I say in order to reach the coal target of 88 million tons if not 97 million tons, the coal mines need a lot of funds and the sum of Rs. 17 crores or Rs. 18 crores provided by the World Bank will have to be found in the rupee counterpart. In addition, they also require a sum of Rs. 17 crores or Rs. 18 crores. So,

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

they would require in all about Rs. 40 crores.

The point is, as the House is aware, the previous Finance Minister made the announcement that he is going to give concessions to the coal industry in respect of the development rebate, and on that basis, already the coal industry has placed orders worth about Rs. 13 crores to Rs. 14 crores.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** How many collieries have placed orders?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Those who are able to utilise this. It is no compulsion. They have already placed orders. If this concession is not given, the result would be that many of them will withdraw. The point at issue is that this is one of the mechanisms by which we want that the much-needed capital base of the coal industry should be extended and new plant and machinery installed, because the coal industry has reached the stage when all the surface mines have been exhausted, and they have to go deeper and deeper.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** That is correct.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** For going in for deep mining, the hon. Member will also agree—he is usually a very knowledgeable person about these matters—they have to go in for increased capitalisation; they have to go in for heavier machinery. Therefore, it is time that at the present moment we provided these facilities. In what way the monopoly concentrations and bigger profits should be mopped up is a different matter. We can do it.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** When? You would not do it.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** There are other occasions for that, but to provide them facilities of tax concessions so that they are able to plough back more and more reserves is, I think, essentially not an anti-social or anti-progressive idea. It is not an anti-progressive idea to increase produc-

tion and productivity. We can take care of other things by different policy measures and we will do it and we are doing it. But I say this measure in its limited sense is very much needed at the present moment but we have to make all efforts to raise the coal output. The need for machinery and ploughing back of capital for plant and machinery is very much felt. Therefore, I commend this Bill for acceptance of the House.

**Shri P. R. Chakraverti:** I scrupulously avoided the question of price revision in earlier speech, but to disabuse the mind of my hon. friend over there, and we are equally concerned about the problem. I have to put in a straight question. Whenever the question of price comes in, it has a direct link to workers' wages. That poses a difficulty which is a matter of concern to us. When the wage was increased, the Price Revision Committee assured the coal-owners that a corresponding increase in price would be made. But when the wage was increased by Rs. 3, the Colliery Mazdoor Sang stated that the price was increased by Rs. 6. In calculating the price—it comes within the jurisdiction of the Ministry concerned, though not falling within the scope of this Bill—will the Ministry also take into account the facilities which have been made available to the owners, so that when any recommendation for wage increase is made, it does not bring in a commensurate increase in the price if not more, as has been pointed out by the Colliery Mazdoor Sang?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Price-fixation, etc., are all economic matters. This was a concession in addition to the rise in price that was decided at the highest level in order to increase the output. This has nothing to do with those matters; they are separate matters.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** I made a reference yesterday in my speech to a letter which was read out by the

Chairman of the IMA in which Government had assured the World Bank that even in the fourth Plan there was no question of nationalisation of the mines. I wanted to know whether the Government have taken a decision like that, when that decision was taken and what about Parliament being consulted?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I am sorry I could not trace that letter. But obviously the Government policy is what is stated by Government spokesmen on the floor of Parliament.

**Shri Indrajit Gupta:** Then why are such letters allowed to be written?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I do not know; that is why I said I am not able to trace that letter. But Government policy about this is very clear. It is there in the industrial policy which has been stated in this House. More than that, no letter from anybody can substitute that policy of the Government.

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

"That the Bill further to amend the Income-tax Act, 1961, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Clause-by-clause consideration. There are no amendments. I will put all the clauses together. The question is:

"That clause 2, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

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

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

13.53 hrs.

**SLUM AREAS (IMPROVEMENT AND CLEARANCE) AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Rehabilitation (Shri P. S. Naskar):** Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956, be taken into consideration."

This is an amending Bill. The original Act was passed to provide for improvement and clearance of slum areas in certain Union Territories and also for the protection of tenants in such areas from eviction. Before I go into the details of the amending Bill, I will say something about the position of housing in our country generally. The most important things of life are food, clothing and shelter. I must say frankly that something tangible has been done in the last three Five Year Plans regarding food and clothing; but I do not think enough has been done about housing. So far about Rs. 950 crores have been sanctioned in the last three Plans, but the demand is more than Rs. 2,000 crores. Among the housing schemes, we give greatest importance to the social housing scheme and among social housing schemes, we attach the greatest importance to the slum clearance schemes.

As you know, the worst slums are to be found in the congested areas of big cities. The necessary powers required for the clearance and improvement of slums were taken by the Central Government when they enacted the Slum Areas (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956. This Act covered the Union Territories. The Central Government also asked the State