

duration of the present Lok Sabha.

(4) That in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make.

SCHEDULE

(List of Public Undertakings)

PART I

(Public Undertakings established by Central Acts)

1. The Damodar Valley Corporation
2. The Industrial Finance Corporation
3. The Indian Airlines Corporation
4. The Air India International
5. The Life Insurance Corporation
6. The Central Warehousing Corporation
7. Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

PART II

(Public Undertakings which are Government Companies formed under the Companies Act)

Every Government Company whose annual report is placed before the Houses of Parliament under subsection (1) of Section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956.

PART III

1. Hindustan Aircraft Ltd., Bangalore
2. Bharat Electronics Ltd., Bangalore
3. Mazagon Docks Ltd., Bombay
4. Garden Reach Workshop Ltd., Calcutta."

The motion as amended, was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then we come to the next motion. There are 1428(Ai) L.S.D.—8.

some amendments to it. Is anybody pressing his amendment?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am not pressing it.

Amendment No. 3 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Guha is not pressing his amendment.

Amendment No. 1 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Chaturvedi is not here. I shall put his amendment to the vote of the House. The question is:

That in the motion,—

for "five members" substitute "six members". (2)

The motion was negatived

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the original motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do agree to nominate five members from Rajya Sabha to associate with the Committee on Public Undertakings and on the constitution of the said Committee to communicate to this House the names of the members so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

The motion was adopted.

16.10 hrs.

INCOME-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Planning and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Sir, I beg to move:

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

As hon. Members would be aware, the Income-tax Act provides for the allowance of a development rebate to

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

assessee who install new machinery or plant in their undertaking for the purpose of their business. This development rebate takes the form of a deduction of a certain specified percentage of the cost of such machinery or plant from the assessable income of the assessee in respect of the year in which it is installed. The object of this special concession is to promote the industrial development of India by providing an incentive for investment in new industrial undertakings. In order to secure that the benefit accruing to an industry from this tax concession effectively serves the purpose of its further development, this rebate is allowed on the condition that an amount equal to 75 per cent thereof is credited by the assessee to a reserve account for being utilised in the next eight years, only for the purpose of the business of the undertaking and not for distribution by way of dividends or profits.

The existing rate at which development rebate is allowed in regard to new machinery or plant installed in any industry on or after the 1st April 1961 is 20 per cent of the cost of the machinery or plant. It is, however, felt that our coal mining industry, in its present phase of development, needs a substantially larger measure of incentive for capital investment, if it is to expand in the way it must to meet the needs. Mining of coal occupies a position of special importance amongst our basic industries because our steel industry and other important industries vitally need coal in increasing quantities in order to fulfil their targets of production during the Third Five Year Plan. The coal mining industry is also exposed to big hazards and handicaps by way of floods, fire, explosions and collapses. Further, in order to achieve a greater output and an improvement in the quality of the coal mined, the existing units in coal mining industry have to resort increasingly to deep mining operations involving a large capital outlay on modern plant and machinery. In or-

der to provide the necessary incentive for further development of the coal industry, it is proposed to increase the rate of development rebate in respect of new machinery or plant installed in this industry during the three financial years from 1963-64 to 1965-66, which is the last year of the Third Five Year Plan, from the existing rate of 20 per cent to 35 per cent of the cost of such machinery or plant. The Bill seeks to amend section 33 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 which prescribes the rates of development rebate, accordingly.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

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

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise to oppose this amending Bill. Under apparently innocent covers, this Bill seeks to make yet one more concession by the Government to big colliery interests at a time when, in my opinion, the coal mining industry does not require any such further incentive whatsoever. In this connection, I would just like to go back a bit in recent history.

In 1958, the Coal Price Revision Committee, which was set up by the Government of India with Shri Bootalingam as its Chairman, submitted its report and it was published in 1959.

16.14 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

This Committee went into the whole cost structure and price structure of the coal industry in Bengal and Bihar and came to certain conclusions and made certain recommendations. The most important of these conclusions and recommendations are the following. Firstly, this Committee stated

that the depreciation and development allowance which should be permitted to the coal companies should be at the rate of Rs. 1.70 nP per ton, and this recommendation was made after a study of the whole coal industry in Bihar and Bengal.

So, we find that provision for depreciation and development had already been taken into account when this committee made its recommendation. This still holds good.

Then, they calculated the cost structure and made a recommendation that a reasonable profit for this industry should be of the order of Re. 1.75 nP per ton. It works out approximately to 11 per cent of the capital which is employed. They took the average capital employed by the industry at Rs. 16 per ton and worked out that a reasonable profit of Re. 1.75 nP per ton would give these coal companies a return of 11 per cent on the capital employed. It is also about 10 per cent of the cost of production.

Having calculated all this in 1959 that committee suggested that the price of coal should be fixed in such a way that the average realisation from sales should come to Rs. 19.65 nP per ton. All this was worked out by an expert committee going specifically into the whole question of cost structure, price structure and profit structure of the industry and finally they said that this price structure which they had fixed should, in their opinion, remain stable. It should not be changed. These prices should hold good for a minimum of five years. This is just the broad outline of what that committee did.

Now, we have not yet passed through the five-year period. We are still passing through it. The question of revision of price has not come up. It should not come up in terms of the recommendation of the Boothalingam Committee, but I have to point out here that even last year, in 1962, despite the Coal Price Revision Committee's recommendation that any adjustments in price should

only be made in the event of any future wage increase given to labour—they made that proviso that in that event there might be a corresponding increase in price, not on any other account—the Government of India, under pressure from the big coal interests, again agree to put up the selling price by 50 nP per ton. Is it a fact that these mining companies have not got adequate resources or margins of profits which they can utilise, if they so desire, for the purpose of modernisation? We are all for modernisation. Certainly, the big mines, the big collieries, which are working with antedated equipment and so on should go in for mechanisation and modern types of equipment should be installed. As far as the smaller mines and the medium collieries are concerned, in any case they will not be able to do it. I am not going into that question now and I do not think the hon. Minister here is also in a position to discuss that. But certainly if this question of mechanisation and modernisation is to be applied to the small and the medium collieries, it can only be done if certain steps are taken to amalgamate these collieries into bigger units. That is a different question. We are concerned for the time being with the bigger and well-established units in the industry. As far as I can understand it, if the advantage of this rebate is to be taken at all, it will be by the bigger and well-established and larger units in the mining industry. Now, are those units in a position today to do that? Are their resources so slender and their margins of profits so meagre that unless an added incentive is given to them by the Government of India in the form suggested by this amending Bill, they will not be able to go in for mechanisation and modernisation?

Only during the last session a question had arisen here and had been answered on the floor of this House about the loan of Rs. 80 crores which has been negotiated with the World Bank for financing private

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

collieries in this country specifically for the purpose of mechanisation and modernisation and it was stated that a substantial portion—I think, about Rs. 12½ crores out of Rs. 17 crores allotted for this particular year—had already been taken up by these collieries. The smaller and medium collieries were complaining that they were not in a position to supply the matching grants which will qualify them to avail of the World Bank credit. But as far as the bigger units and bigger collieries are concerned, they have availed themselves of that credit too. Bearing in mind this 11 per cent of capital which the Boothalingam Committee had suggested as a reasonable rate of return or profit, what do we find? You will also be interested to know that generally the cross-section of the collieries which is taken by every enquiry committee, the cross-section on which they work, is the Bengal Coal Co., that group of collieries under the Bengal Coal Co. whose managing agents are Andrew Yule & Co., the Equitable Group whose managing agents are Macneil & Barry Ltd. and the Burrakur Group whose managing agents are the Bird & Co. (Private) Ltd. These are not small fries; they are the giants of the mining industry and in some other industries too. In 1960, the Bengal Coal Co. paid a dividend of 20 per cent on their ordinary shares and in 1961 they paid a dividend of 21 per cent. The Equitable Group paid a dividend of 15 per cent in 1960 and 10 per cent in 1961. The Burrakur Group paid 13 per cent in 1960 and the same 13 per cent in 1961 and again 13 per cent in 1962. Andrew Yule's Katras Jherriah paid 95 per cent in 1960, 40 per cent in 1961 and 25 per cent in 1962. If you go into the figures of a few more of these bigger companies like the Bengal Nagpur Coal Co., it was 10 per cent dividend in 1960 and 28 per cent in 1961. The Borea Coal Co.—15 per cent in 1960 and again 15 per cent in 1961. The Borea Coal Co.—15 per cent in 1961 and 20-2/3 per cent in 1962;

the North West Coal Co.—20 per cent in 1960 and the same 20 per cent in 1961, Raneegunje Coal Co.—15 per cent in 1960, 17 per cent in 1961 and 17 per cent in 1962; Rewa Coal Co.—20 per cent in 1960 and 20 per cent in 1961; Seebpave Coal Co.—42 per cent in 1960 and the same 42 per cent in 1961.

What I wish to say is there is no evidence to show that the bigger units are the ones which are concerned with the question of going in for mechanisation and modernisation programme. The smaller units cannot do it any way. They will not be able to do it until they are amalgamated or brought into bigger units or nationalised or something like that is done. As far as these bigger units are concerned, it is my submission that in terms of the Boothalingam Committee's report and recommendations they are making enormous profits and they have got adequate reserves. Let the hon. Minister mark also that the basis on which this computation of reasonable profit was made by the Boothalingam Committee was on the basis of an output per man shift hour of 42 tons. That output per man shift hour has now increased from 42 tons to 48 tons, that is, the output per man shift hour has gone up. Therefore, the rate of return also at 11 per cent is correspondingly higher now. So, I do not see any reason why this Bill is being brought forward except that it be under the pressure of the Indian Mining Association and other big collieries' interests. Why should the Government come forward to give them more and more concessions. This is more than what I can understand.

In August last, there was a question put by me on the question of the extent of utilisation of the World Bank loan by the collieries. In his reply, the hon. Minister for Fuel and Mines said—I am just quoting a part of his reply:

"In order to enable collieries to find matching rupee finance,

certain steps have been taken. Government has sanctioned a partial guarantee scheme for advances to be given by credit institutions to collieries. Secondly, the Refinance Corporation has also agreed to provide refinancing facilities to credit institutions participating in this guarantee scheme. Thirdly, the Reserve Bank also has agreed to offer certain borrowing facilities to scheduled banks against their lendings to the coal industry under the guarantee scheme."

So, it is not as though the Government is neglecting their requirements. The number of facilities and concessions have been listed over and over again which have been made to them to enable them to go in for expansion, development and modernisation. And I believe that loans have been guaranteed to the extent of about 65 per cent. The scheduled banks which have made loans to the coal industry have received a guarantee from the Government of India to the extent of 65 per cent of the loans made to the collieries. So, it is not a small matter. On top of that, we find, as I said earlier, that in spite of the clear recommendation by the Boothalingam Committee that the coal prices should not be increased for a period of five years, unless it be explicitly to counterbalance any increase in wages of labour, unrelated to this factor another increase in coal prices to the extent of 50 nP per ton was given.

It has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that the purpose of this is to give an incentive and so on, and it says:

"... So as to achieve a larger production of coal which is at present needed in increasing quantities for meeting the requirements of steel and other industries."

But is this a correct depiction of the picture at present? The latest trend

is just the opposite, namely that the coal that is being produced cannot be consumed. As far as helping the private sector in the collieries to achieve the target of production, which has been laid down in the Third Plan is concerned, what do the figures show? What is the difficulty that they are experiencing? There is nothing. In 1960-61 the private sector collieries produced 44.8 million tons of coal; in 1961-62, it went up to 46.34 million tons. In 1962-63, they have produced 52 million tons. That is very good, and we should give them a pat on the back. But at this rate of production, they will, without any difficulty, be able to achieve the Third Plan target namely 60 million tons. They have already produced 52 million tons. If anybody is failing or lagging in the production target in coal, it is not the private sector. I am sorry I have to say this. But facts are facts. It is the NCDC mines which are lagging behind in the fulfilment of the target, whatever the reasons may be—I am not going into them now.

Therefore, it is not right to bring forward this Bill with a Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to it which seeks to give an explanation to the effect, though indirectly, that coal production is lagging behind in the private collieries, and some added incentive is necessary so that they can step up the production and reach the target and so on. That is not the picture at all.

A much more serious development to which Government ought to devote their mind is why the coal which is being produced now is accumulating at the pit-heads and is not being consumed. Why is there a declining demand for coal? Admissions have been made, and in the papers reports of certain meetings have appeared, in which certain Government Ministers and officials have admitted, that there has been wrong planning, some maladjustment in planning, and the tar-

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

get fixed for coal production has actually gone in excess of the capacity of our industries to consume that coal. Yet, the whole thing is put to-psy-turvy in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. And in the name of that, these huge big coal companies, monopolies in the mining industry are going to be given a further concession and a further rebate on income-tax. I do not see why. There is no necessity for it whatsoever.

I may say that recently in Calcutta where the Wage Board for the Coal Industry was meeting, the chairman of the Indian Mining Association, Mr. Pran Prasad of Birde made a submission before the Wage Board in which he said very explicitly that he did not want the present price structure of coal to be examined *de novo* by the wage board or by any other body. He made it quite clear that he was more than satisfied with the existing price structure of coal, and he has every reason to be, because we have found how it was devised, how the Bhoothalingam Committee worked it out, giving him an ample margin of profit, and Government have obliged him last year by adding on another 50 nP per ton. So, why should Mr. Pran Prasad be bothered? He says that he does not want that price structure to be tinkered with any more, and it might be allowed to remain as it is. I can well understand that.

Then, there is also a letter—I am sorry I cannot produce a copy of that letter here, but I am stating this in all responsibility—which was read out by Mr. Pran Prasad before the Wage Board meeting in Calcutta, which was a letter written on behalf of the Government of India to the World Bank, assuring the World Bank—because the World Bank has given Rs. 80 crores worth of loans for the development of the private sector collieries—that there was no question of nationalisation, and no intention on the part of the Government of India to nationalise the coal mines either in the Third Plan or

in the Fourth Plan. Who gave the Government the right to say what is going to happen in the Fourth Plan—may I know?

The Minister of Planning and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Whose letter was that?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: It was a letter written on behalf of the Government of India to the World Bank and quoted by Shri Pran Prashad, Chairman of the IMA, before the meeting of the Wage Board for Coal two months ago in Calcutta. The Fourth Plan has not been worked out yet. It has not been adopted by this Parliament, this country or anybody. Who authorised the Government to go and tell the World Bank that this country has already decided that even in the Fourth Plan period there will never be nationalisation of coal mines? The country has not decided it. Parliament has not decided it. Who decided it?

Therefore, these things which are going on are very disturbing. Only this morning, although the question did not actually come up here, because the question hour was over there was a starred question to which a reply was given by Shri Alagesan in which he also says that Government have not yet fixed the Fourth Plan coal production target. We know that 60 million tons is the target for the Third Plan for the private sector. They have already reached 52 million tons. No target has been fixed for the Fourth Plan. Shri Alagesan says:

“Government will ultimately fix a realistic target for coal keeping in view the expected growth of the industries that are based on coal and the capacity of the coal industry to develop additional production. Once the target has been fixed, necessary steps will be taken to work progressively towards achievement of the set target”.

That is all right. We will see when the target is worked out. But for the time being, on the basis of the Third Plan target, on the basis of the costing done by the Bhoothalingam Committee, on the basis of the figures which show what high profits these coal companies are earning, on the basis of the curious development which is taking place where consumption of coal is lagging behind the production of coal, why should Government come forward to make fresh concessions of this type?—If Shri Bhagat will kindly listen to me, I would like him to satisfy me.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I am listening.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Small and medium collieries are not going to be benighted whatsoever by this amending Bill, because they are in no position to carry out mechanisation and modernisation. Therefore, why are you hanging in a silver platter to the ~~bars~~ the Equitable Company, Macneil and Barry and Andrew Yule a further rebate in income tax? They do not require it. They have got ample reserves and profit margins, if they are serious about it. If they are not, you can take other steps. If you are so concerned to develop coal production to reach some target why don't you nationalise the industry? Rather than do that, somebody or other, an unnamed representative of the India Government has the temerity to write to the World Bank to say that we have no intention of nationalising in the Third or the Fourth Plan. Who has decided what is going to happen in the Fourth Plan? The Fourth Plan has not been adopted yet.

Therefore, these are my submissions. This is a concession absolutely unwarranted and it is one in a long series of concessions which have been made openly under the pressure of these big mining forces, and I think the Government should consider this matter very seriously and not, in the name of incentive, surrender once

again to the profiteering motive of these big coal companies. Therefore, I totally oppose this amendment and request Government to give the matter a second thought and drop it.

श्री कछवाय (देवास) : सभापति महोदय, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस समय सदन में क्वोरम नहीं है ।

Mr. Chairman: The bell is being rung—Now there is quorum. Shri Jaipal Singh.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West): I wish I could agree with my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta. But the way he has presented and marshalled his arguments is so full of loose foundations that I feel I must oppose him and support the amending Bill. The first argument he gave was of the enormous profits some of the big concerns were making. I do not know why he did not mention the profits the small concerns were also making. When he talks of some concerns earning 93 per cent, 43 per cent and so on, I think he forgets that this percentage computation is on the basis of the original price of the shares. The share may be of the value of Rs. 10. It is no longer Rs. 10, it may be Rs. 100. So, when you say 40 per cent it is on the basis of the original Rs. 10 and not of the present day price. So, we get a wrong picture. The high dividends as they appear are not really so high, though I would say they are high enough.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: What was the 11 per cent recommended then?

Shri Jaipal Singh: I accept the 11 per cent, but when he quotes 93 per cent, the real picture is not given.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: It is in relation to 11 per cent.

Shri Jaipal Singh: The same argument is also applied to the tea industry, where we are told 40 per cent, 50 per cent and the like is earned. But again, this reckoning computation or calculation is on the basis of the ori-

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

ginal price of the share, not the price of today, because there is no share that still carries the original price. It has either gone up very high, or gone down. That is the first argument I have to rebut, and over which I have a quarrel with him.

16.36 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The second argument is something about which I can talk a lot, because I have been associated with it for the last 18 months or so, and it is the question of the stockpiling taking place at the pitheads. He has put forward the argument that there is plenty of coal, but there is no demand for it. That is not the correct picture. There is plenty of coal which is being stockpiled, and the same story is true of the mining areas of iron ore and other minerals, but there has been a transport bottleneck. The coal cannot move, we have not enough wagons to move it.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Not true now.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Very soon we shall be submitting the report to this House, and my hon. friend will realise what the truth is. The fact is there has been a transport bottleneck.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: There was.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Take the case of Dhanbad and Asansol for example. I come from that area, and I know the picture as we see it every day. What about coal supply across the river to Barauni and elsewhere? Our trains cannot carry them; and so now Government is thinking of transporting coal by road. There has been this transporting bottleneck.

A redeeming feature of his speech has been the fact that for a change he has applauded the performance of the private sector.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Why not?

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am very glad to hear that. I hope he and his colleagues hereafter will denationalise whatever has been nationalised. If the private sector can achieve a performance, deliver the goods, and contribute towards development, which is the language of the day, then I suggest they better drop this nationalisation.

The NCDC is located in my own constituency. I am not one who is opposed to nationalisation as such, but when I find that the private sector can perform something better, can have better achievement, I cease to have any respect for the public sector.

I am surprised that my hon. friend Shri Gupta forgot one thing—the horrible conditions of housing for the workers. He never made a reference to that. It is a most deplorable thing in this country that the coal mine workers have practically no housing. So, if this money were given, the so-called incentive for development, what about developing better housing conditions?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Yes, I am with you.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I am very glad my hon. friend is with me for a change.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: It is not being given for that purpose.

Shri Jaipal Singh: The question is that we must mechanise, we must modernise, and I support my hon. friend's plea that the smaller concerns must be amalgamated, they must be economically rationalised. Only four days ago, I was going round the coal mining machinery manufacturing plant in Durgapur. We have begun to manufacture ourselves in the country for the first time modern machinery for the coal mining industry. I do not know whether I can agree with my hon. friend that smaller mines cannot

be modernised. I am not technical enough to give any judgment on that. But I think that this can be done in the case of even smaller mines.

In the end, if my hon. friend's arguments had not been so deceptive and deceiving, I would have supported him but he has really twisted the picture and therefore I am bound to support the amending Bill.

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं केवल एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ। किसी कानून का संशोधन करने के लिए जब सरकार बैठती है तो उस कानून में और भी जितनी खामियाँ हैं, उन सब को उसको ठीक तरह से देख लेना चाहिये ताकि सभी खामियाँ संशोधन के रूप में एक साथ सदन के सामने रखी जा सकें और उन सब को दूर किया जा सके।

यह बिल इनकम-टैक्स यानी आय-कर से सम्बन्धित है। आय-कर का जब हिसाब लगाया जाता है तो उस हिसाब से एक बहुत बड़े भ्रंश को छोड़ दिया जाता है। जो अफसर होते हैं या पार्लियामेंट के मੈम्बर होते हैं अगर उनकी आय का आप हिसाब करेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि आय का बहुत बड़ा भ्रंश छोड़ दिया गया है। एक पार्लियामेंट के मੈम्बर को एक महीने में जितनी आय होती है, उसका एक बहुत बड़ा भ्रंश तनख्वाह नहीं होता है। तनख्वाह को छोड़ कर जो सुविधायें होती हैं, भत्ता वगैरह होता है, उनका परिमाण तनख्वाह से कहीं अधिक, कहीं ज्यादा होता है। मैं केवल पार्लियामेंट के मੈम्बरों के बारे में नहीं कहता बल्कि नौकरशाही में जितने बड़े आफिसर्स होते हैं, सब के बारे में कहता हूँ और यह बात समान रूप से उन पर लागू होती है। तनख्वाह नाम के वास्ते होती है। मिनिस्ट्रों को और डिप्टी मिनिस्ट्रों को भी मैं इस में शामिल करता हूँ। तनख्वाह एक हजार, डेढ़ हजार या दो हजार हो जाती है लेकिन सुविधाओं को अगर आप लेंगे, घर को लेंगे,

नौकरों को लेंगे, भत्तों को लेंगे तो आपको पता चल जाएगा कि आय तनख्वाह से कहीं ज्यादा बैठती है। डिप्टी मिनिस्ट्रों की आय का भी कभी हिसाब लगा कर देख लिया जाना चाहिये। उनकी आय भी पांच या छः हजार हो जाएगी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय यह बिल कोल इंडस्ट्री के बारे में है।

श्री किशन पटनायक : आयकर में संशोधन किया जा रहा है और चूँकि यह जनरल डिस्कशन है इसलिए मैं इस चीज को इस में ला रहा हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : बिल के बारे में जो आपको बोलना है, बोलिये।

श्री किशन पटनायक : इनकम टैक्स के कानून के संशोधन के बारे में मैं बोल रहा हूँ। जब यह संशोधन आप लाये हैं तो यह जो सारी चीज है, इसको आपको देख लेना चाहिये था। यह बहुत जरूरी है। बहुत सी आय इनकम टैक्स के अन्दर आती ही नहीं है, बाहर रह जाती है और इनकम टैक्स के रूप में सरकार को जो पैसा मिलना चाहिये, नहीं मिलता है। मेरा इतना ही निवेदन है कि इसके बारे में भी मिनिस्ट्र साहब संशोधन पेश करें कि नौकरशाही, मिनिस्ट्रों, पार्लियामेंट के मੈम्बरों वगैरह जितने लोग हैं, उन पर जब आय-कर लगाया जाता है, तो सिर्फ तनख्वाह का ही ध्यान नहीं रखा जाना चाहिये, सुविधाओं, भत्तों वगैरह को भी हिसाब में गिना जाना चाहिये।

Shri P. K. Ghosh (Ranchi East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak. I welcome the amendment because it aims at giving an incentive to the coal-mining industry. The coal-mining industry is one of the most important industries in our country, because coal is the key raw material for our steel industry and also for the foundry industry and so on. As far as our past experience goes,

[Shri P. K. Ghosh]

industrial growth has been seriously hampered due to short supply of coal. This development rebate is only aimed at modernisation and mechanisation of coal industry in order that the production of coal will go up.

In this respect, I disagree with Shri Indrajit Gupta who says that this development rebate will be added to the dividend of the big colliery owners. Actually, the aim of this rebate is to encourage this industry in modernisation and mechanisation. It is clearly stated that it is a development rebate.

In this connection, I would request the hon. Minister of Finance to see that similar higher development rebates are also extended to the small-scale and cottage industries. It is equally important that our small-scale and cottage industries should be given encouragement. So, they should also be given a higher development rebate in order that they may also flourish.

It is our experience that these small-scale and cottage industries sometimes are run by single proprietors who are very busy with the administrative work of the industry. Most of the time they do not know how many facilities are extended to them by the Government. So, the Government should also make proper publicity of the facilities extended to them.

It is found, at the same time, that while examining the books of accounts, the income-tax officers find that the industries in some cases have overlooked by mistake and have not claimed the rebate which they can under the rules expect to get. By oversight or mistake it is found that the rebates have not been claimed. In such cases, the industries are not allowed to claim rebate. So, I request the Minister of Finance to instruct the income-tax officers concerned that whenever they find that certain small-

scale or cottage industries have by mistake not claimed such development rebate, they should take the initiative and deduct this rebate from the income-tax.

With these words I support the amendment to the Bill.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, I rise to oppose the Bill and to support the arguments placed before the House by my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta. I have been watching with keen interest that industrialists, whether in coal or in other industries, have been given concession after concession. I would like to know from the Minister whether the coal or coal-mining industry deserves any more incentive. My information is that the income-tax amount due from them is colossal. It is still to be recovered from these mining magnates. They took advantage of the bottleneck of our industrial expansion and in the name of helping the growth of the public sector and private sector, they took this advantage and compelled the Government to come to this decision.

It may not be out of place to mention here the horrible condition of the workers who are working in those mines. There is violation of all labour legislation. Any agreement, bipartite or tripartite, which is arrived at by mutual discussion or in cooperation with the Labour Ministry is being flouted by them. This is not the proper opportunity to place all those cases. But we have received letters from various federations and unions that in the name of modernisation of mines, they are retrenching people, reverting people and charge-sheeting them. There is a definite and calculated step by the mining magnates to increase the work-load without increase in the salary or allowances.

As ably pointed out by Mr. Jaipal Singh, the housing condition is horrible. With the exception of a very few mines where quarters have been

constructed under a particular scheme either by the West Bengal Government or Central Government or in some cases by the mining magnates, there are no quarters for most of the workers. Hardly 5 per cent of the workers who are working in the coal mines have been given quarters. Apart from that, even good water is not available for drinking purposes. One of our Members—he has unfortunately not been elected this time—Shri Vittal Rao, has been raising this question since 1952 onwards that Government must come out with a scheme for compelling those employers to make some arrangement for good drinking water. Even that has been denied to the workers. Under these circumstances, I feel that this Bill will give a further handle to pay less income-tax and exploit the workers. I would like to know from the Minister what is the profit earned by these mining magnates in 1961 and 1962; that itself will reveal that they are minting money at the cost of the workers. If really they have earned fabulous profits and if the known profits are mentioned to us—unknown profits are known only to unknown persons—I feel there would be no necessity of giving further concession to the mine-owners.

With these words, I fully support the contention of my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta and I would request the Minister to reconsider whether this concession is at all necessary and to explain whether this Bill has been brought because of the threatening attitude of the employers or whether the Government thinks it proper to give them further exemptions. Every industry will demand this sort of exemption in the name of plans and helping various projects. This will be a precedent which will be quoted against the Government and they will be forcing the Government to take such a lenient view in the matter of exemption from income-tax and other taxes.

With these words, Sir, I oppose the Bill and I request the hon. Minister to kindly withdraw it.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the story of coal mining in my country is a story of which I cannot be wholly proud, with which I cannot feel full satisfaction. We have been studying the coal problem in this country for a long time, and whatever we have done has not produced the desired results. The fact of the matter is that some of these persons who are interested in coal mining are interested more in profit than in the service of the nation or in the good of the country.

Sir, one should try to understand how they exploit these mines and how they work these mines. My hon. friend has brought a Bill that they should mechanise the mines. Well, they can mechanise the mines. But the way they have been trying to take coal from these mines has been the most primitive so far, has been the most backward, the most unscientific and the most destructive of this very valuable wealth of our nation. I can say this without any fear of contradiction that they have not looked upon the coal mines as a national wealth. They have not tried to understand these coal mines as if they are also for them the golden goose that lays the golden egg. They have not tried to exploit them as fully as possible and exploit them in the best possible manner.

I do not want to go into the questions which have been raised by some of my hon. friends on those benches there. For instance, they mentioned about houses for the workers, drinking water for them and other things. Well, I think the reports of the Estimates Committee, the reports of the National Coal Development Corporation and other reports will tell us what is happening. I do not think a worker who is working in a coal mine can be held up as an example of the welfare State that is aimed at for our country. He is one of those persons who is the most exploited. So far as I know,

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

many accidents take place in these coal mines. Safety devices are neglected and all those things are given a go-by which can ensure a safe, clean and satisfying life for our workers.

Then, on top of it, we are told that we should give this development rebate to these coal miners. Well, I think, in principle it is a very good thing. We all want that the mines should be mechanised. We all want that up-to-date machinery should be installed in these mines. There is no doubt about it. We are all living in the age of automation. There is the story of an American labour leader who went to see a colliery proprietor. He showed him the miracles of his automation. He asked, where are the workers. He said that automation had been carried to such an extent that the workers had become almost superfluous, almost redundant. But the labour leader said: "You asked me a question as to where the workers were. I would put a question to you. Where are the customers?"

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would the hon. Member be taking more time?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Of course; I have just started.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, he will continue his speech tomorrow. Shri Rane.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TWENTIETH REPORT

Shri Rane: Sir, I beg to present the Twentieth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

17.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, November 21, 1963/Kartika 30, 1885 (Saka).