

[Mr. Speaker]

- (7) Shri Chandikeshwar Sharan Singh Ju Deo—14th February to 11th April, 1961 (Thirteenth Session).
- (8) Shri Laisram Achaw Singh—3rd December to 23rd December, 1960 (Twelfth Session).
- (9) Shri Surendranath Dwivedy—29th March to 5th May, 1961 (Thirteenth Session).
- (10) Shri Narasingha Malla Deb—14th April to 5th May, 1961 (Thirteenth Session).
- (11) Shri A. Doraiswami Gounder—15th April to 5th May, 1961 (Thirteenth Session).
- (12) Kunwarani Vijaya Raju—7th March to 4th May, 1961 (Thirteenth Session).
- (13) Shri S. R. Arumugham—14th February to 4th March, 1961 (Thirteenth Session).

I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Members will be informed accordingly.

12.23 hrs.

ARREST OF A MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that I have received the following two telegrams dated the 2nd May, 1961, from the Police Inspector, Kozhikode:—

- (1) "Shri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair, Member, Lok Sabha, was arrested by Circle Inspector of Police, Kozhikode, at Kozhikode, at 8-30 A.M. today, under Section 38(2) of the Kerala Police Act, while the former and six others were doing obstructive picketing in front of the Peirce Leslie Office. He did not apply for bail. He is being produced

before the Magistrate with petty case charge-sheet today."

- (2) "Shri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair, Member, Lok Sabha, produced with charge-sheet in Calicut Town Police Station petty case No. 199/61, before the Additional Sub-Magistrate, Kozhikode, today noon. The member is remanded for one day in the special sub-jail, Kozhikode, today afternoon."

12.25 hrs.

COAL MINES (CONSERVATION AND SAFETY) AMENDMENT BILL—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Sardar Swaran Singh on the 2nd May, 1961, namely:

"That the Bill to amend the Coal Mines (Conservation and Safety) Act, 1952, be taken into consideration."

Time not allotted. Time taken is one hour. How many hon. Members want to participate in the discussion?

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Let us have one hour more. Shri Braj Raj Singh may continue his speech.

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) :
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मैं कह रहा था कि जो यह नई एक्साइज ड्यूटी माननीय मंत्री महोदय लगाने वाले हैं उनका प्रस्ताव है कि उससे ७ करोड़ रुपया एकत्र करें। इस सात करोड़ रुपये में से बहूतीन करोड़ सेंट्रल रोपवेज स्कीम के लिए लगाना चाहते हैं। जैसा कि कल मंत्री महोदय ने कहा, इस स्कीम पर कुल १५ करोड़ रुपया खर्च होने को है। मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आया कि यह १५ करोड़ रुपया सरकार प्राइवेट माइन मीनर्स की प्रार्थना पर लगाने

था रही है या अपने आप ही उनको यह सुविधा देने के लिये यह रूपया लगा रही है। जहां तक प्राइवेट माइन मीनर्स की प्रार्थना का सवाल है, मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने यह कभी नहीं कहा कि उन्हें इस तरह की कोई स्कीम सरकार बना कर दे और जो स्टोइंग के लिये रेत आता है उस में सौ फीसदी सहायता दे। उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा है वह तो यह है कि उनको वैगन्स नहीं मिलते इसलिए वैगन्स की व्यवस्था की जाये, लेकिन हम यह देखते हैं कि मंत्री महोदय इस कानून के द्वारा उनको सौ फीसदी सहायता करने जा रहे हैं। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सहायता प्राइवेट सेक्टर की जो खदानें हैं उनको कुछ विशेष सुविधाएं देने के लिए की जा रही है या इससे कोयले के उत्पादन पर भी कोई अभाव पड़ने वाला है।

इस बात करोड़ रुपये में से चार करोड़ रूपया कोयले को पानी के जहाजों द्वारा ले जाने पर खर्च होगा। यह रूपया सहायता के रूप में दिया जायेगा। मैं ने कल भी इसके बारे में कहा था और आज फिर दुहराना चाहता हूँ। कि जब तक हम कोयला डोने की एक निश्चित नीति निर्धारित नहीं करेंगे कि जिसके मुताबिक सड़क, रेल और पानी के जहाज से कोयला डोया जाये, और उसको हर माधन में डोने के जब तक अलग अलग लक्ष्य स्थिर नहीं किये जायेंगे, तब तक मैं समझता हूँ कि कोयले को डोने का संकट देश के सामने बार बार आता रहेगा। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि इस वक्त, जब कि इस बिल पर विचार हो रहा है, सरकार की तरफ से इस तरह की किसी योजना की घोषणा की जाये जिसके मुताबिक तृतीय अर्धवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत कोयला डोने का संकट बचाया जा सके। विशेष तौर से मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सड़क परिवहन द्वारा कोयला डोने के बारे में सरकार की तरफ से क्या नीति अपनायी जाने वाली है। क्या इस बारे में कोई जांच पड़ताल चल रही है और अगर चल रही है तो सरकार ने सड़क द्वारा

कोयला डोने के लिए तृतीय अर्धवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत कितनी रकम निर्धारित की है ?

एक प्रश्न उठाया गया बार बार इस सदन में और अभी भी उसके बारे में चर्चा हुई। माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने इस बिल को पेश करते हुए अपने भाषण में कहा कि अभी सारे देश के लिए कोयले की एक सी दर लागू करने के सम्बन्ध में वह निश्चित रूप से कुछ नहीं कह सकते, यानी वह सम्भव नहीं है। मैं जानता हूँ मंत्री महोदय की कठिनाई को। ऐसा करने से उस औद्योगिक क्षेत्र के उत्पादन पर असर पड़ सकता है जो कि कोयला खदानों के पास पास है जैसे कि बंगाल और बिहार का क्षेत्र और हमारे स्टील प्लांट जो कि उड़ीसा और बिहार में लगने को हैं और लगे हुए हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस प्रश्न पर केवल इसी क्षेत्र की दृष्टि से विचार किया जा रहा है या सारे देश की दृष्टि से विचार किया जा रहा है खास कर जब कि स्टील के सम्बन्ध में सरकार ने दूमरी नीति अपनायी हुई है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार स्टील का औद्योगिक उत्पादन की क्षमता पर असर पड़ता है उसी तरह से कोयले का भी पड़ता है। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि जब स्टील के बारे में सरकार ने एक नीति निर्धारित की है तो कोयले के बारे में भी वह नीति क्यों नहीं निर्धारित की जाती? मेरा निवेदन है कि सारे देश के लिए कोयले का एक सा मूल्य स्थिर करने के प्रश्न पर सरकार विचार करे जिससे कि जो क्षेत्र कोयला क्षेत्र से दूर पड़ते हैं उनको किसी तरह का डिस्एडवांटेज न रहे उन क्षेत्रों के मुकाबले में जो कि कोयला क्षेत्र के पास पड़ते हैं। अगर ऐसा नहीं किया गया और सारे देश के लिए कोयले की एक सी दर स्थिर नहीं की गयी तो जो उत्पादन क्षेत्र कोयला क्षेत्र से दूर स्थित हैं उनका उत्पादन उन क्षेत्रों से जो कि कोयला क्षेत्र के पास पास है अधिक बर्बाद पड़ेगा और उनको नुकसान होगा। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार इस प्रश्न पर विचार करे कि अगर सारे देश

[श्री अजराम सिंह]

के लिए एक सी कोयले की कीमत निर्धारित कर दी जाती है तो बिहार, बंगाल और उड़ीसा के औद्योगिक क्षेत्र को कितनी हानि होगी और बाकी के क्षेत्र को कितना लाभ होगा, और इन दोनों की लाभ हानि का मुकाबला कर के देखे कि कुल मिला कर देश को ऐसा करने से लाभ होगा या हानि। मैं चाहूंगा कि इस पर भी मंत्री महोदय अपने विचार प्रकट करें।

इस बिल में रेलवेज के सम्बन्ध में जो व्यवस्था की गई है वह स्वागत करने लायक है और मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ। लेकिन मैं फिर कहना चाहूंगा कि एक्साईज के द्वारा इस तरीके से एक बहुत विस्तृत शक्ति सरकार को अपने हाथ में नहीं लेनी चाहिए। इस के मुताबिक जब भी वह चाहे नोटिफिकेशन के द्वारा कोयले पर जितनी चाहे एक्साईज बढ़ा दे और इस तरह कोयले की कीमत बढ़ाने की तरफ एक कदम उठाए। यह ध्यान देने योग्य बात है कि सितम्बर सन् १९५८ में अर्थात् आज से तीन साल से भी कम समय हुआ जब कोयले पर ३८ नये पैसे के हिसाब से एक्साईज ली जा रही थी और अब ८८ या ९४ नये पैसे ले रहे हैं और इस बिल के कानून बन जाने के बाद १२० नये पैसे या १ रुपया और ५० नये पैसे लेंगे। इस ढाई साल के अर्से में कोयले पर चौगुनी एक्साईज बढ़ा देना यह एक विचारणीय बात है और इस बढ़ोतरी का औद्योगिक उत्पादन पर और रेलों के परिचालन पर क्या असर पड़ेगा? इस संदर्भ में यह बात ध्यान रखने की है कि रेलवेज को जितना कोयले खोने का खर्चा दिया जाता है वह रेलवे के परिचालन व्यय से कम होता है। एक तरफ तो हम पानी के जहाजों के बास्ते जो कि प्राइवेट उद्योगपतियों के हाथ में हैं, उस इंडस्ट्री को कायम रखने के लिए एक्साईज इयूटी बढ़ा कर यह विशेष सहायता दें और दूसरी तरफ रेलवेज जो कि हमारा राष्ट्रीय उद्योग बढ़ रहा है

उसका परिचालन व्यय बढ़ायें, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उचित बात नहीं है। सरकार को इस सारे मसले पर पूरी तरह से विचार करने की जरूरत है।

आज कोयला खोने में रेलवेज का परिचालन व्यय जितना होता है उतना किराया नहीं मिलता है। हमें देखना है कि उस को बढ़ा कर के हम उस को सहायता दे सकते हैं या नहीं दे सकते हैं। मैं मोटे अंदाजे से यह कह सकता हूँ कि ७ करोड़ रुपया जो अभी एक्साईज से आना है उस में से अकेले रेलवेज को ही १ करोड़ २० लाख रुपया देना पड़ेगा। यह हमारा राष्ट्रीय उद्योग है और जब उस को १ करोड़ और २० लाख रुपया देना पड़ेगा तो उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि रेलवे विभाग कहेगा कि अब हमें किराया बढ़ाने की जरूरत है। दूसरी परेशानियाँ पैदा होंगी। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि इस मसले पर गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार होना चाहिए, सब पहलुओं पर ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये तब एक्साईज इयूटी बढ़ाने की बात होनी चाहिए। एक्साईज इयूटी बढ़ाकर हम औद्योगिक उत्पादन में व्यय बढ़ाने में सहायता देते हैं और इस से मुद्रास्फिति बढ़ सकती है। इसलिए इन तमाम प्रश्नों पर, कानून बनाने से पहले, सरकार को बहुत ही गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार कर लेना चाहिए और यह सोचना चाहिए कि कहीं इनका यह तो असर नहीं पड़ेगा कि मुल्क के औद्योगिक उत्पादन पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़े और मुद्रास्फिति बढ़ जाय। मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय इन सारे प्रश्नों पर गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार करें। और अगर इस बिल को कानून की शकल दे दी जाती है तो उस के बाद भी नोटिफिकेशन के द्वारा कम से कम ही एक्साईज इयूटी बढ़ायें। उसको इस शकल में न बढ़ायें जिस से केवल प्राइवेट उद्योगपतियों को ही सहायता देने का हमारा काम हो जाय।

मुझे लगता है कि ७ करोड़ रुपया १ हम एक्सार्जिज ड्यूटी बढ़ाने जा रहे हैं वह प्राइवेट खदानों के मालिकों को सहायता देने जा रहे हैं या जो प्राइवेट पानी के जहाज हैं उन को हम सहायता देने जा रहे हैं। राष्ट्रीय उद्योगों से हम एक्सार्जिज ले कर के इन लोगों को पैसा दें यह मुझे मुनासिब नहीं लगता है। मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार इस के बारे में स्पष्ट रूप से अपनी नीति की घोषणा करे।

अन्त में मैं अपनी उसी बात को फिर दुहरा-उंगा कि जहां तक कोयले के ढोने की नीति का प्रश्न है उस पर बहुत ही गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार करने की जरूरत है। खास तौर से तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में कोयले के ढोने का जो लक्ष्य रक्खा है उस को ढोने के लिये अगर हम अभी से एक सुनिश्चित योजना नहीं बनाते हैं तो उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि बारबार मुल्क में कोयला ढोने के संकट होंगे। कोयले की खदानों के पास कोयला पड़ा होगा और उस में प्राग लगने की संभावना होगी और दूसरी जगह मुल्क में औद्योगिक उत्पादन इस लिए मंद पड़ेगा और बंद हो जायगा क्योंकि कोयला वहां पर हम समय पर पहुंचा नहीं पायेंगे। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि कोयले के दुलाई के रेल, रोड और सी, सब के अलग-अलग लक्ष्य निर्धारित हों जिस से हम तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो कोयले का उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहते हैं उस में कभी कोई संकट और बाधा पैदा न हो।

Dr. Melkote (Raichur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a well known fact that during the Second Five Year Plan we have not been able to raise sufficient amount of coal that the country needed and we have not been able to meet the targets. Equal has been our difficulty with regard to transport of coal also from the pit-head to the various places where it is needed. In view of these difficulties, I welcome this Bill that has been

presented to this House by the hon. Minister.

But I have carefully read the statement he had occasion to make yesterday in this House. I had expected further clarification with regard to certain points, but they are not there. In view of that, I felt I should express my own feelings with regard to this Bill here today.

Sir, so far as giving protection to the railways in these coal mining areas is concerned, nobody has any objection; in fact, we would welcome it. But the other aspect of the question, that the excise levy is now being raised from Re. 1 to Rs. 4 is a thing which we have not been able to understand clearly. If the excise levy had been raised in previous years, the object for which it was raised was entirely different. Today we are raising it in order that more coal may be obtained from these pitheads.

Now, so far as the raising of this coal by depillaring in these coal mines is concerned, one has to understand that the present agents of the coal mine owners have not to explore whether coal is there or not. They have not to create new pitheads. Everything has been created and money spent already, and they will benefit to the extent of millions of tons of this coal. Instead of taking this levy from them for giving this benefit, the Government is trying to tax the consumer by raising the levy from Re. 1 to Rs. 4. I have not been able to understand this aspect of the question, and I personally feel that this amount of money should not go to the help of the owners, or their agents, but it should go to the benefit of the nation as such. I have, therefore, Sir, objection to this increase from Re. 1 to Rs. 4, and unless the hon. Minister gives a satisfactory answer in his reply we would not be convinced with regard to the increase in this levy.

[Dr. Melkote]

Then there is the question of quicker movement and removal of the bottle-neck in transport. The hon. Minister has said that carrying of coal by sea costs more. It is usually found that any material that is carried by sea is carried at a cheaper rate than what obtains in the railways. Here it is the question of the lead, and therefore the Minister mentioned that possibly the western coast would have to bear a heavier amount of money in this mode of transport. In order to benefit them, he said, this part of the levy may be utilised that way. Sir, places like Hyderabad, Bangalore or places in the interior have not the same advantages as the western coast areas, particularly Bombay. If this money is to be paid for industries which are already in an advantageous position, if this money is spent in order to benefit them, I would request the hon. Minister, since the money is being raised by the public, that there should be an equalisation in this price of coal, that there should be a standard price for coal all over India, whether it is Bangalore, Mysore or Madras. It is that way that industries would benefit, and there would not be this unhealthy competition; otherwise, Government would be helping a particular industry in a particular place which has greater advantages than the other. I would like to understand from the Minister as to why this is being done. So this part is objectionable to us. Thirdly, a part of this coal is being carried by sea. I welcome this. But the hon. Minister has not made it clear that this coal that has to be carried would be carried by national bottoms alone and nobody else. That would help the industry in acquiring more tonnage and give more employment to the people. Therefore, if this is to go to help other ships that are plying in our national waters, it would not be a welcome feature. I personally feel that these three aspects of the question should be dealt with by the hon. Minister and a satisfactory answer given to us.

श्री० रणबीर सिंह (रोहतक) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कोयले पर उत्पादन-कर एक रुपया फी टन से बढ़ा कर चार रुपया फी टन करने का अधिकार सरकार ने इस विधेयक में मांगा है और मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि इस मंत्रालय के पास उत्पादन कर लगाने की जितनी शक्ति अभी तक थी उसका भी पूरे तौर पर इस मंत्रालय ने इस्तेमाल नहीं किया है। अभी तक ८८ नए पैसे या ९४ नए पैसे ही उत्पादन कर लगा हुआ था। उस के पास यह अधिकार था कि वह एक तरह से १२ नए पैसे और ६ नए पैसे तक इस कर को बढ़ा सकता है। लेकिन खुशी की बात है कि मंत्रालय ने यह समझा कि देश के रिप्रिजेंटेटिव्स के पास गए बिना उस को इस अस्तित्कार का इस्तेमाल नहीं करना चाहिये। अभी मेरे माननीय सदस्य श्री बजराम सिंह जी ने सन्देश प्रकट किया है कि यह कर इस लिए लगाया जा रहा है या इसलिए बढ़ाया जा रहा है कि किसी जहाजी कम्पनी को फायदा पहुंचाना है या जो कोयले के उत्पादक हैं, जो बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपति हैं, उन को फायदा पहुंचाना है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो इस तरह की बातें कहते हैं वे सरासर गलती पर हैं। यह शक्ति इस लिए ली जा रही है कि इस देश में कोयला अधिक पैदा करने की आवश्यकता है और कोयले का उत्पादन जब तक नहीं बढ़गा तब तक इस देश की तरक्की पूरे तौर पर नहीं हो सकती। इस वास्ते आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि कोयले के उत्पादन को बढ़ाया जाए।

भ्राएँ दिन कोयले की खानों के मन्दर एक्सीडेंट्स होते रहते हैं। उन को भी जहां तक मुम्किन हो सके रोका जाय यह भी एक इस विधेयक का उद्देश्य है। इस के अलावा कई बार ऐसा भी भी होता है कि कोयले का उत्पादन तो काफी हो जाता है लेकिन कोयले की ढोने की रेलों में शक्ति नहीं होती है और वह एक

बगह से दूसरी जगह नहीं जा सकता है । एक तरह से बाटलनेक्स पैदा हो जाते हैं, काम रुक जाता है, इस वास्ते यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि कोयले की बुलाई का कोई और भी साथ साथ प्रबन्ध किया जाए । कोयले का अन्य साधनों से ढोने का और इस काम को मुचारू रूप से चलाने का अस्तित्थार भी इस विधेयक में मांगा जा रहा है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जानता हूँ कि इस मंत्रालय ने जहाँ तक कोयले के उत्पादन का सम्बन्ध है, तीसरे प्लान के अन्दर ६ करोड़ ७० लाख टन उत्पादन करने का लक्ष्य रखा है । यह जो उत्पादन बढ़ेगा यह केवल प्राइवेट पूंजीपतियों द्वारा ही नहीं बढ़ाया जाएगा बल्कि पब्लिक सैक्टर द्वारा भी बढ़ाया जायगा । २०० लाख टन यानी दो करोड़ टन पब्लिक सैक्टर पैदा करेगा । अब एसी हालत में अगर कोई यह कहता है कि प्राइवेट पूंजीपतियों को बढ़ावा दिया जा रहा है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह सही बात नहीं कहता है, गलत बात कहता है । इस मैदान में, इस फील्ड में पब्लिक सैक्टर ने हाथ बढ़ाया है और पब्लिक सैक्टर मुबारक रूप से आगे बढ़ सके और देश की उन्नति में सहायक हो सके, इस उद्देश्य से यह उत्पादन कर बढ़ाने की शक्ति मांगी जा रही है । उत्पादन कर बढ़ाने से जो लाभ होगा उसका २५ प्रतिशत या उस से कुछ कम पब्लिक सैक्टर को पहुँचेगा । मैं श्री ब्रजराज सिंह जी की तारीफ करता हूँ जब उन्होंने यह कहा कि जहाँ आज हम यह देखते हैं कि जो अनाज है वह रेल हैड पर, हर रेलवे स्टेशन पर सरकार एक ही भाव पर पहुँचानी है, उसी तरह उसे कोयला भी पहुँचाना चाहिये । अनाज हर एक के खाने की चीज है चाहे कोई पंजाबी हो, चाहे बंगाली हो, चाहे मद्रासी हो या बम्बई वाला है, हर कोई अनाज खाता है और यह जीवन के लिये आवश्यक

वस्तुओं में से सब से आवश्यक वस्तु है । इसी तरह से कोयला भी मैं यह तो नहीं कहूँगा कि अनाज जितना ही जरूरी है लेकिन बहुत जरूरी चीज है और इसकी धोर भी आपका समुचित ध्यान जाना चाहिये । हो सकता है कि मंत्रालय के रास्ते में बहुत सी रुकावटें हों, बहुत सी मुश्किलता हों, उस नीति के निर्धारण में या उस को चलाने में लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह मंत्रालय इस के बारे में थोड़ा सोचे क्योंकि इस देश के सभी भागों का आर्थिक विकास तभी हो सकता है जब कि देश की तरक्की के लिए, सब चीजों का और खास तौर पर कोयले का वितरण न्यायोचित ढंग से हो । यह ठीक है कि भगवान ने बिहार, उड़ीसा इत्यादि में कोयले की खाने रखी हैं और इस से उन इलाकों को फायदा पहुँचता है । एक फायदा तो कोयला निकालने से ही पहुँचता है और दूसरा फायदा कुछ कारखानों की इस वजह से स्थापना हो जाने की शकल में भी पहुँचता है । लेकिन उस फायदे को हमें इस हद तक नहीं सीखना चाहिये कि दूसरे इलाकों को गिला होने लग जाए । आप जानते हैं कि रिजनल कमिश्नर पर विकास की हर इलाका मांग करता है और खास तौर पर प्रजातांत्रिक ढांचा जहाँ होगा वहाँ पर तो यह कुररती बात है कि हर इलाके के लोग यह चाहेंगे कि उन का इलाका भी आर्थिक तौर पर तरक्की करे और उम के लिये यह जरूरी है कि वहाँ जिन वस्तुओं की आवश्यकता है, उनको आप पहुँचायें ।

कल माननीय मंत्री जी ने बताया कि ८८ और ९४ नये पैसे की दर जो उत्पादन कर की है, उसको ज्यादा से ज्यादा वह १२० या १५० नये पैसे तक ले जाना चाहते हैं । मेरी राय है कि अगर इसको और भी कुछ बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता हो और मंत्रालय इस बात

[श्री० रणबंर सिंह]

का इतिहास कर सके कि पंजाब के अन्दर तथा दूसरे प्रान्तों के अन्दर भी जिस भाव पर कोयला बंगाल, बिहार इत्यादि में दिया जाता है, उसी भाव पर दिया जाये, तो यह एक स्वागत योग्य बात होगी। इस उद्देश्य से अग्रर इस कर को बढ़ाया जाता है तो कैसे कहा जा सकता है कि यह उद्योगपतियों के हक की बात है या किसी जहाजरानी कम्पनी के हक की बात है। उस सूरत में यह देश के लाभ की बात होगी।

इस के साथ-साथ मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक कोयले को रोड से ढोने का वास्ता है, अग्रर हव भी बिहार, उड़ीसा इत्यादि के आस पास के इलाकों में प्रीर हो सके तो उत्तर प्रदेश के भी कुछ इलाकों में ट्रकों से ढो कर पहुंचाया जा सके, तो यह अच्छी बात होगी। वहां जितना कोयला जाना है वह सब ट्रकों से भेजा जाये तो इसका मतलब यह होगा कि रेलों के ऊपर जो आज़ दबाव है, वह कम किया जा सकेगा। रेलवे के पास आज़ इतने वंगन नहीं हैं कि कोयले को सारे देश में ठीक तरह से प्रीर समय पर वह पहुंचा सके। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जहां थोड़ा बहुत रुपया जहाजरानी कम्पनियों पर दर को ठीक स्तर पर लाने के लिए, रेल के दर के बराबर लाने के लिए खर्च किया जाये वहां ट्रक्स के ऊपर जो थोड़ा बहुत खर्चा अग्रर फालतू होता है, तो उसको भी सबसिडाइज़ करने पर इस्तेमाल किया जाये।

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan (Coimbatore): Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill seems to be three-fold; firstly, to erect aerial ropeways in the Jharia and Raniganj coal fields for supplying sand to the private mine-owners for stowing in the interests of safety of life and property and also in the interests of conservation of our coal resources; secondly, to subsidise coastal shipping and, thirdly, to finance the mine-owners for the com-

pulsory execution of protective measures.

Sir, it seems that there is no quorum very early in the day.

Mr. Speaker: Those hon. Members who are interested in this Bill area all here.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: It seems to be an important Bill. Coal is a very important subject.

Mr. Speaker: When other hon. Members do not take interest, that can I do?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: They are busy in the Central Hall.

An Hon. Member: We are going to be taxed for this.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): It is lunch hour.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: It is not yet lunch hour. One should not be hungry before 1 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: We are at present in the general discussion stage. When it comes to the question of voting, they will all come.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khamam): But it is a very sad that we have no quorum even before 1 o'clock.

Shri Warior (Trichur): This is not very good. All of a sudden they rush in when the bell rings and without knowing what has happened in the House they vote either 'Aye' or 'No'. There are not even half the number of hon. Members required for the quorum.

Shri Tyagi: It is lunch hour. It has been our practice that during lunch hour.....

Mr. Speaker: I know. But lunch hour is from 1 o'clock to 2.30. It is not yet 1 o'clock.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): They have gone for an early lunch.

Mr. Speaker: I will have the bell rung. Now, there is quorum. The hon. Member may continue her speech.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: This is the result of not discussing the Department of Parliamentary Affairs during the Budget debate.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I cannot bring them and keep them in my lap.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the coming elections at least, hon. Members must be present in larger numbers in the House. I propose doing one thing. I shall ask the office to take note of the number of hon. Members present and put up on the Notice Board division numbers of those hon. Members who are present from 11 o'clock to 1 o'clock, then from 1 o'clock to 3 o'clock and from 3 o'clock onwards.

Shri Tyagi: That will be too restrictive. I would beg of you not to order such a thing. It will be too restrictive.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a restriction. Whichever hon. Member is here is a representative of 8 lakhs of our population.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Now it is 9 lakhs.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, now it is 9 lakhs. They must be here from morning till evening. I do not know what other work they do. Hon. Members should be here not only for speaking but also because there is no much of education. All that I know about the distant parts of the country is what I went on hearing here. There is nothing particular. Why should one deny oneself even the pleasure of knowing something? I would appeal to Shri Tyagi that instead of pleading for the cause of the absentee hon. Members, he should go and bring them and tell them that it is not all right. It is not all right. We are trying to set an

example. Even before 1 o'clock they are all gathering there in the Central Hall. I sometimes think that I may have a session both in the Central Hall and here simultaneously and ask the hon. Deputy-Speaker to preside over there with myself presiding over here and carrying it on.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: All that you have said is off the record, I suppose.

Mr. Speaker: Why? Let future generations know it. There is no harm.

An Hon. Member: There should be a penalty attached to it.

Shri Tyagi: It should be the moral duty of the Party leaders or their whips to see that their Members do not absent themselves.

Mr. Speaker: I expect that for official Bills, the official whips will see to it that there is quorum and for non-official Bills all of them together will jointly see to it that there is a quorum.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Then the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will withdraw those words that he has used, namely, "I cannot bring them and keep them in my lap". It is for the second time that he has said so.

Mr. Speaker: He refers to his own Party Members.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I can only appeal.

Mr. Speaker: I told them that the hon. Minister referred to his own Party Members and not to hon. Members belonging to the Opposition.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Shri Vittal Rao is my counterpart on the other side, but perhaps he does not realise that sometimes none of his Party Members are there

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: We take it on a percentage basis.

Shri Warrior: At least one hon. Member from our Party is always here.

Mr. Speaker: Has she concluded her speech? Did she get up only for the purpose of objecting about quorum?

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: No, Sir, I had just started.

Mr. Speaker: Then she may continue.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: According to the provisions of this Bill, if this Bill is passed, the result will be that there will be an increase in the price of coal and we will find that immediately steel, railways and so on will be the major sufferers. What I would like the hon. Minister to tell us, therefore, is this. How far is this increase going to be justified because we have seen how during the past few years many concessions, particularly with regard to price, have been given to the mine-owners? In fact, if one looks into the recent speeches of the Chairmen of the Mining Association and of the Federation at the annual meetings, one will find that there is a mention in a very appreciable manner of how these concessions have been given to them. Therefore while this increase and this concession are being given, we would like to know as to what exactly are the safeguards to make sure that the production of coal goes up and that at the same time the various other measures with regard to safety and conservation are also really adhered to by the mine-owners. This, to my mind, is one of the most important aspects of this Bill.

Secondly, we find that there is going to be a subsidising of coal that will be transported by sea. Is this the only way in which the question of transport of coal can be answered? It is true that there has been a bottleneck and a scarcity of wagons to

move the coal. Therefore it is necessary to find out other methods and routes for transporting coal from one area to another and particularly to down south. But why is it that we have to rush in to subsidise the private sector once again? I would like the Government to consider the wider aspect of taking over coastal shipping and seeing how much Government itself will bear so that it becomes a more integrated policy and integrated financial scheme of the Government itself and how far this could be taken up.

Then, with regard to the question of assistance to be given for stowing, apart from actually supplying the sand by the ropeway, we find that it is a question of the mines being in a state that is far from happy. When we read in the newspapers and also when time and again we find the question of accidents and so on being raised on the floor of the House, the question arises whether it is that no proper check and supervision is there to see as to how far the safety and precautionary measures are being taken by the various private mineowners. Under the regulations, as they exist, and under the practice it is for the Coal Board to see to it whether the stowing operations and so on are there and how far the subsidy that is given by the Government is being put to a proper use. In so doing, it is not only the question of the lives of mine workers, which is, of course, of primary importance, but it is also the question of conservation of coal and of seeing that we nurture the coal resources that exist in our country. We find that during the last so many years with all the assistance that has been given for stowing only about one-tenth of the mines have really taken up stowing. I would like the hon. Minister to clarify the difficulties that are being countered whenever this question is taken up, namely, the question of what measures Government is going to take beyond subsidising and beyond just giving the

monetary assistance that they can give. What further measures are going to be taken to guarantee that this work is undertaken in a proper manner so as to see that these accidents that have been taking place as a result of the absence of this work are rapidly brought down and are finally eliminated altogether? For instance, during last year (1960) there were a number of serious accidents. What usually happens is that only such accidents hit the public eye, or are immediately taken note of, where there is fatality. As far as the coal industry is concerned, it is necessary that we should look to the number of serious accidents which lead to serious injury. In 1960 the number is by no means a small one. The number of serious accidents was nearly 3,000 and the number of seriously injured is nearly 3,000. This is no small figure. When we are discussing a Bill that concerns the conservation and safety, we would like to know from the hon. Minister the steps that are going to be taken to see that these accidents come down. Stowing, as I said, is an important thing. We would also like to know from him what else is being done in this regard.

13 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: How many of these accidents have been due to non-stowing?

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: That is what we want the hon. Minister to tell us. This report gives only the whole figures and we would like to know from him, how many of these are due to non-stowing.

Again, Sir, we are told that the entire coal area of Raniganj and Jharia is becoming unsafe. Underground fires there, it is said, are widespread and the villagers are becoming panicky. We would like to know what steps are being taken by the Ministry and the Coal Board to check this, and also to tell us the exact position, so that we may know how far these reports are true and whether this panic is justified or not. There are reports that even cinema houses are being closed

down and that whole villages are wondering whether they should move or not. They do not know where to go. It is said that smoke is seen emerging from many areas and the suspicion is that there are underground fires and there are a large number of gassy mines there. What are the steps that the Ministry propose to take not only under the provisions of this measure, but also under the powers they have already to see that adequate measures are taken to prevent any major disaster in that area and the coal production that we have targeted is achieved. They should also see that the mine-owners do not play with the lives of our mine-workers, with the prosperity of our country, and with the production of coal, without taking into consideration the wider national interests, particularly when they are being given these concessions, when they are being given an increased price and subsidies by Government.

The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Sardar Swaran Singh): Sir, I have formed the impression that the general principles underlying this Bill are acceptable to hon. Members who have participated in the debate and I venture to reply to some of the points that have been raised in the course of the discussion.

Before I touch upon any other matter there are two points which call for a reply. More than one hon. Member has mentioned that the excise duty is being raised to help the private sector and in that connection it was said that the mine-owners in the private sector are sought to be helped; secondly that private shipping companies are proposed to be subsidised. I would like to clarify the position that neither of these two fears is correct.

There is no question of subsidising the coastal shipping companies. As a matter of fact, it is hoped that as a result of the increased traffic and assured traffic, it would be possible—at any rate it should be possible, for the coastal shipping companies to reduce their freight. Already the Minis-

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

try of Transport are carrying on discussions with the coastal shipping interests with a view to bringing down their existing tariff rates. So, there is no question of subsidising the coastal shipping by means of this subsidy.

It is a fact that transport by sea is more costly. It is anticipated that even after the efforts of the Ministry of Transport succeed in reducing the sea tariff resulting from movement by sea, still the cost of transport by sea would be higher as compared to cost of transport by rail. This is partly due to the fact that the railway tariff over longer distances happens to be already subsidised in view of the telescopic rates applicable to longer distances. Above a certain distance, the railways charge the same freight for transport of coal irrespective of the distance. That obviously means that the railways are incurring actually more costs in transporting coal over longer distances and are charging the consumer less; so an element of subsidy is already there in a way when transport by rail to longer points is involved. We have undertaken that scheme in order to help the consumer situated at a longer distance. Although there may be a slight conflict between the consumers that are located nearer the points of production and those at longer distances, still I think, that, on the whole, it is a fair decision that the entire burden of transport is not loaded on to the consumer who happens to be situated at a long distance from the point of production. Whereas a public undertaking like the railways can undertake a scheme of that type of enforcing telescopic rates where longer haulages are involved, we cannot expect the private shipping companies to undertake this part-financing of their cost of transport when long haulages by sea are involved. Therefore, in the ultimate analysis the rate of transport by sea works out to be higher than the rate which

is actually chargeable when coal is transported by rail.

It must be clearly understood that what the railways charge for these long haulages is not what the railways actually incur by way of cost. It is far from a commercial rate so far as railways are concerned. It will, therefore, not be correct to say that shipping companies as such are being subsidised. We are extending the principle that those who have to be supplied coal in this emergency by sea-route should not pay a rate which is higher than what they would otherwise pay if the transport were by rail. This little additional cost which consumers all over the country should pay is from that angle justified.

While on this, I would like to clarify one other point. The Members who come from States which are a little farther from the centres of production have urged that there should be a uniform coal price at all rail-heads whereas the Members who come from areas where coal is produced have voiced their objection to this scheme. I can understand this conflict of interests; and conscious as we are of this conflict of interests, we cannot go whole hog in making the price of coal uniform at all rail-heads. But steps such as, for instance, telescopic rates when movement by rail is involved and the element of subsidy to reduce the cost which would otherwise work out if it is transported by sea, are steps in the same direction.

I am mentioning this, because some hon. Members who on the one hand strongly advocated the scheme of enforcing uniform coal prices at all rail-heads have, in indirect manner, tried to criticise this element of subsidy to meet the additional cost of transport by sea. I feel that that criticism is not valid from those Members who have advocated a uniform price of coal at all rail-heads. It is true that we cannot accept that suggestion in its entirety. Still, when the rigour of

that is sought to be mitigated by introducing an element of concession by reducing the freight when long haulages by rail are involved, or when transport by sea has to be undertaken and the cost works out to be higher, then to bring it at a level with the cost of transport by rail, are steps in the same direction. Therefore, any criticism from those friends who are advocates of a uniform price of coal at all rail-heads, does not appear to be valid.

While on this question of movement of part of coal by sea, I would also like to touch upon another matter which has been mentioned by Shri Braj Raj Singh and also by Ch. Ranbir Singh, that is transport of coal by road. This matter has been engaging the attention of the Government, of the Coal Board, of the industry and also of the various consumers. We must clearly understand that there are certain limits with regard to the capacity of our road system and transport system to carry coal by road. It is not my intention to go into details. The present state of roads, the availability of trucks, the conditions of bridges, the over-crowding that already exists on certain sections of the road are factors with which hon. Members would be quite familiar. In spite of all these difficulties, there is at the moment a sizeable transport of coal by road. It must also be understood in this connection that movement of a commodity like coal over long distances is not feasible by road. The cost will work out so high that it will become prohibitive, and any attempt to subsidise the movement by road over long distances will land us into difficulties which it will not be easy for the coal industry and the coal consumer to bear. At the moment I think as much as roughly about 1½ to 2 million tons of coal is actually being moved by road; and the main centres of movement are the consumers in Bihar, Bengal and maybe, in certain parts of Orissa also. We have tried to help this movement as much

as we can within the physical limitations which I mentioned a moment ago. There were certain restrictions before, mainly with a view to ensuring that realisations of excise are not evaded. But we are trying to simplify that procedure so that the colliery owners may purchase their coupons for excise and when they load a truck they could issue the coupon to that person and credit the same amount. Some such simpler thing is sought to be worked out, so that difficulties in the movement of coal by road may be minimised. With all these steps that might be taken, there will always be limitations with regard to the movement of coal by road, particularly over longer distances.

Another fruitful avenue which may be thought of is the movement by rivers. In most of the other countries a good part of coal and iron ore moves by ships, by even country craft and the like, and river transport is being utilised. It is not my intention to go into the details of our transport system. But unfortunately we have inherited a transport system which paid very little attention to the utilisation of transport facilities which the rivers can provide. Surface transport has, by and large, been neglected. Now, we cannot do away with facts of geography. Our canal system, our bridges, etc. have been so designed that they have placed a physical limitation on transport of all these bulk commodities by our river system. Still, in the long range, this is a matter which requires consideration, and already some thought is being given to this aspect. But these are long-range problems.

We are faced with the immediate problem of short supply of coal at points which are situated at longer distances from the main centres of production. To supplement their requirements it is necessary to take some quick decision, and it is for this reason that we decided that the movement by sea should be stepped up. This, as I have already indicated,

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

will strengthen our coastal shipping, which is all to the good. It is likely to result in a reduction of the tariff rate of movement by sea which, again, is a step in the right direction. And, thirdly, by raising this excise duty the differential between the cost of transport of coal by sea and the cost of transport of coal by rail will be minimised to a fairly large extent and, therefore, the consumer at these distant points will not be hit. From whatever angle we may examine it, this was the most practical approach and we have, therefore, undertaken this measure.

The second count on which the additional subsidy is sought to be utilised is to finance the central ropeway scheme. Hon. Members from various parties have generally welcomed the stowing activities. That is as it should be. Both for safety in mines as well as for conservation purposes stowing is necessary. The question is to whether it should be subsidised and continue to be subsidised according to the existing system, or whether the central ropeway scheme should be adopted is a point about which there appeared to be some confusion in the minds of certain hon. Members. At the moment there are stowing subsidy schemes which have had the general approval of the House. Because of difficult mining conditions in certain areas it was found necessary, both from the angle of conservation as well as from the angle of safety, to encourage stowing. That meant additional expenditure. In a controlled commodity, when additional expenditure is involved, there should be willingness to face that in a practical manner, and we should not be carried away by sentimental ideas. If it were not a case of mineral development, then we could apply approximations, but we have to realise that mining conditions in various mines are not the same. There may be an open cast mine, there may be a deep mine, there

may be a gassy mine, or there may be a mine in which a large quantity of water may be gushing from underground strata, and so on. If we want to have some sort of a pattern of a controlled price, which appears to be the consensus of opinion in the House, then, either we take into consideration the difficult mining conditions and push up the prices of that coal also which is mined from easier areas, which may not be in the overall interest or adopt other methods; if we do the former, then the coal price has to be fixed at a level which approximates the difficult conditions in the various areas; then, certain cases would be left where the mining conditions are difficult, and these are there not on account of the creation of industry, either private or public, but on account of the freaks of nature; there can be more gas, or there can be more water, or the depth can be very much greater, or the seam may be very thin and so on. So, if we do not take into consideration these differentials, then, we should be prepared to face a situation where people will not be interested in producing coal from those areas where the cost of production comes out to be higher than the controlled price. So, other methods have to be adopted. I think the stowing subsidy is a step in the right direction.

Stowing is necessary both for the human aspect of safety as also from the angle of mineral conservation. Instead of giving a higher price for that coal, it is better that this additional expenditure is shared by others. That again is an approximation to the idea of uniform prices. So, that should be a welcome thing to those quarters which are advocates of a uniform price at all rail-heads.

If we recognise this as our basic approach, then it does not take long for us to come to the conclusion that a central ropeways scheme is more welcome than monetary help by way of subsidy. The great advantage is that sand will be conveyed over longer

leads; therefore, physically, it can be available; secondly, the administration of the subsidy may lead to some of the defects which were pointed out by some hon. Members, namely that people may make exaggerated claims, there may be malpractices and the like, but the possibility of such malpractices is very much reduced if there is a central ropeways scheme, so that we supply the thing physically rather than give monetary assistance.

So, if we recognise that stowing is a good thing, then stowing by means of a central ropeways scheme appears to be a much better proposition, as compared to administration of a monetary scheme. From whatever angle we may examine it, the scheme appears to be a reasonable one and it should be supported.

I think a fear was expressed by Shri T. B. Vittal Rao that most of the money would be consumed in this ropeways scheme or for stowing subsidy, and very little money would be left to subsidise the higher freight for haulage of coal by sea. That has been carefully looked into, and the quantum of excise duty will be so modulated that the quantum of subsidy on movement by sea will not be eaten into for the ropeways scheme. It is for that reason that an allocation of Rs. 3 crores has been indicated. But this point will be constantly kept in view, and it will be our earnest endeavour to ensure that both these things which are complementary to each other are not worked in any manner in which the one will hit the other or eat into the other.

I am grateful to the hon. Members belonging to all the parties, who have all welcomed the amendment relating to the protection of railway property.

I do not think that any other points remain. So, I commend my motion for the acceptance of the House.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: May I seek a clarification? In regard to the movement of coal by road, could not some provision be made by which, up to a specified distance from the coal mining

area, say, 200 miles or so, only movement by road would be permitted, and movement by rail would not be permitted? In this way, we could move more coal to these areas by road.

Sardar Swaran Singh: I am afraid that a general restriction of that type will not work. Let us be quite clear about one thing. Most of the big consuming centres like the steel plant at Durgapur, the steel plant of Indian Iron at Burnpur, the steel plant of Tatas, the Rourkela plant—Bhilai, of course, is at a distance of more than 200 miles—would be within 200 miles of the coal mines, and they are so organised that they will not be able to handle the trucks at all; their tippers and their bunkers are of such a type that movement by road is not possible. I can understand the suggestion for moving some quantities of coal by road for the general consumers like the industries and the like. I have already indicated that we encourage that, and the railways have put a minimum rate for movement by rail. That in itself is an indirect inhibition. We can examine this, but to apply a type of blanket restriction is not practical.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The only point is that more coal should be moved by road, so that there might not be any crisis in the future in regard to the movement of coal.

Sardar Swaran Singh: Generally, I have no quarrel with that proposition. That is a suggestion for action which will receive our very careful consideration.

Shri Tyagi: May I seek one information? May I know whether this levy of Rs. 4 per ton is going to be levied immediately, and if not, to what extent it is going to be levied now? The shortage of coal, etc. is more on account of the shortage of wagons. The hon. Minister has not expressed any views as to whether the Railway Ministry is doing something to add to the number of wagons required. If they are not adding to the number of wagons, will that not lead to a general rise in the price of coal all over the country?

Sardar Swaran Singh: As I have indicated, there are two aspects of this additional subsidy. One is for the ropeways scheme. That is independent of movement by sea. But, still, there is a part in this additional levy which is intended to be utilised for meeting the differential between the cost of transport by sea and the cost of transport by rail. The railways are doing their best to step up the manufacture of wagons and are improving their transport capacity, but I think that for some time to come movement by sea will have to be undertaken, but I would like to repeat that the railways are trying to do their best. There are particular bottle-necks; most of this trouble has been created on account of limited capacity for movement above Mughalsarai. We have discussed that so often that I do not want to repeat it. The increase in the number of wagons will not solve that, unless other measures like additional track, etc. are there; the railways have undertaken that also, and they hope that they will be able to step up very substantially the movement even above Mughalsarai. They hope that even in July, they will be able to have 200 more wagons a day.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: That is not a very substantial increase.

Sardar Swaran Singh: When the total is 1,900 today, 200 is certainly a substantial increase as compared with 1,900. After some time, they will be able to move even more.

Shri Tyagi: Would the hon. Minister undertake to reduce the levy as soon as the ropeways are ready, and as soon as there are enough wagons, and conveyance by ship is not required? Will that levy be given back to the consumers?

Sardar Swaran Singh: That is why the power that is sought to be taken is elastic, and that incidentally answers the objection which Shri Braj Raj Singh had. This is not a revenue-earning measure. I want to clarify

that point. This is a sort of equalisation in one form or the other.

Shri Tyagi: Our experience is that once any levy is enforced, it is never withdrawn. After all this work is done, after quite a large number of wagons become available and shipping is not needed and after the ropeways are also ready, will the hon. Minister reduce it to the present level?

Sardar Swaran Singh: We will try to reduce it, and if we do not, we will ask for specific approval of the House that now it is a revenue measure and not an equalisation measure.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I prophesy that they will not reduce it for ten years.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): More than 12 years ago, I was working on the Standing Finance Committee for Railways. I have read that in European countries transport by water has been found cheaper than transport by rail. From that point of view, how is it that in India we are not thinking in terms of developing water-ways rather than thinking of subsidy and persisting in dependence on railways only? Is there no possibility of developing water-ways in such a way as to make them a cheaper means of transport than the railways?

Sardar Swaran Singh: I have every sympathy with that view. In fact, I said something to that effect in the course of my remarks. But history and geography cannot be rewritten so soon. As I said, we have inherited a transport system which was essentially based on railways. Historically, our railway system originated as private companies. We were under foreign domination. I think the other means of transport were suppressed as compared to the

railways. That is an unhappy memory, but there is no harm in stating it.

Dr. Melkote: A betterment levy is being imposed on land revenue for the provision of facilities of water. Here ropeways are being created. Sand is taken for stowing and the mine-owners reap all this benefit by raising coal, for which they do not spend any money. I do not understand why this amount of money should not be raised from the mine-owners themselves. Will the Minister please reply to this?

Sardar Swaran Singh: Then you will have to raise the price of coal because it is a controlled commodity and the elements that go into the cost structure are carefully examined.

Mr. Speaker: The question is.

"That the Bill to amend the Coal Mines (Conservation and Safety) Act, 1952, be taken into consideration".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3—(Amendment of Section 6)

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I beg to move:

Page 1, line 14, for "four" substitute "two".

By my amendment, I am seeking to reduce the amount of excise duty from Rs. 4 to Rs. 2 per ton. I do not think they require such a huge amount in the initial stages. Whenever they do require it, the Minister can come to this House and ask for an increase in the excise duty.

When I was speaking during the consideration stage, I said that the

whole Act, as it stood, required revision by means of a comprehensive Bill brought forward. Anyway, I feel that Rs. 2 per ton is sufficient to cover the expenditure this year. With the Coal Board, there are already this was at the tune of Rs. 2.76 crores. This was at the beginning of April 1960. I do not know how much it is now. But it is not going to be less.

With regard to the other aspect of the subsidy, I want that out of these Rs. 2, Re. 1 should be definitely kept apart for subsidising movement of coal to the remote regions. When I asked a question regarding the operating ratio on the Southern Railway and wanted to know why it was high, the Minister replied that they paid Rs. 65 per ton on coal as against the average of Rs. 40 per ton. The transport of coal by the rail-cum-sea route is a factor in the increased cost. The factories in the south or the West coast have to pay an addition of Rs. 26 per ton by way of freight. Then again there is this cess which will be added and which they will have to pay. Therefore, the amount of subsidy that is going to be given should be clearly mentioned.

As I said, we have got Rs. 2.76 crores at the disposal of the Coal Board, plus Re. 1 per ton excise which is already there which should be utilised for stowing purposes. The other Re. 1 out of the excise of Rs. 2 which I have proposed should be set apart for subsidising coal transported to the south and the western coast. Otherwise, the cost will be enormous. These are the figures which have been given by the Minister.

Therefore, I would strongly urge upon the Minister to see that this excise duty is reduced. If he wants more money, let him come forward with a comprehensive Bill so that we can exercise proper check and counter-check wherever we give subsidy to the mine-owners.

There is another point. I am told that a new discovery has been made

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

in Poland regarding the transport of coal. They pulverise it, mix it with water and send it through pipelines. This is a new process. I am told the economics of it have been worked out and these go to prove that haulage through pipeline is less than by railway or by sea. That is their experience. Only recently I read about it in some magazine. Let the Coal Board also try to find out what this process is. There are so many delegations being sent abroad. They may go into this question also.

My suggestion regarding subsidy should be taken into serious consideration because the Minister has ruled out once and for all the suggestion that there should be uniform coal prices.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment moved is before the House.

श्री बजराम सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मंत्री महोदय ने जो कुछ कहा, उस से ऐसा प्रतीत होता था कि किसी भी सूरत में वे डेढ़ रुपया प्रति टन से अधिक एक्साइज ड्यूटी बढ़ाने वाले नहीं हैं, किन्तु आज जो आंकड़े उन्होंने पेश किये उन में कहा गया है कि वे ७ करोड़ रु० लेना चाहते हैं एक्साइज से। इस के बाद उन्होंने कहा कि १ रु० २० नये पैसे से ले कर १ रु० ५० नये पैसे के बीच में वे एक्साइज ड्यूटी बढ़ायेंगे। अगर इस को हिसाब में ले लिया जाय और जो आज लगी हुई है उस को भी लिया जाय तो किसी भी सूरत में एक्साइज ढाई रुपये से ज्यादा नहीं पड़ती है। मैं नहीं समझता कि जब हिसाब से ढाई रुपया ही आता है तो उसमें चार रुपये तक बढ़ाने की क्या जरूरत है। वे एक साल का हिसाब लगा रहे हैं। वे चार रुपये की व्यवस्था अभी कर लेंगे और उस के बाद सदन के सामने न आयेंगे। यह जो नोटिफिकेशन जारी होने वाला है १ रु० २० नये पैसे या १ रु० ५६ नये पैसे तक बढ़ाने का, उस के बाद सदन के सामने उन का आना उचित नहीं होगा।

हमारे मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि यह कोई पैसे लेने वाला मेजर नहीं है, कोई ऐसा कानन नहीं है जो कि बजट प्रस्तावों के अन्तर्गत आता हो। तो फिर उतनी ही व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये जितनी आवश्यकता हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री जी ने जो चार रुपये की एक्साइज रखी है उस की इस वक्त आवश्यकता नहीं है। इस क्षिये यदि चार रुपये के बजाये दो रुपये को ही वे मान लें तो अच्छा है। लेकिन अगर वे दो रुपये न भी कर सकें तो भी ७ करोड़ रुपये जो वे इकट्ठा कर रहे हैं वह ढाई रुपये से आ जाता है ज्यादा की कोई आवश्यकता है ही नहीं। मैं समझता हूँ कि वे चार रुपये के बजाय ढाई रुपये मान लेंगे। यह एक ऐसा सुझाव है जिसे न मानने का, मैं समझता हूँ, मंत्री जी के पास कोई कारण नहीं हो सकता।

Sardar Swaran Singh: There is a distinction between the quantum of levy that is sought to be imposed and the ceiling that is sought to be raised. I have already indicated that the intention is not to utilise this measure for raising revenue. The specific purposes have also been indicated by me; and I would like to repeat them. They are:—

- (1) to try to subsidise the movement by sea; and
- (2) an effort to finance the rope-way scheme.

I do not want to elaborate these points. Therefore, there should be no apprehension in the mind of the hon. Member that Government will utilise this for raising revenue.

I have every sympathy with the view that was put forward both by Shri Braj Raj Singh and by Shri Vittal Rao that there should be some quantum of subsidy. It is precisely for that purpose we do this. But it may not be wise to earmark any specific part of it to subsidise the move by sea.

As regards the general question that he has raised that there should be a quantum of subsidy when haulages over longer distances are involved, I would like to re-state what I mentioned a moment ago that already we are attempting to subsidise the movement of coal over longer distances. That is there in the freight structure of the Rail movement of coal itself. We do not want to hit any person who happens to be using coal which is moved by sea. So, it is a very simple measure. Whereas in the case of Railways, being the public exchequer, we could bear that burden and the Railways could be asked to give that concealed subsidy, we cannot do that in the case of the shipping companies. Therefore, this is the specific purpose for which this additional excise will be raised.

As regards the general question which Shri Vittal Rao raised namely that there should be a general amendment of the Act and that we should have a second look at the Act, I can assure him that this matter is engaging our attention. There are two ways. One is to wait for a general overhaul and keep this as part of that. But this was a specific measure and I wanted the sanction of the House—and the reactions of the House—with regard to this specific measure. This does not mean that by voting this you will be depriving yourselves of the opportunity of having a look at the legislative measure as a whole. We are examining the provisions and it may be necessary to undertake comprehensive legislation. But, this being a specific purpose and a sort of a taxation, it was necessary for me to come before the House and to ask for this relaxation.

There is no risk in giving this ceiling. But, with this assurance that the actual quantum will be changed from time to time in such a manner that it is utilised for this specific purpose—unless I come to the House and say that it is for another purpose—with this assurance, I hope the House

House would agree to the ceiling as provided in this measure.

Shri Tyagi: Will the hon. Minister see to it that there is no speculative rise in the general price of coal to consumers on account of this?

Sardar Swaran Singh: Actually, it is the other way round because the movement of coal will increase; and at the points where there is shortage, on account of this element of subsidy, the price will remain low.

Shri Tyagi: The experience of the country has been that whenever there has been a tax levy, whether logically the prices are to be raised or not, the psychology is to start raising the prices saying that because of the levy the prices have gone up. That is what the speculators do. You must have some power to control speculative rise in prices.

Sardar Swaran Singh: Luckily, this being a controlled commodity, that type of speculation is not likely to be there. Secondly, it is a commodity which has to be moved before it is utilised. So, these are the two powerful instruments of control, and I do not anticipate any speculative tendencies in this.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I will put the amendment to the House.

The Question is:

Page 1, line 14,—

for "four" substitute "two". (1).

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I will put all the clauses together, clauses 3, 4, 5 and 1.

The question is:

"That Clause 3 to 5, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 3 to 5, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title were added to the Bill.

Sardar Swaran Singh: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: What I want to impress upon the Minister is this. The Coal Board is constituting so many committees like the Technical Committee, the Advisory Committee, the Stowing Committee and various other Committees. In these committees, generally, the representatives of the workers are not at all included. We are coming to a stage where there should be full participation of labour in management at all stages. So, I would request the Minister to see that the representatives of labour are included in these committees which are constituted, because those who are actively connected with production will be able to give some advice which will be useful. If they want technical men, the workers' representatives will send technical men.

13.47 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANATHA RAO in the Chair]

Our thinking has changed so much that what was not thought of a few years ago is going to be done now. A few years ago we were urging about Worker Inspectors as in the United Kingdom. Everybody used to think that these workers' representative; were not technically qualified so how could there be Worker Inspectors. Government is now suggesting that there will be Worker Inspectors and the Mines Act is going to be amended. For the success of the Stowing and various other committees of the Coal Board, there should be full association of labour.

Now, we have armed the Minister with a piece of legislation which is going to give him a fund of Rs. 20 crores or a little more because our production is going up. We have set for ourselves a target of 97 million tons during the Third Plan. Many of us still feel that that target is not sufficient. Whatever it is, the Planners and the Government have put it down at 97 million tons. I want that steps should be taken to achieve

this target in physical production, not as the Minister says in this House, 'We have achieved the rated capacity.' That is not the way we should talk of achieving our targets. For example, in the NCDC whenever we ask for the achievement of physical targets, we are told that we have achieved the rate of production. Let the hon. Minister see that the 97 million tons which has been set as the target for the Third Plan is really achieved. Not only that, he should also see that this target is surpassed.

With these words I support the Bill.

श्री बजरंग सिंह : मैं केवल दो आश्वासन चाहूंगा माननीय मंत्री महोदय से। एक तो यह कि जब वह एक्साइज की दर १ रुपया २० नये पैसे या १ रुपया ५० नये पैसे से अधिक बढ़ायेंगे, जैसा कि उन्होंने कहा था, तो वे इस सदन के सम्मुख सदन की प्रतिक्रिया जानने के लिए आवेंगे, और इस साल इससे ज्यादा दर नहीं बढ़ायी जायेगी, और दूसरे यह कि जो कोयला क्षेत्र के २०० मील के भीतर के स्थान हैं उन स्थानों पर जहां भी संभव हो सके, सरकारी कारखानों को छोड़ कर जहां कि यह सम्भव नहीं है, कोयले का यातायात सड़क से किया जायेगा और अभी अगर सड़क द्वारा १५ या २० लाख टन कोयला ढोया जाता है तो उसे बढ़ा कर ४०-५० लाख टन करने का प्रयत्न किया जायेगा।

Sardar Swaran Singh: The suggestion that the viewpoint of the workers should be ascertained is a welcome one. It is not quite clear to me as to how we should do that. But that is a good suggestion and it will be my endeavour to devise some method under which it may be possible to derive benefit from the experience of the workers. I have every hope that the leaders connected with the various unions would co-operate with us. The object is non-controversial; what is the best way of stepping up production? That type of spirit would be brought about in the discharge of this heavy

responsibility. There are a large number of committees of various types and I am not quite clear as to whether any fruitful purpose would be served by associating the workers' representatives in all of them. I agree in principle that there should be some method of ascertaining the viewpoint of the worker. Some method can be easily thought of by inviting them or by having discussions so that their viewpoint may be known. The endeavour is a common one.

There was this question about the realisation of the targets. We are at the commencement of the Third Plan. With all the shortfalls, we should have a little greater confidence. It is true that physically we have not been able to produce throughout the twelve months a rate of production which would give about 60 million tons. But there is the fact that during the last quarter, every month, we have been producing a quantity of coal which, if multiplied by 12, would give you that rate which is much more than the capacity. That is to say, the physical production of coal was that much in the last three months. Therefore, we should have greater confidence that we can go up to that level of production. It is no doubt correct that our tasks in the Third Plan are much larger if we are to go up to 97 million tons. That means that in a period of ten years, we are planning to step it up three times. When we imagine the level of production at the commencement of the Second Plan and when we take into account that the level at that time was achieved after a period which extended to over a century, we will know the magnitude of the task. We are now attempting, in ten years, to step up the production by three times of what it was at the commencement of the Second Plan. It is a very huge task. But I think the steps that we have taken, organisational, training and the like, should create confidence in this House that given the requisite

support the NCDC as also the private industry are well set to achieve this target which we hope to finalise, so far as the Third Plan is concerned.

There was reference to the movement of coal by road. I have already said that we will try to see that as much coal as can possibly be moved by road is moved by road. With regard to the other points, I may say this. Certainly whenever there is an increase in the excise duty, the notification will be placed on the Table of the House and the hon. Members who want to raise a discussion would be most welcome.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Within a year you will not raise it beyond Rs. 150 nP.

Sardar Swaran Singh: I can say that. During the next year our intention is that; it may actually turn out to be less than that sum of Rs. 150. This is the maximum that is contemplated for the next year.

Mr. Chairman: The question is.

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

13.55 hrs.

DELHI SHOPS AND ESTABLISHMENTS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Chairman: We will take up the next item.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): How much time?

Mr. Chairman: Three hours.

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): It may not take more than thirty minutes.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): But Shri Banerjee is there.

Shri Abid Ali: He is welcome to speak.

Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Delhi Shops and Establishments Act, 1954, as passed by