

कि भाई आप कुछ खयाल में पड़े हुए हैं।
 आप का यह विचार है।

अभी परसों तरसों युगोस्लाव के जल्से
 की बात है कि पोलैंड के ऐम्बैसेडर मेरे पास
 आये . . .

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member must
 conclude now.

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप: मुझे मालूम नहीं था
 कि वह पोलैंड के ऐम्बैसेडर हैं उन्होंने
 मुझ से हाथ मिलाया और फिर उन्होंने मेरे
 बारे में कहा कि

He is the most courageous man in the
 country.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य
 अपना स्थान ग्रहण करें।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : खैर जैसी आप को
 आज्ञा। वैसे कहना तो मुझे बहुत कुछ था।

सीवी ही बात यह है कि चीन, पाकिस्तान
 और सीलोन के मसले को मैं हल कर सकता हूँ
 अगर आप मुझे मेहरबानी करके मदद करें
 और मैं यह भी यकीन दिला दूँ कि उसकी
 तारीफ सरकार के हाथ में रहेगी। मैं तो एक
 सेवक की तरह से सेवा करूँगा।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Mi-
 nister will reply tomorrow.

16-14 hrs.

*DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY
 GRANTS (GENERAL), 1961-62

Mr. Speaker: The House will now
 take up Supplementary Demands for
 Grants (General). Three hours have
 been allotted for this.

DEMAND NO. 2—INDUSTRIES

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to
 the President to defray the

charges which will come in course
 of payment during the year ending
 the 31st day of March, 1962, in
 respect of 'Industries'."

DEMAND NO. 19-A—DADRA AND NAGAR
 HAVELI AREA

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 21,28,000 be granted
 to the President to defray the
 charges which will come in course
 of payment during the year ending
 the 31st day of March, 1962 in
 respect of 'Dadra and Nagar Haveli
 Area'."

DEMAND NO. 34—GRANTS-IN-AID TO
 STATES

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to
 the President to defray the charges
 which will come in course of pay-
 ment during the year ending the
 31st day of March, 1962, in respect
 of 'Grants-in-Aid to States'."

DEMAND NO. 41—ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to
 the President to defray the charges
 which will come in course of pay-
 ment during the year ending the
 31st day of March, 1962, in respect
 of 'Animal Husbandry'."

DEMAND NO. 60—MISCELLANEOUS
 DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER
 THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not
 exceeding Rs. 1000 be granted to
 the President to defray the charges
 which will come in course of pay-
 ment during the year ending the
 31st day of March, 1962 in respect
 of 'Miscellaneous Departments and
 Expenditure under the Ministry
 of Home Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 90—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS

Failure to determine the cost per ton of the steel produced in the three Steel Plants

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 54,00,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

DEMAND NO. 132—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES AND FUEL

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,75,00,000 in respect of 'capital outlay of the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel' be reduced by Rs. 100." (13)

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,75,00,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel'."

Inability of the Hindustan Steel Limited to repay the loan advanced by the Government or even to pay interest thereon

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,75,00,000 in respect of 'capital outlay of the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel' be reduced by Rs. 100." (14)

DEMAND NO. 137—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,83,00,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Transport and Communications'."

Capital structure of the three steel plants

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,75,00,000 in respect of 'capital outlay of the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel' be reduced by Rs. 100." (15)

Hon. Members desiring to move cut motions may do so now.

Extravagant revised estimates for the three Steel Plants

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,75,00,000 in respect of 'capital outlay of the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel' be reduced by Rs. 100." (12)

Failure of the steel plants to fulfil the targets of production of steel ingots and finished steel products

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,75,00,000 in respect of 'capital outlay of the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel' be reduced by Rs. 100." (16)

Futility of wasting more of tax-payers' money in financing the Hindustan Steel Limited

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,75,00,000 in respect of 'capital outlay of the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel' be reduced by Rs. 100." (17)

Failure of the Air India International Corporation to compete with other foreign air services

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the Demand for a Supplementary Grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,83,00,000 in respect of other 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Transport and Communications' be reduced by Rs. 100." (18)

Reasons for the financial difficulties of the Air India International Corporation

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:

"That the Demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,83,00,000 in respect of other 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Transport and Communications' be reduced by Rs. 100." (20)

The Government is seeking approval of this House for supplementary demands of Rs. 10 crores and I propose to confine my observations to two of those demands, one made by the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel and the other which relates to Delhi capital outlay.

With regard to the demand asked for by the Ministry of Steel, for a sum of Rs. 675 lakhs for purchase of shares in the Hindustan Steel Limited, I desire to invite the attention of the House to the growing expenditure on

these three concerns, to which there seems to be no end. This House will recollect that originally when administrative sanction for the three steel plants was given, a comparatively small figure was mentioned. I believe it was in the vicinity of Rs. 353 crores for the three steel plants. Now in demand No. 132 on page 21, the revised estimate of the cost of construction of the three steel plants including the ancillaries has been placed at Rs. 663 crores.

16-36 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Therefore, the first point I desire to make is that there must be a limit to the extravagant revised estimates of the three steel plants. It is not enough that the House is told day in and day out that the three steel plants constitute the core of the third Plan or for the matter of that of the second Plan. This House must know definitely where this extravagance of Hindustan Steel Limited will end. Even with Rs. 663 crores which will be spent, appears that there is absolutely no limit to the expenditure still in sight and I would call upon the Minister in charge of this demand to explain to the House....

An Hon. Member: The Minister is not there.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: The Deputy Minister of Finance is there. She is responsible for it and she will have to answer that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are Lady Ministers not recognised?

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): They are very well-recognised, but they should reply to the points.

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha): I am writing down the points.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: She is very attentive.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): She always replies very well.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us wait and listen.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): May I suggest that some time may be fixed for this?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not debarred him or precluded him; he will have an opportunity.

Hon. Members may send in the numbers of the cut motions that they want to move within the next 10 minutes.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: In this connection, I would also like to invite the attention of the House to the fact that the capital at present of the Hindustan Steel Limited is Rs. 300 crores and a loan of the like amount has been advanced by the Government to the Hindustan Steel Limited. This House will recollect that in their 23rd report, the Estimates Committee very clearly stated that not only the three steel plants will not be able to repay the principal amount, viz., Rs. 300 crores, but they will not be able to pay even the interest on it. I ask whether without any regard for the waste of taxpayers' money, this House should keep on pouring more money into the steel plants without our being told as to exactly what the state of affairs is.

Today the demand is for Rs. 675 lakhs for purchase of shares in the Hindustan Steel Limited. May I know from the Minister whether the capital structure is proposed to be altered gradually. It is necessary that this House should be told what exactly is the ratio between the capital of the company and the loans advanced to it and whether there is any proposal to alter that in future. The note presented by the Government in justification of this demand reveals a more disconcerting picture. They say, originally it was intended that this amount would be made up from the sale proceeds of the products of the

company. But the sale proceeds of the products have not fetched the requisite amount, I, therefore, ask how this House is being called upon to invest more and more money in what seems to be a bottomless sink of the Hindustan Steel Limited.

Sir, there is another point to which I would like to draw the attention of the House, that though the steel plants have been with us for quite a long time even now the hon. Minister is not in a position to tell us what the cost per ton of steel in got will be. I do not know whether the hon. Minister for steel proposes to treat it as a secret which it is not possible for him in the interest of the country to divulge! But the fact remains that perhaps the steel produced by the three steel plants is costlier than imported steel, and unless the hon. Minister makes a categorical reply to this accusation that the plants are being run most inefficiently and the steel produced there is most expensive, I for one am not prepared to vote a single rupee to the Hindustan Steel company.

It is high time that the nation was taken into confidence. It is not enough that we should be told that we have three plants and a proposal for a fourth one until we know exactly how efficiently our plants are functioning. Sir, by now, according to the original schedule on the basis of which this House was persuaded to sanction the three plants, we should have had them running by now at their full stature, but we are still told that the production is far from the physical targets. When are these physical targets going to be reached, one does not know. Therefore, I say that unless the House is taken into confidence regarding these matters as to what the production is, as to why it is that the production is so low and it has fallen so short of the physical targets, and as to what the cost per ton of steel is, I think the House would be well advised to reject this demand.

There is another point to which I would like to draw your attention and that relates to Demand No. 138—Delhi Capital Outlay—on pages 26 and 27. Sir, it is a very peculiar story which is revealed in the note presented by the Government to the House. It relates to the 350 acres of land which was originally acquired for one of the important schemes by the Delhi Improvement Trust and which was subsequently taken over by the Ministry of Rehabilitation for resettlement of displaced persons. Sir, when the land was acquired the Land Acquisition Collector, Delhi, awarded compensation for this land at the rate of 14 annas per square yard and when the matter was taken to the Tribunal the compensation was enhanced from 14 annas to Rs. 5. Now the matter is still under litigation. But I am told that this very land has been sold or auctioned to the refugees at prices varying from Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 a square yard. Therefore, I should like to know from the Government what the policy of the Government is. If this is not downright profiteering in land, what else is it? Just because the Government chooses to pocket the profit, profiteering does not shed its character as such. The land which was acquired for which the Land Acquisition Collector awarded 14 annas per square yard as compensation and which was enhanced to Rs. 5 per square yard by Tribunal is sold at Rs. 30 and Rs. 40 per square yard. Sir, the Government owes an explanation to the public as to why this disparity exists between the acquisition price of the land and the price which the Government charged to the displaced persons or whomsoever they may be to whom this land was sold.

Sir, there are several points on which I would have liked to invite the attention of the House, but I think these are two outstanding questions on which an explanation is called for and I hope the hon. Ministers in charge will care to reply to these points precisely.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I shall confine

my remarks to Demands Nos. 34, 41 and 132. As regards Demand No. 34, I am extremely happy to read that there is a scheme to give merit scholarships for children of school teachers for university education. This we are told is on the basis of the recommendation made in a conference of the State Education Ministers held at Delhi in November, 1960. Under the scheme a total of 500 fresh scholarships will be awarded annually during the Third Plan period. These will be distributed among the various States in proportion to the primary and secondary school teachers in a State subject to each State getting at least 5 scholarships if the quota of that State is less than five. This is really a very good scheme. But you can imagine, Sir, what these five scholarships would mean in a State. The teachers, whether primary or secondary school teachers, would not have demanded scholarships for giving education to their children, but they are in utter distress, their financial condition excites horror and pity that they are compelled to ask for such things. Sir, these teachers, these primary and secondary school teachers are supposed to be the builders of our nation, but the builders of the nation do not build anything for themselves. That is the condition of our secondary and primary school teachers, and when we are considering the question of granting merit scholarships for children of school teachers, I feel that there should have been some sizeable quota for which the teachers would have felt thankful.

My other submission in this connection is, the children of school teachers are not even granted freeship in many schools, at least in my State. I do not know whether this is being done everywhere. But my feeling is that at least there should be some standing instructions that the children of teachers should be exempted from fee and they should be granted free-ship. That is the minimum that we can do for school teachers who are supposed to be the builders of the nation. Of course, I welcome this step

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

though the quota of five scholarships is very meagre. I do not know which teacher's son is going to get this scholarship, unless his son is known to some son of a big man in the Education Ministry as otherwise it is difficult for anyone to get the scholarship.

Then I come to Demand No. 41 and that is about animal husbandary. I have taken the monopoly of Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava on this subject in this House, but I also feel that Government has not paid enough attention to this problems.

An Hon. Member: Are you stepping into his shoes?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No; but if the shoe is good and it does not pinch I do not mind. The point is, this time I had an opportunity to visit certain areas where I saw how badly the cattle were treated. Even fodder was not available for cattle in those areas. Certain fields have been taken over by various Ministries with the result that, what we call, grazing land has been acquired by them and there is no place where the cattle could be allowed to graze. This is the time when we want to improve our cattle. If we want to have well bred cattle, it is not enough that we try only for that but we should also see that the existing cattle is looked after in a better way.

Then I come to Demand No. 132 and that is about the steel plants. My hon. friend Shri Bharucha has very ably said that there should be no extravagance in the name of the expansion of steel plants. I am one of those who ardently support the expansion of steel plants or the public sector projects. According to the Prime Minister, nowadays these various public sector projects, our steel plants or the HAAL or the HEL are places of pilgrimage. But unfortunately, these places of pilgrimage are dominated by those pandas who do not understand what those places of pilgrimage are. I have visited them and I have seen

chaotic wastage in certain places, how promotion is given to various people and all that. If one is the son of a Planning Commission member or the son of a Minister or even a Member of Parliament, I am sure he will get preference. He may be qualified or may not be qualified, but I am sure he gets preference over others. I have sent a big memorandum to the hon. Minister and I would request him to go through it. People are losing their initiative to work in these public sector projects, in Rourkela, in Durgapur etc.

What is happening? There is labour trouble daily. With this particular pace and with this industrial unrest spreading over that particular belt, I am sure the steel plants will not be able to function well. The cause may be deep-rooted, because in none of these steel plants, neither in Bhilai, nor in Rourkela or Durgapur, the labour legislations are being implemented. They are being implemented in certain ways. This Rourkela steel plant is an example where all labour laws have been flouted by the authorities. I feel that before we try to expand these steel plants—it is certainly necessary that we should have a fourth steel plant and I am all for it—we should see to it that the existing plants set an example for the new plants yet to come into being. Now the steel plants are seats of extravagance. It can be checked provided there is a thorough probe into the working of the steel plants,—promotion, appointment, functioning etc. This is necessary because now there is scathing criticism of the public sector. There are people who are against the expansion of public sector and they say that public sector means more scandal. I am all for public sector and I want to give a crushing reply to those who are against the expansion of public sector. But if I am to defend the public sector, I must have with me a clean record of the public sector projects. So, I still feel that a thorough probe is necessary before this House grants another Rs. 6 crores.

I agree with the view of Shri Bharucha about the cost of steel. What is the cost of steel at present? When people gave land for the construction of the Bhilai steel plant, they were told "if you gave this land, you will get your agricultural implements cheaper because the steel project will supply cheaper steel". Now some of those villagers ask us "Have you seen our plight? We have lost our land. We did not get any compensation. We were given the promise that we will get cheaper agricultural implements, but even that promise has not been fulfilled." That can be done only if the price of steel comes down. Of course, it is less than the cost of the imported steel. Even then the entire price policy is controlled by the two big firms, TISCO and IISCO.

I am sorry to say that even now those two companies are trying to persuade the Government to fix the price which suits them. So, it will be difficult for the steel plants to suggest any reduction in prices. Those companies do it so very nicely. In today's newspapers I came across another balance sheet of a company which gave some money to the Congress party. I do not know why they are not refusing it. Because, if they give Rs. 1 lakh to the Congress party, they will rob the labourers of that particular factory of more than that amount.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: This Rs. one lakh is only for Tata Chemicals.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Yes, for Tata Chemicals. Probably, Tata Iron and Steel will give Rs. 5 lakhs. Then there are TOMCO and other concerns which will give money. I do not grudge their giving money or the other party receiving it. But the money must not influence or change the policy of the Government. When the hon. Prime Minister was in Kanpur, he was given Rs. 2½ lakhs. Then he said that if anybody wants to pay the Congress party and also other parties—he meant the Swatantras—he is not going to be influenced by that. The Prime Minister refused the

money by saying "I am the Prime Minister of this country. I do not want to receive money from you" but money poured into his pocket, unfortunately. He resisted it with all his might. I was personally listening to the speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why did the hon. Member not help the Prime Minister?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I wrote to him a letter.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: All these things are not relevant.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But the hon. Member has got an inimitable way of saying correct things in a different manner, in a reverse way.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I will not say anything more, if you so desire.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: About the Supplementary Demands the Speaker has already given a ruling fixing the scope. This goes beyond the scope of that ruling.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Why should the Deputy Minister get nervous? The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel is there.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I am not nervous. I am only pointing out that he must refer only to the point.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha has not to answer this point. I have never put her in an awkward position.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I know that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The particular donation taken by the Prime Minister has shaken the very foundation of democracy in this country.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should be happy about that. Now he should refer to the cut motions.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I wanted to refer to the retention price of steel and the loans advanced to TISCO and ISCO. I want the price of steel to be reduced. With these words, I would request the hon. Minister and the Deputy Minister to go through these demands and our observations and accept the cut motion of my hon. friend, Shri Tangamani.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): Are we having discussion on railway accidents at 5 o'clock?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Probably not.

Working of the National Scholarship Scheme on the basis of merit

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the Demand for a supplementary grant of a sum of not exceeding Rs. 1,000 in respect of 'Grants-in-aid to States' be reduced by Rs. 100." (5)

Scope and working of the Institute of Applied Manpower Research

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the Demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 in respect of Miscellaneous Departments and expenditure under 'the Ministry of Home Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100." (10)

Failure to utilise the Indian potential for manufacture of Lighthouse materials

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the Demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 54,00,000 in respect of 'Lighthouses and lightships' be reduced by Rs. 100." (11)

Failure to add Viscounts in addition to Boeing to meet the increasing demand.

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:

"That the Demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not ex-

ceeding Rs. 2,83,00,000 in respect of other Capital Outlay, of 'the Ministry of Transport and Communications' be reduced by Rs. 100." (21)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All the cut motions are before the House.

Shri Tangamani: In addition to the four demands, to which I have moved cut motions, I would also like to refer to Demand No. 19, with your leave. That demand relates to the State of Pondicherry. They have not come here with supplementary demands for voting and Rs. 4,000 is only charged from the provisional account. But the point that has been raised here is of vital importance and I thought that I should make a reference to this. The supplementary appropriation of Rs. 4,000 is required to meet the expenditure of a decree awarded by the Supreme Court of India in three writ petitions filed under article 32 of the Constitution by a firm in Pondicherry. This has arisen as a result of the confusion that is still prevalent in Pondicherry and we are not yet sure as to which of the laws in force in India are now applicable to Pondicherry. There are certain laws which are extended to Pondicherry, like certain industrial laws and laws relating to customs, but all of them have not been extended, and that is why this confusion has arisen which has really resulted in serious dislocation and has created a lot of furore in the administration also. The Government of India imposed certain duties which were revoked ultimately by the Supreme Court. All these things go to show that now at least it is necessary that all the laws in this country are extended to Pondicherry and to the other former French possession and at least the repeated demand that the Supreme Court should be clothed with appellate powers concerning matters pertaining to Pondicherry should be taken up. I want to know from the hon. Minister how far we have

advanced in the matter of legal relationship and appeals and other things, so far as Pondicherry is concerned. That is the limited purpose for which I want to refer to Demand No. 19.

A reference was already made by the hon. Member who preceded to me to Demand No. 34. There are two aspects in this scholarship scheme. The hon. Member referred to the scholarship scheme which applies to children of school teachers. There is also a national scholarship scheme, irrespective of the fact whether they are children of the primary school teachers or not. It is a welcome thing that during the Third Plan period 2,400 scholarships will be awarded annually. The number of scholarships as a result of the results of the matriculation or high school leaving certificate will be 1,800 while those to be awarded on the results of the pre-university, intermediate and first year degree course students will be 400 and 200 respectively. This will be distributed among the States on the basis of enrolment at the relevant stages of education in the different States. Here I would like to give a note of warning. Even in the case of scholarships for students belonging to the scheduled and other backward classes, it shall be on the basis of population. In other words, even the students who were able to secure more marks from a particular State were denied scholarships whereas students who did not secure so many marks were able to secure scholarships from the other states. The distribution was on the basis of population. I feel that that should not apply in the case of the National Scholarship Scheme. As far as possible we must try to centralise it. The note is not very clear, but I would like the merit scholarships to be on an all-India basis and not on the basis of the States.

The Government should also request the various State Governments to award these merit scholarships. It is a pitiable thing that students generally belonging to poor families were

not able to get scholarships because there were no merit scholarships either on an all-India basis or on a State basis. There are only certain scholarships peculiar to certain colleges or institutions. That is why, while welcoming this I would like this scholarship to be on an all-India basis and not on a State basis.

The other cut motion relates to the working of the Institute of Applied Manpower Research. I must frankly admit that we are in the dark about manpower research. Under Demand No. 60 this is what they say:

"Manpower research provides an objective basis for the formulation of Government policies and programmes for promoting economic growth. Some amount of research into manpower problems has been and is being done by departmental agencies but its scope is limited. It is, however, necessary to view manpower problems in an integrated way covering not only the requirements of various Government departments but also those of Government Corporations and Companies, other corporate bodies and the private sector. Considering the range and complexity of manpower problems and the need for research on a continuing basis into important aspects of this problem, it has been decided to set up an 'Institute of Applied Manpower Research' functioning outside the Government, but in close association with Government agencies."

I am not very clear as to how this is going to function and what the experience has been. The object appears to be a very laudable one. We have already voted Rs. 69 lakhs so we would like to know how this manpower research organisation independent of the Government functioning today.

[Shri Tangamani]

My other two cut motions relate to the same Ministry, namely, the Transport and Communications Ministry. One is to Demand No. 90 which deals with lighthouses and the purchase that we are going to make from a Yugoslave firm which is expected to cost about Rs. 156 lakhs. We are voting Rs. 54 lakhs for this. My purpose in moving this cut motion briefly is this. Lighthouse materials are today manufactured in the Bharat Electronics Limited, Bangalore. I would like to know how far we are utilising Bharat Electronics in the matter of manufacturing materials which are required for lighthouse purposes. Twice it has been brought to the notice of this House that Bharat Electronics are not able to go into production according to the rated capacity. How far Ministries like the Transport and Communications Ministry which would require materials for this purpose are utilising a public concern like the Bharat Electronics? It is that point that I wish to make. Although I am aware that this particular demand for Rs. 54 lakhs is not directly connected with that, I would like to know how far even for this project the materials which are required for lighthouses will be manufactured at Bharat Electronics.

My last point is regarding Demand No. 137. Under that Demand we are now voting Rs. 2,83,00,000. The main point is this. It is stated here as follows:—

“The Air India International Corporation acquired 3 Boeing 707 Jet aircraft in 1960 at a total cost of Rs. 11:50 crores. One more Boeing 707 aircraft was purchased in 1961 at a cost of Rs. 4 crores. As air transport is a highly competitive business and the Corporation has to compete with well established international air companies, it has become necessary for the Air India International Corporation to go in for all Jet operations replacing the existing piston-engined Super Constellations alto-

gether. Accordingly, the Corporation with the approval of the Government have decided to purchase two more Boeing 707 aircraft for which necessary orders have been placed.”

The amount that is now required is for the two Boeing 707s. Without going into the further explanation which they have given, my humble submission will be that we have not reached a stage where every aircraft will have to be replaced by Boeing 707s. The question was also raised here that many of these aircraft are grounded. We find in the papers that many of these aircrafts are grounded. This morning one of my questions. . .

The Deputy Minister of Civil Aviation (Shri Mohiuddin): The hon. Member is confusing the Viscounts with Boeings.

Shri Tangamani: I am not confusing the Viscounts with Boeings.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I hope they would not clash against each other even then.

Shri Tangamani: I am merely saying that instead of spending so much money on Boeing 707s the time has come for us to replace many of our Viscounts and old Skymasters and other planes by Viscounts. That is the point.

In this connection I would like to mention that the IAC service from Bombay to Colombo has not been taken over by the Air India International but is still being run by the Indian Airlines Corporation. The Indian Airlines Corporation and the Air India International are more or less working in close conjunction. Even as late as the 15th November one of the IAC's four-engined Viscounts met with an accident. Fortunately for us none of the 39 passengers or five crews were injured. As my hon. friend was saying, I was just not on the plane because I took

the next plane to Colombo. The point I would like to make is that in the Indian Airlines Corporation as also in the Air India International there is need for a larger number of Viscount planes and instead of spending so much money, this colossal sum of crores and crores of rupees on boeing 707s the Viscounts can be purchased with advantage. That is why in my cut motion I have said:

"Failure to add Viscounts in addition to Boeing to meet the increasing demand."

Let not the hon. Minister try to get away by saying that this is for the Air India International whereas that is for the Indian Airlines Corporation. That is why I said that the Indian Airlines Corporation is also running planes not only inside the country but outside also. Both for the Air India International and the Indian Airlines Corporation the time has come for replacing the old Skymasters with Viscounts and to have more Viscounts for efficiency and for increasing the service instead of these expensive Boeings.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If nowody rises, what should I do? Should I come down and speak?

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I am sorry, Sir. I have only a few observations to make.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan (Coimbatore): But very important ones.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Not very important, as my hon. friend says.

Shri Tangamani: But important enough.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Just a few observations on the Demand which have been brought forward.

With regard to the Institute of Applied Manpower Research which is under the Home Ministry this is a very important institute which is being taken up by the Government. It should have been done some ten years ago. Otherwise the whole question of training up of our people, the whole question of planning would not have been possible. If we want to plan, we have to have training and such information regarding the proper utilisation of manpower.

In this connection, I have read some papers that have been issued by the Planning Commission regarding applied manpower research. This Home Ministry has not shown any initiative in the course of the two Plans. Suddenly, this Institute is going to be under them. I do not know how the decision was taken to keep this Institute under the Home Ministry. Either it should have gone to the Planning Commission or even the Ministry of Labour and Employment or the Education Ministry or the Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs. Suddenly, I do not know how this has come under the Home Ministry. Because, the Home Ministry has not shown any initiative during the course of the two Plan periods for this research in utilisation of manpower. It is only the Planning Commission that has done some good work.

This is a very important thing. I may briefly refer to one example. Whether we should first train our men technically or whether we build all the machinery and then train: this was the question that was posed before the conference on Manpower research. There, they have nicely answered that training is essential before we build machinery and so forth. Therefore, while I welcome this Demand, I am only surprised why it has gone to the Home Ministry. This Institute is very necessary. I want it to be a statutory body, not simply some society registered under the Societies Registration Act, because

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

this is going to be one of our important institutes, in the economic life of our country. Therefore, there should be legislation undertaken and it should be statutorily established.

Then, I come to another Institute without tool technology and design. That is by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. I feel that this also should have rightly come under the Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs. This Institute is going to train our personnel for drawing proper designs for our machinery and also for machine building. These are very important Institutes. But, surprisingly enough, there is a small note given and a Supplementary Demand is brought forward. We are going to have foreign collaboration for the setting up of this Institute. What happens? Whether there is a Certificate being given after training or not, who will be responsible, whether there will be proper Councils guiding the work of this Institute—these are not properly mentioned here. In the case of the Institute of Applied manpower research, it is said that there is going to be an Advisory council consisting of 50 Members drawn from the private sector or public sector, from trade unions and so on. In this case I do not find that even a council or advisory body is going to be set up. Some legislation should be undertaken for the setting up of this Institute. This only shows that our Ministers do not take seriously about this Institute.

Then, I come to another aspect about Hindustan Steel. Much has been said about it by my hon. friend Shri S. M. Banerjee. I would only make a mention of this. They are going to resort to some retrenchment in Bhilai and other places, especially in the iron ore mines. A large number of workers are going to be retrenched in the iron ore mines in the Bhilai project. When you are going to expand the steel plants and when you want to go on in a big way, I do not understand why retrenchment

should be resorted to. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that in these two projects that we are going to undertake, for which nearly Rs. 500 crores have been provided during the Third Plan period, he should try to absorb those workers; either in these steel projects or elsewhere. If it is impossible to absorb them, they must be paid the retrenchment compensation that is due to them under the Industrial Disputes Act.

Then, I come to the Air India International, for which a sum of about Rs. 8 crores is being asked for. I am very glad to say that the Air India International has not got into a muddle like the IAC. The IAC is in a very deplorable state of affairs because the Viscount services are disrupted and cancelled very often; several scheduled services have been cancelled frequently, as if they are dealing with a domestic affair. I am very happy that at least the Air India International has not got into such a muddle like the IAC. It would not reflect any credit on the functioning of the IAC or the Government or the Minister in charge, if we were to say all that we wanted to say about the IAC. Anyway, the Air India International has earned a very good reputation in the international field, and their services are very good, and they are also in a position to compete with other airlines which were established several years ago and which have got a better record of service. We feel proud that this infant service has been able to earn a good reputation in the short period. But that does not mean that we should go on spending a lot of money on these Boeings. We should be content with the three Boeings that we have got; though we want to extend our services, we should consider whether the Air India International can afford this amount.

Further, I find from the explanatory memorandum that we are going to draw some money from some foreign

banks. I do not know why Government are treating Parliament in this cavalier fashion. They are going to draw money from the World Bank, from the US Exim bank and other banks, but they have not specified the rate of interest. Should they not have given the rate of interest on which these amounts are being borrowed? Is that not a legitimate question? Can they not think about these things while drafting the foot notes. Rs. 8 crores are being asked for, and Government are going to draw loan from other places, from the US Exim bank and other banks, and, therefore, I feel that more information should have been given. Only if the rate of interest at which Government are going to get these loans from the banks is known, can Parliament judge whether this amount should be drawn or not. Already, we have been questioning the heavy interest on the loans advanced by the world Bank. If we have to pay heavy interest on these loans, then our services may not be so very economic and competitive. Therefore, I feel that all this information should have been given.

Even then, I would feel content with the three services that we are having now, instead of going in for an expenditure of another Rs. 8 crores, though it is true that our services have earned a very good reputation in the international field.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the hon. Minister.

Shri L. Achaw Singh (Inner Marpur): May I speak?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When I looked towards this side, no hon. Member rose. But when I have called the hon. Minister, the hon. Member is getting up and says that he wants to speak. The hon. Minister.

The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Sardar Swaran Singh): Cer-

tain observations have been made with regard to the Demand relating to the Hindustan Steel Limited. Three of the hon. Members opposite have participated in the debate, so far as this Demand is concerned, and I would like to say a few words with regard to the remarks that they have made.

The hon. Member who preceded me, Shri T. B. Vittal Rao, made a mention about retrenchment of workers in the iron ore mines attached to the Bhilai steel project. I would like to mention that Rajhara mines which supply iron ore to Bhilai are to be mechanised, and iron ore is to be produced by mechanical mining. Before the mechanical mining got ready, a large number of workers were engaged by the contractors and also a few by the project authorities for carrying on manual mining of iron ore.

17 hrs.

It would be appreciated that at the time when these workers started working either with the contractors or with Hindustan Steel, they knew that this being a transitory form of employment their utility would come to an end when mechanical mining took shape. He also suggested that they should be absorbed in the expansion programme of Bhilai. It should be appreciated that such a suggestion coming from an hon. Member who generally takes interest in labour matters is rather surprising. He should have thought about this before making the suggestion. Persons who are engaged in manual mining cannot easily be absorbed in other types of work. I can appreciate that if mining work expands probably they could be absorbed, but not in the expansion programme of the steel plant as such.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would the hon. Minister like to finish today or would he like to continue tomorrow?

Sardar Swaran Singh: I will continue tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, I am told that the further consideration of the motion regarding major railway accidents may not be taken up today as hon. Members might not like to sit so late. So we will take up the half hour discussion.

17:02 hrs.

***COAL MINES PROVIDENT FUND SCHEME**

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): I raise this half-hour discussion following the unsatisfactory nature of the answer given to Unstarred question No. 1 of the 20th November 1961 with regard to the raising of the rate of contribution to the Coal Mines Provident Fund.

Assurances were given by the hon. Minister of Labour and Employment. But they have not been implemented even after five years. The Government accepted in principle the raising of the rate of provident fund contribution, but they have not implemented it even after five years. Persistently we have been asking for this increase, but the Government have not come to a decision with regard to its implementation.

Last time, when this question came up in the form of a Resolution and was discussed, the Deputy Minister of Labour and Employment was pleased to say that this matter would be considered by the Industrial Committee which would be meeting in March. The Industrial Committee on Coal Mining met on 25th/26th April 1961. The matter came before it and we discussed it. The employers' representatives were opposed to the increase in the rate of this contribution until and unless the price of coal was increased. I categorically asked the Chairman of the Committee what he was going to do now that the employers had refused it and the

workers' representatives wanted it. He said it would have to be left to the Government to take a decision.

What has happened after eight months? Till now a decision has not been forthcoming. In the last Session, the hon. Deputy Minister, replying to a question, said that the matter was still under consideration. The Speaker knew that the subject was coming before the House very often. So, he himself asked the Deputy Minister to see that it was implemented by the end of this year. Unfortunately it has not been done. What does the Minister think of behaving in this fashion?

I may refer here to an interesting speech which the hon. Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning delivered, while inaugurating the prize bonds drawn. He said that the resources for the Plan had to be provided by internal and domestic savings. Here are nearly 350,000 coal miners wanting to contribute to the internal savings. They want to contribute to the provident fund if the rate is increased. By that we will get Rs. 75 lakhs, and the employers will be forced to give Rs. 75 lakhs. So Rs. 1:5 crores we will get every year, which can be utilised for various industrial purposes in our country. These Ministers who go about moralising the people should be the first to set an example by implementing the assurances they have given, by increasing the rate of provident fund.

Is there a time more appropriate, a climate and atmosphere more appropriate than the present time? If I refer to the productivity figures, you will be amazed. The coal miner's productivity was 0.35 tons in 1951 whereas today it is the reverse, 0.53 tons. What an enormous increase in the productivity of the worker.

Then, in the chapter on labour policy and programme in the Third Plan it has been stated that the share of increased productivity should naturally go the worker. And here what is happening? Are they not justified in de-