

Members so agree, at that point of time, according to our principle, it can go to the Standing Committee for appraisal. If the Members so agree, we may not have any discussion on the Constitution (Seventy-seventh Amendment) Bill, 1992.

**SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT:** It is perfectly all right.

**SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra):** I want to make one thing clear. What the Constitution Amendment Bill seeks to do is to add an item to article 323B as "(h) rent, its regulation and control..." and when the rent tribunals are constituted by virtue of power given under this provision, they will be under State laws. We should not assume that there will be a Central law which will come to us. We should not assume it at all.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** If you like to discuss it now, I have no objection.

**SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE:** This is non-controversial. Why don't we pass it just now?

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** We cannot pass it now because we need two-thirds majority. We cannot pass it by a simple majority. And I have to ask the Chairman also to be here. I am only taking the view of the House. After the Seventy-seventh Amendment, we will go ahead with the discussion on Kashmir and as the time permits, we may discuss Dunkel also. Shall we now go ahead with the calling attention?

**SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat):** Madam, without permission also somebody can raise a question of privilege. I have a very important question of privilege involving the dignity of this House. We have been discussing about Narmada. Yesterday four Members made a special mention on it. Thrice the Minister of Irrigation went to the Lok Sabha to clarify his stand. But he does not come to this House. This is lowering the dignity of this House. Therefore, I think, he should be called for a minute or two. I do not want of more of his time to be taken. But this is not the right treatment. Let him come only for two minutes. We are not asking questions. Let him come. He can go through our speeches. Therefore, it is necessary that the dignity of this House should not be lowered. This has happened on other occasions also. I do not want to raise those issues. But kindly request Shuklaji to come and clarify his stand

within two minutes because I was hoping that he would come today. Yesterday I was thinking that Dr. Abrar Ahmed might convey to him, I do not know what has happened.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** In any case he has got his Question Hour and he will come.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: सदर साहिबा, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, यही बात है कि इस हाऊस को इन्फॉर्म किया जाता है। इस चीज को लेना चाहिए, नकायदा कल लिस्ट ऑफ बिजनेस में आना चाहिए और विचारण शुक्ल जी को यहाँ पर आकर बयान देना चाहिए। मेहता साहब का जो मुतालबा है, कल लिस्ट ऑफ बिजनेस में रखा जाए, उसको लिया जाए। आज का जैसा आपने कहा है, वह ठीक है बिल्कुल।

شری سکندر بخت: صدر صاحبہ۔ میں یہ کہنا چاہ رہا تھا۔ وہی بات ہے کہ اس ہاؤس کو آگنور کیا جاتا ہے۔ اس چیز کو لینا چاہیے۔ باقاعدہ کل لسٹ آف بزنس میں آنا چاہیے اور وڈیا چرن شکل کو یہاں پر آکر بیان دینا چاہیے۔ مہتا صاحب کا جو مطالبہ ہے۔ کل لسٹ آف بزنس میں رکھا جائے اس کو لیا جائے۔ آج کا جیسا آپ نے کہا ہے۔ وہ ٹھیک ہے بالکل۔

#### CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Urgent need for Government to undertake measures for the revival of sick Public Sector Undertakings

उपसभापति: ठीक है, आप बता दीजिएगा

श्री अब्दुल अहमद (Rajasthan): जी

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Now we take up calling attention. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta.

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal):** Madam, I call the attention of the Minister of Industry to the urgent need for Government to undertake measures for the revival of sick Public Sector Undertakings.

† [ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script

उद्योग मंत्रालय (औद्योगिक विकास विभाग) में राज्य मंत्री और उद्योग मंत्रालय (भारी उद्योग विभाग) का अतिरिक्त प्रभार (श्रीमती कृष्णा साहू) : महोदय, केन्द्रीय लोक उद्यमों में से कतिपय इकाइयों को उद्योग की समस्याओं से सरकार चिंतित है और इनके निराकरण के प्रति भी पूर्णतः जागरूक है। इनमें से कई क्षेत्रों में रोजगार उपलब्ध कराने और अधिक अस्थिरता को दूर रखने के ध्येय से सरकार ने उन इकाइयों को उत्तरदायित्व प्रहण करना पड़ा है। बहुत से ऐसे उद्योग हैं जो निजी क्षेत्र के उद्योगपतियों द्वारा घाटे में लाकर छोड़ दिये गये थे और समापन के कगार पर पहुँच गये थे। सरकार को उन्हें पुनर्जीवित करने के लिए आगे आना पड़ा और घाटा उठाना पड़ा। ऐसे उद्योग देश के हर क्षेत्र में हैं और माननीय सदस्यों की जानकारी में हैं। इसी प्रकार अनेक उद्योगों की सार्वजनिक क्षेत्रों में स्थापना की आवश्यकता देश के औद्योगीकरण को गति देने के लिए पड़ी, क्योंकि उनके बगैर अन्य उद्योगों को मशीनरी तथा अन्य सुविधा मिलाना संभव नहीं था। उदाहरण के लिए सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में हेवी इंजीनियरी कारपोरेशन का नाम लिया जा सकता है, जिसे केवल इसलिए लगाया गया कि भारी उद्योग क्षेत्र में इस्पात आदि के निर्माण के लिए अन्य इकाइयाँ उसके माध्यम से लग सकें। कालान्तर में उक्त इकाई को समुचित कार्यभार न मिलने के कारण घाटा उठाना पड़ा पान्तु शुरू में इस इकाई का योगदान देश के औद्योगीकरण में सराहनीय कहा जायेगा। सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की भीमार उद्योगों के संबंध में सरकार की नीति की स्पष्ट घोषणा 24 जुलाई, 1991 को औद्योगिक नीति के माध्यम से की गई। उस औद्योगिक नीति प्रस्ताव का संदर्भित अंश इस प्रकार है :—

सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की ऐसी इकाइयाँ जो भीमार चल रही हैं, जिनके सुधारने की संभावना कम है, की पुनर्स्थापना अथवा पुनर्जीवन हेतु योजना प्रस्तावित करने के लिए बी० आई० एफ० आर० या अन्य उच्च-स्तरीय संस्थाओं को संदर्भित किया जायेगा। इस संबंध में ऐसी व्यवस्था भी की जायेगी जिससे इन उद्योगों में कार्यरत श्रमिकों के हितों की रक्षा हो।

उक्त घोषणा का कार्यान्वयन किया गया है। हमने सिक इंडस्ट्रियल कम्पनी एक्ट को दिसम्बर, 91 में संशोधित कर सभी सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की इकाइयों को बी० आई० एफ० आर० को संदर्भित करने का नियम बना दिया है।

इसके अनुपालन में सभी 50 भीमार केन्द्रीय लोक उद्यमों को बी० आई० एफ० आर० को संदर्भित किया जा चुका है और उसमें से 44 मामले पुनर्स्थापना और पुनर्जीवन के लिए पंजीकृत कर दिये गये हैं। चूंकि यह कार्रवाई लगभग एक वर्ष पहले ही शुरू की गई है, इसलिए अब तक किसी मामले में अंतिम निर्णय नहीं हो पाया है।

सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में लगे हुए श्रमिकों के हितों की रक्षा के लिए राष्ट्रीय नवीकरण निधि (एन० आर० एफ०) की स्थापना में

फरवरी, 1992 में की गई है। इसके माध्यम से श्रमिकों के प्रशिक्षण, मार्गदर्शन और पुनर्स्थापना में जाने में सहायता देने के लिए योजनाएँ प्रस्तावित हैं। श्रमिकों को ऐच्छिक रूप से सेवा निवृत्त होने या अतिरिक्त घोषित होने की दशा में एन० आर० एफ० के माध्यम से धनराशि देने की व्यवस्था भी है। एन० आर० एफ० की योजनाओं को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए एक इम्प्लाइड ऑथोरिटी का सृजन भी हो चुका है और इस वर्ष बजट में 700 करोड़ रुपये की धनराशि का प्रावधान किया जा चुका है। कुछ योजनाओं के लिए अधिक राशि का प्रावधान पुनरीक्षित बजट के माध्यम से कराने का प्रस्ताव किया जा रहा है।

पुछे माननीय सदस्यों को आवश्यक करना है कि सरकार सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के उद्योगों की कार्य-प्रणाली को सुधारने के लिए सचेत है। हमारा प्रयत्न है कि उन्हें अधिक से अधिक अधिकार एवं स्वायत्तता दी जाये। अधिकांश उद्योग अब सरकार से एम० औ० यू० (मेमोरेटम आफ अडरस्टैंडिंग) पर हस्ताक्षर करने के बाद नौकर हस्तक्षेप के अपना कार्य करते हैं और सरकार द्वारा समय-समय पर उसकी समीक्षा की जाती है। साथ ही साथ यह भी प्रयत्न रहता है कि हमारे सार्वजनिक उद्यम अपनी टेक्नोलोजी और उत्पादन में सुधार करके इतने समर्थ हो सकें कि निजी क्षेत्रों से मुकाबला होने पर उन्हें संरक्षण की आवश्यकता न रहे और वे एक लाभदेय सशक्त उद्योग के रूप में कार्य करते रहें।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, keeping the time factor in mind, will you please confine your speech to the minimum?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra) : It is a very good statement.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Madam, the statement is very good in the sense that it spells out the intention of the Government.

We have been discussing the issue of sickness for a long time, may be, for several years. Therefore, I would like to know what steps the Government had taken to implement this pious desire which the hon. Minister has taken the trouble to express in the House. While going through the statement, I find that there are a number of inaccuracies. For example, the Heavy Engineering Corporation was not set up for the production of steel. This unit was set up for the production of equipment related to mining. Secondly, Madam, the hon. Minister refers to 50 sick Central public sector units having been referred to the BIFR, out of which 44 have been registered. My point is in how many cases the plan has been undertaken. To my knowledge the BIFR has not succeeded in initiating even a single revival plan so far as the Central public undertakings are concerned.

That is the main problem. To me, Madam, it appears that the Government is not working with a single mind. The Government is not working with a direction, and there is lack of decisiveness in every sphere. And the emerging scenario in the country is like this that cynicism is mounting tremendously among the working class and the picture is one of total gloom. The only question that I would like to ask the Minister of Industry and the Minister of Finance, whose presence in the House flatters me, is this. Does he believe that with a demoralised working class the country can advance forward? What are the essential points which we have been discussing during the last three years? The most important point has been that the workers have been asked to go out under the voluntary retirement scheme. This is, in fact, a scheme of involuntary retrenchment. BIFR had been making inordinate delay. Budgetary support had either been withdrawn or reduced which in turn accentuates the problem of negative working of the public undertakings. Fourthly, the Government is resorting to payment of idle wages. Therefore, the approach of the Government, to me, appears to be totally negative and cannot be explained in terms of economic variables. It is not only against the working classes—which, of course, it is—it is against the nation because this policy does not encourage/ growth, does not induce advance, does not generate the environment needed for the expansion of the economy of the country. This is a policy of colossal loss. We are discussing the inaction of the Government. What are the facts on which I can level this charge? Fifty industries have fallen sick under the Central Government. They have been referred to the BIFR and they are pending for years. But in the meantime, the BIFR has not been able to draw up a plan for rehabilitation or revival in a single case—let alone the question of taking steps for the revival of these units.

Madam, let us go into the statistics. In all 1846 units have been referred to the BIFR. It is not 50 units only. Out of these 1846 units the BIFR has been able to prepare till date the revival package—they have agreed upon, they have sanctioned—in case of 292, and the plan has been approved only in case of 118 which is less than 10 per cent of the total cases referred to the BIFR. Madam, if we speak of the numbers, this is a partial representation, but if we look at the country as a whole, if we look at the report published by the Reserve Bank of India, then the problem of sickness is of a much bigger and colossal dimension. The total number of sick

units has grown to nearly 3 lakhs and we had been complaining about the inaction of the BIFR for a pretty long time. In this connection, while this issue was referred to the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister lost little time in writing to the Chief Minister of West Bengal. And what did he say while the question of inaction of the BIFR was referred to him? In a letter written as far back as June 9 to the Chief Minister of West Bengal, the Prime Minister said—let me quote: "As you also know, the Special Tripartite Committee under the Ministry of Labour is already looking into the problems of sick PSUs in each sector and trying to find solutions. If these are agreed to in the Tripartite Committee, the BIFR will then really be required to accord formal approval"—which means, the Special Tripartite Committee is being considered as an important tool in the process of finding a consensus on preparing a plan or plans for the revival of the sick units. And what has happened in the Special Tripartite Committee? The Special Tripartite Committee, which was set up by the Government, could hold only three meetings in one and half a years. What is the outcome? I do not want to characterize the work of the Tripartite Committee. Here let me refer to what Mr. Ramanujam has said. The hon. Minister of Finance will kindly remember that he is the leader of the trade union movement led by the Indian National Trade Union Congress. What was his reaction? Reacting to the inordinate delay in the work of the Special Tripartite Committee, he told the last sitting of the Tripartite Committee that it is not working at all because the nodal Ministries are not participating in the meetings and the nodal Ministries are not taking any interest at all. Therefore, for the Labour Ministry or the Special Tripartite Committee, it is very difficult to find a solution. This is the level of co-operation that the nodal Ministries are giving to the Tripartite Committee. And what is happening as a result of the inordinate delay of the BIFR and as a result of the total non-performance of the Tripartite Committee? These units are being closed down and workers are being asked to go. Here, may I refer to what the National Textiles Corporation has done? The National Textiles Corporation has closed down its textile mill in Lucknow, violating the order of the then BJP Government in Uttar Pradesh. It violated not only the government order but it has also violated the court's order. This is how the policy of revival of the public sector units in the country is taking place.

What is the number of workers who have been forced to go on voluntary retirement? As

on date, one lakh workers had to leave their jobs, not voluntarily but because of being confronted with a situation of involuntary coercion. In the textile sector, alone, 35,000 workers had to leave.

Madam, the only important thing that the Government has decided upon most seriously and with singlemindedness—and credit must go to the hon. Minister of Finance because of his commitment to it—is the policy of the so-called liberalization which is having a “human face”. While replying to the debate on the no-confidence motion in the Lok Sabha the other day, the Prime Minister told the Lok Sabha that the liberalization in the country is not without a “human face”. And what is the face like for millions of working class people? Only yesterday, hundreds of working class people belonging to Bengal Potteries had to sit in the streets of Delhi, demanding “Kindly pay us the voluntary scheme benefits”. For the fund which the hon. Minister boasts of, hundreds of workers had to come all the way from Calcutta to demand that the workers may kindly be given the benefits under the Voluntary Retirement Scheme, for which the hon. Minister of Finance has been able to get the handsome loan of a few million dollars from the World Bank. And even that is not being given to the workers. While the revival scheme is being scuttled, while the BIFR is almost inoperative and while the tripartite Special Committee is non-performing, one particular type of policy of the Government that is being especially implemented, is the policy of the Voluntary Retirement Scheme. How much have they spent and how much would they like to spend? For 1992-93 and 1993-94, for these two years, the Government is spending or is likely to spend nearly Rs. 1,500 crores. You do not have dearth of funds to implement the policy of exit, but you do not have funds for the implementation of a policy of entrance! What about entrance? This is a welfare state. You are committed for the well-being of the people and for promotion of employment opportunities. The government does not have money for entrance, but it has money for exit. As a result, while delay is taking place at the level of the BIFR or the Special Tripartite Committee, what is the effect at the level of performance of the units that have been identified as sick? The result is increase in the loss, increase in the loss of mandays and increase in the payment of idle wages.

I will give two instances of how this delay is affecting them. The Bengal Potteries has been

under the jurisdiction of the Central Government for 17 years. The Government could not find money to revive the unit. What was the amount needed? You speak of the private sector. Yes, a private sector unit, the Tata Consultancy, had come out with a revival plan and pleaded for mere Rs. 15 crores which the Government did not give, but in course of 17 years the Government has paid idle wages to the extent of Rs. 140 crores. You can spend money on idle wages but not on revival!

Modernisation of the IISCO is being delayed. I should say, “deliberately”. What is the price of the delay? Till date, according to a parliamentary committee, Rs. 784 crores have been lost because of the inordinate delay that the Government is making. The Government is not in a position to find out where, how and in what way its modernisation can be done.

What is the main reason for the Government's refusal to undertake revival? The main reason is constraint of funds. At the beginning I said, “I disagree with the hon. Minister of Finance here”. At the time when you are speaking of constraint of funds, is it not true, hon. Minister of Finance, that in 1992-93, 96 public sector undertakings, out of 246 public sector undertakings, have invested Rs. 24,660 crores under the Portfolio Management Scheme in banks, also in some places in private, financial services and in some cases even at a rate of interest which is lower than the bank rate, which means that a large number of public sector undertakings in this country are left with surplus funds, that the surplus funds are being used to play in the share market and that the surplus funds are being used for investment in some places where the rate of interest is lower than the bank rate? If so, why can those surplus funds that remain with a large number of public sector units, not be mopped up, not for retirement benefit and not for the so-called “exit policy”, but for building up a fund for the revival of public sector units? That is my question. Dr. Singh will stand up and say, “I don't have money”. We do not beg you to give us money. Neither do we want you to go to Washington and get us money. But there is money in surplus funds with the public sector undertakings. That money could be mopped up.

Madam, I will just give two examples of how, while a large number of public sector units are starving of funds, how a large number of other public sector units are fraudulently using surplus funds. How could the surplus funds be

mobilised? Nineteen public sector undertakings, because they were allowed to float development bonds, floated development bonds and mobilised Rs. 20,000 crores. A large number of these bonds were tax-free. According to my calculation, on account of this tax-exemption, the country lost tax to the extent of Rs. 900 crores. I do not go into the details, but at least there are three public sector undertakings like the Power Finance Corporation, the Indian Railway Finance Corporation, who had raised from market loans to the extent of Rs. 1,500 crores. When the hon. Minister speaks of funds stringency, let me point out, only two units raised Rs. 1,300 crores and the entire money was not spent. Even a paisa of that was not spent on developmental work. The entire surplus funds of these two units were used for play in the share market and for financing fraudulent transactions undertaken by the brokers. That is my point.

My only important point is while you speak of stringency of funds, why the surplus funds lying with the public sector cannot be mobilised. It can be commercial transactions. The funds that you so mobilise for the revival schemes can be on commercial basis, can be in terms of interest rates fixed by the Reserve Bank of India or by the Ministry of Finance. It is not a question of doling out surplus funds from profitable units to sick units. Let the surplus funds, a large number of funds with the public sector units, be mobilised into a fund for the revival of sick units.

*[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) IN THE CHAIR]*

My point is that it is very difficult to sit hard; it is hard to become hard on a Minister, because we have a Minister like Madam who is here. While I cannot afford to be hard on her, yet I would like to see that she is not soft so far as irregularities in the department she represent take place. Let her not be soft. I would most humble request the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry to kindly dispel the notion that rules the country that this Government does not plays with the economy of the country in the way the brokers have played the share market. Let the Government dispel that notion that prevails in the country.

Lastly, today then we are discussing the calling attention motion in this House, within a fortnight from now there is going to be a strike by the steel workers all over the country. It is going to be a united strike; it includes the

INTUC. What is their demand? The demand of the strikers is that the IISCO must not be left to the private sector. When we are discussing the calling attention, the country is confronted with a *Bharat Bandh* on 9th of next month. When we are discussing the motion, there is an all-party delegation from the Government of West Bengal led by its Finance Minister to take up the issue of sickness with the Government, because the problem of sickness affects West Bengal more than any part other of the country. When we are discussing the issue, it is here in Delhi that a few hundred workers are there to demand that payment be made according to their own scheme, according to the scheme of 'Golden Hand-Shake'. Therefore, Sir, we are not discussing the actions of the Government. In fact, we are discussing the inactions of the Government, the non-performance of the Government. Let the hon. Minister representing the Government in the House kindly confirm the allegations that are normally there in the mind of the trade unions and the workers that the Government is not after reviving the public sector, the Government is in no mood to help the public sector, the Government is in a mood to scuttle it step by step in order to make room for the private sector to rule the economy of the country. Thank you.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, thank you for giving me this opportunity. I went through the statement of the hon. Minister and the steps the Government is going to take for the revival of the sick public sector units in the country. There are 246 public sector units in the country. The Government found that some of the public sector units are becoming sick in spite of pumping enormous money. They have to take a decision whether they have to spend the public money for the purpose of making the public sector units more sick or they have to use the public money for the better use and what they have to do with the public sectors which have become sick. Therefore, they have taken a decision in July, 1991. They have worked out two or three important aspects. Number one, the Government had widened the area which has been totally controlled by the public sector for competition with the private sector. Some areas have been reserved for the public sector also. Two, chronic sick public sector units which will not be viable in spite of pumping money have to be referred to the BIFR and then a decision would be taken accordingly. Three, they have decided to give more autonomy to the public sector units for their functioning. It is a good thing. Fourth,

they have entered into a memorandum of understanding with the public sector units for their efficient functioning and so on and so forth. I was listening to the speech of Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta. He mentioned that the Government has either withdrawn the funds provided to the public sector units or the Government has not provided funds for improving the public sector units in the country. I would submit in this august House a canard is being raised by some vested interests and also by the working class that the Government is going to kill the public sector units in the country. The allegations that they have made are totally unwarranted and it is far from the truth.

In the year 1990-91, the investment that has been made for the public sector units is of the order of Rs. 1,13,896 crores. In the year 1991-92 it was Rs. 1,35,871 crores. So the investment had increased considerable. It is more than 19.3 per cent.

Not only that, the public sector units are contributing to the exchequer by way of taxes to the tune of Rs. 19,466 crores. The total turn-over by the public sector units had crossed more than Rs. 1,00,000 crores. The new industrial policy that had been evolved by the Government for reviving the... (*Time Bell rings*). What is this?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM):** We have to finish by 2.30 P.M. That was the consensus of the House. Each and every speaker should complete within five minutes. Otherwise, it will be difficult to complete by 2.30 P.M.

**SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY:** I would like to submit number one, it is a very important subject. Number two, Members are concerned about the public sector units.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM):** You finish your speech within one minute.

**SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY:** How can I finish in one minute? I have not even started.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM):** Each Member will be given five minutes only.

**SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY:** The course open to the public sector was—the Government was very liberal—they can raise funds from external sources as well as from the internal

sources. They can go in for mobilisation of funds. They can approach the banks for loans. That being the case, it is very clear that the public sector units have to compete with the private sector in the country. The Government should not consider—aid the Government is not considering—public sector units as white elephants. The Government should not give funds, public funds, for the purpose of improving the public sector units which are dying. The money that is pumped in becomes wasteful expenditure and in spite of enormous funds being spent on them, the units are not able to revive. Then, the question comes as to what will happen to the employees. The Minister has also said that the question of revival and rehabilitation of 44 units is pending before the BIFR. I would like to submit to the hon. Minister that an early decision has to be taken in respect of these 44 units for the simple reason that even if you want to revive these units, giving allowance for cost escalation, when compared to the figures projected originally, you will have to spend more funds with the delay that occurs. Therefore, the cases pending decision before the BIFR should be finalised as early as possible.

Then, I would like to make my submissions with regard to raising of funds through external sources. I would like to submit to the hon. Minister—the hon. Finance Minister is also sitting here—that the Konkan Railway, the ONGC and the MTNL, all public sector units, went to the public for raising funds through bonds; but they could not achieve the objective of mobilising resources; the amount of resources mobilised was not in conformity with the expectations. Therefore, all these organisations are finding it very difficult to raise funds through external sources. Therefore, for the purpose of improving the efficiency of public sector units and to make them viable, there are two important things which the hon. Minister has to consider. Firstly, in public sector units, work culture should improve. Though I come from the labour sector, I find that in the public sector, workers are demanding more and they are not discharging their duty according to the directions, according to the time-frame given to them. That is one of the basic reasons why in our country, public sector units are losing.

The second thing is inefficient management. The management of the affairs of public sector units...

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM):** You have to conclude, Mr.

Narayanasamy. You are a senior Member. We have 14 speakers and we want to finish the debate in one and a half hours. You please suggest how we can finish it.

**SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY:** Sir, I will conclude within three minutes.

In the management of the affairs of public sector units, wasteful expenditure has to be avoided. This has been made clear in various reports and the Government is also considering it. But in public sector units, this has been given the go-by. This is also one of the reasons for the sickness of public sector units.

About the Exit Policy, there is a clear misunderstanding in the mind of the labour class that the Government is retrenching employees forcibly. I would like to submit that the policy of the Government is very clear to the effect that nobody can stop those employees who want to retire voluntarily. They can go, getting the compensation that has been provided by the Government. Not only that. As far as employees are concerned, under the New Exit Policy—the hon. Minister has said this in his statement—Rs. 700 crores have been allocated. To my knowledge, it was about Rs. 2000 crores which was envisaged and the Finance Minister said that Rs. 1000 crores would be provided for this year. I would like to seek clarification on this because the hon. Minister says now that it will be Rs. 700 crores. Under the New Exit Policy that has been brought by the Government, it is made very clear that employees will not be retrenched and those employees who want to go voluntarily will be allowed to go. The impression has been created by some people that employees are sent out without their consent forcibly. This is another canard, bogey, raised for the purpose of maligning this Government and for saying that the employees in the public sector are thrown out. Sir, the hon. Prime Minister and also the hon. Finance Minister have said in this House and outside that the employees will not be retrenched and if a public sector sick unit is closed, those people will be absorbed, as far as possible. Yesterday, we discussed the Goswami Committee Report in this House. In that report, two important things were referred to by the hon. Minister in this august House. One was about the winding up of the Tribunals. A question was asked as to what the Government is thinking in regard to the winding up of the Tribunals. The hon. Minister of State for Finance said that it is under the consideration of the Government. A suggestion was made that though BIFR is there, there should be

another parallel organisation for the purpose of winding up the sick units. A suggestion has been made by the Goswami Committee Report, if a unit is not able to pay within 180 days, that unit may be considered a sick unit. Sir, this is a very dangerous provision that goes against the interests of the public sector units. The public sector units cannot be allowed to be killed like this.

Finally, I would like to submit for the information of the hon. Minister that in Bombay, one of the public sector units was given to the workers' cooperative and as per my information, that unit is working very well. Therefore, if the employees come forward to run the public sector units, which have to be revived in the form of employees' cooperatives, the hon. Minister should consider that point and see to it that such employees, who want to take over the public sector units, should be given preference. As per the policy, the public sector and the private sector has to grow side by side in this country and public sector units should not be killed in the name of privatisation. However, there should not be any compromise in the sphere where public sector units are competing with the private sector. We should make that very clear. The chronic sick units have to be closed and there is no other alternative except to close them. I support the hon. Minister on this point. I congratulate the hon. Minister for closing those public sector units and for safeguarding the interests of the workers. Thank you.

**श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा (बिहार):** उपसभाध्यक्षजी, यह पब्लिक सेक्टर इंस्ट्रुमेंट्स की बीमारी के बारे में आज हम सदन में चर्चा कर रहे हैं। मंत्री जी का वक्तव्य भी आया है। मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य को मैं बहुत गौर से पढ़ रही थी।

मैंने देखा कि कुछ मुद्दों पर इन्होंने काफी इमानदारी से बात की है, जैसे इन्होंने कहा कि हेवी इंजीनियरिंग कॉर्पोरेशन ... (अवधान) ...

**श्रीमती कृष्णा साहू:** ऐसा भी आपके लगता है कि कभी इस सदन में तो कुछ भी बेइमानदारी से नहीं कहा जाता।

**श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा:** यह तो देखने की बात होगी। ... (अवधान) ...

मंत्री जी ने जो मेरा समय लिया है, उसकी मेरे समय में शिन्ती नहीं होगी। मंत्री जी ने कहा कि —“The Heavy Engineering Corporation which was established with the principal purpose of facilitating the manufacture of steel etc. in the heavy industries sector, later, this unit had to suffer loss because its workload was not adequate but, in the

beginning, the contribution of this unit towards the industrialisation of the country has been commendable."

महोदय, ये इसी से अपनी बात को शुरू करना चाहेंगे। हमारे देश में पब्लिक सेक्टर खंडरटेकिंग, सरकारी उपक्रम इसलिए शुरू किया गया था कि यह सरकारी उपक्रम इस देश के औद्योगिक विकास के काम को तेजी से आगे बढ़ायेगा और जिस बात की चर्चा मंत्री महोदय ने अपने वक्तव्य के प्रथम पृष्ठ में की है, यह हैवी इंजीनियरिंग कॉर्पोरेशन बिहार प्रांत में है।

अब हैवी इंजीनियरिंग कॉर्पोरेशन की बुरायात इसलिए की गई थी कि यह मगर इंडस्ट्री की तरह काम करेगी। पूरे देश में जो बड़े-बड़े कारखाने बैठेंगे, इसमें हैवी इंजीनियरिंग कॉर्पोरेशन से उसको आर्डर देकर बनवाया जाएगा और मंत्री जी ने बिल्कुल सही कहा है, बाद में सरकार ने खुद अपने कारखाने को आर्डर देना बंद कर दिया और जैसे मां अपनी सन्तान को बिना दूध पिलाये मार दे, वह इस तरह की हालत हो गई। ठीक इसी तरह की हालत दूसरे कई और कल-कारखानों की है। मैं आपके सामने पूरी फेब्रिस्ट तो नहीं रखूंगी 246 पब्लिक खंडरटेकिंग्स की, लेकिन नमूने के तौर पर कुछ बड़े उद्योगों के बारे में जरूर चर्चा करना चाहूंगी। एक भात इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स लि. है। यह मुनाफा कमाने वाले इस देश के बहुत बड़े उद्योगों में से एक है। पिछले दिनों इस उद्योग के कामगार मेरे पास आए और उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे पास सारा इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर है, रॉ-मैटीरियल भी है, लेकिन सरकार हमको आर्डर नहीं दे रही है। डिफेंस से हमको आर्डर मिलता था, दूसरी जगहों से आर्डर मिलता था। उन्होंने मुझे कहा कि मैडम, आप कुछ कीजिए ताकि हमें आर्डर मिले, क्योंकि सरकार की मंशा पर हमें शक है। वह चाहती है कि हमें मार दे। इस उद्योग को मार देने की उनकी नीति है। बी.एच.ई.एल. के साथ भी यही हो रहा है। बी.आर.ए. अर्थात् भारत रैफ़ैक्ट्रीज लि. एक ऐसा उद्योग है जिसमें कुल चार ही कारखाने हैं, जिसमें तीन बिहार में हैं। उसमें फायर ब्रिक्स बनता है। फायर ब्रिक्स के बगैर कोई कारखाना लग नहीं सकता है। यह फायर ब्रिक्स बिहार में जो बनता है उसकी लागत खर्च एक ईटा का 2700 रुपये आता है, पर हम जापान से 5000 रुपये देकर मंगा रहे हैं। लेकिन अपने कारखाने को उनमें सुधार करने के लिए जो कुछ चाहिए, पुराने कारखाने हो गए, इस सही के मध्य में यह शुरू किया गया था। 25—30 साल पहले का पुराना कारखाना है जो हमें माइनरिजेशन का प्रोसेस चालू करना चाहिए था, वह नहीं किया। नतीजा यह कि आज हम विदेश से दुगुना, ख़ास पूना दाम दे करके सामान मंगावा रहे हैं, लेकिन अपने यहां के कारखाने का स्वास्थ्य का सुधार करने का सरकार की कोई नीति नहीं है। यह बहुत भयंकर स्थिति है। तो मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगी मंत्री महोदय से अपनी बात को लंबी नहीं करते हुए कि क्या यह सही है एक समिति बनी लेबर डिपार्टमेंट की पार्लियामेंटरी कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी की मंत्री महोदय ने एक कमेटी बनाई थी। उसमें यह सुझाव दिया गया था कि जो जोड़े-बहुत घाटे में चल रहे हैं ऐसे कारखानों को बी.आई.एफ.आर. में रैफर किया जाए, लेकिन तत्काल उनको कुछ पैसा भी दिया

जाए। बजटरी सपोर्ट भी दिया जाए ताकि वे चल सकें और आगे जब तक दूसरा फैसला नहीं हो। तो यह मंत्री महोदय ने बयान दे कर कह दिया कि हम इसको नहीं मानते। पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी का फैसला हैटोड बाय द डिप्टी मिनिस्टर आफ लेबर और उनके फैसले को हैवी इंडस्ट्रीज के मिनिस्टर आफ स्टेट ने यह बयान देकर कहा कि यह संभव नहीं है। हम यह नहीं करेंगे। तो हम किसके ऊपर भरोसा करेंगे? यहाँ कौन सरकार है? क्या मनमोहन सिंह जी सरकार हैं? क्या कृष्णा साहू जी सरकार हैं? क्या केवल नरसिंह राय जी ही सरकार हैं या उनके साथ यहाँ और जो मंत्री बैठे हैं यह भी सरकार हैं? कौन सरकार हैं? किसकी बात सत्य है, किसकी बात असत्य है? हम किसके ऊपर भरोसा करें? महोदय, यह कहा जा रहा है कि पब्लिक खंडरटेकिंग्स घाटे में चल रहे हैं। यह बात भी गलत है। कुछ पब्लिक खंडरटेकिंग्स ने पिछले साल गत कई साल से अधिक मुनाफा कमाया है। जैसे 174 एटरप्राइजेज ने पिछले साल यह प्रॉफिट उन्होंने 6,148.71 करोड़ कमाया है as compared to the net profit of Rs. 5,193.9 crores earned in the previous year. तो वे मुनाफा कमा रहे हैं। जो मुनाफा कमाने वाली कंपनियाँ हैं उसको तो आप डिस्कन्सेमेट कर रहे हैं। बाजार में उसके प्रेयर बेच रहे हैं। वर्कर को देने के लिए कुछ नहीं है, वर्कर को नहीं दे रहे हैं और जो कम्पोजर हो रहा है जो सिक इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उनको आप सीधे बेचने पर लगे हुए हैं।

**उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री मोहम्मद खलीम) :** प्लीज़ कन्क्लूड। आप कन्क्लूड करें।

**श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा :** बेचेंगे भी तो किसके पास बेचेंगे? Who are the private owners? They are also using public money, Government money. There is no so-called private owner here. तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछना चाहती हूँ सीधे-सीधे इन्होंने कहा कि बी.आई.एफ.आर. में 50 सिक पब्लिक एटरप्राइजेज को रैफर किया गया है, जिसमें 44 केस तो रजिस्टर हो गए हैं रीवैलिटेसन एंड रीबाइबल के लिए और साल भर हो भी गया, लेकिन अभी तक कोई डिसिज़न नहीं हुआ। डिसिज़न नहीं होने का क्या कारण है? क्या यह कारण है कि बी.आई.एफ.आर. का इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर सक्षम नहीं है? क्या बी.आय.एफ.आर. कमजोर है कि फैसला नहीं ले सकता? क्या यह बात सही है और अगर सही है तो बी.आय.एफ.आर. को सक्षम बनाने के लिए सरकार कौनसे कदम उठा रही है। दूसरी बात मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगी कि कितने केसेज में सरकार कितनी जल्दी फैसला करायी? यह जो 50 सिक इंडस्ट्रीज रैफर हुई हैं और 44 केसेज जिनका कि रजिस्ट्रेशन हो गया है, कितनी जल्दी इनका फैसला होगा? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन्होंने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है पृष्ठ 2 पर अंतिम पैरा में कि नेशनल रिन्युअल फंड का गठन हुआ है और इन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि इस स्कीम के तहत ...Schemes have been proposed to assist the employees in re-training, re-deployment and counselling. तो मैं यह पूछना चाहती हूँ कि कितने मजदूरों



का, कितने श्रमिकों का रिट्रेनिंग हुआ है, कितने श्रमिकों का रि-डिप्लॉयमेंट हुआ है और कितने का काउंसिलिंग हुआ है और कहा-कहा पर इनका रि-ट्रेनिंग के बाद रि-डिप्लॉयमेंट हुआ है, यह पूरा ज्योरा मंत्री जी सदन में प्रस्तुत करें ?

मान्यवर, जैसेकि श्री नारायणसामी जी अभी यहां बोलकर गए, नेशनल रिन्यूअल फंड एक "एक्टिव पॉलिसी" का ही दूसरा रूप है और इससे सीधे-सीधे लोगों को बी०आर०एस० देकर घर में जाने के बजाए दूसरा काम नहीं हुआ है और न आगे होनेवाला है। तो इस तरह से काम नहीं हो सकता और आगे आनेवाले दिनों में इस देश के औद्योगिकरण की प्रक्रिया अगर सही मायनों में चालू रखनी है तो इस देश के श्रमिक ही उसके का सकते हैं, लेकिन असंतुष्ट श्रमिक के द्वारा कोई काम ठीक से नहीं हो पाएगा। इस देश का श्रमिक बहुत असंतुष्ट है, उद्धेलित है और... (ध्वजघ्वान)...

उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री मोहम्मद खलील) : कमला जी, अब आप समाप्त कीजिए।

श्रीमती कमला सिन्हा : मैं विल मंत्रीजी से कहना चाहूंगी कि आप चाहे बितनी भी बात कहें विदेश से एन०आर०आय० के जरिए या दूसरे लोगों से कि हमारे यहां इनवेस्टमेंट हो, मल्टीनेशनल्स को बुलाया जाय, लेकिन मल्टी-नेशनल्स का इनवेस्टमेंट जिस किसी देश में हुआ है, उस देश का बहुत विकास नहीं हुआ है। इससे हमारी आर्थिक आजादी समाप्त हो जाएगी। यह इस देश के लिए बहुत बड़ी खतरे की घंटी होगी। मैं अभी कुछ दिन पूर्व दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया की कुछ जगहों पर गयी थी। वहां हमारी मीटिंग थी, उसमें मुझे यह बताया गया कि हांगकांग, कोरिया और ताइवान इन तीन देश का जी०एन०पी० मिलाकर जितना होता है उतना हमारे हिंदुस्तान का जी०एन०पी० नहीं है। तो हमने क्या तरक्की की है और आगे आनेवाले दिनों में हम क्या तरक्की करनेवाले हैं ? इसलिए यह बहुत ही खतरे की घंटी है और उद्योग मंत्री महोदय, मैं चाहूंगी कि मैंने जो प्रश्न पूछे हैं, उसका साफ-साफ जवाब दें। एक तो उद्योगों को जानबूझकर बीमार कराया जा रहा है, खासकर भारी उद्योगों को जानबूझकर बिना आईएन देकर सरकार बीमार करा रही है ताकि उनको विदेशी मल्टी-नेशनल्स के हाथ बेचा जा सके और दूसरी बात बी०आय०एफ०आर० को भी जानबूझकर कमजोर बनाया गया है ताकि ये जल्दी फैसला न हो सके और इनका रिट्रेनिंगेशन हो सके। यह मेरा सीधा आरोप सरकार पर है। धन्यवाद।

(समाप्त)

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat) : Sir, sick industries in the public sector as well in the private sector have become a very vital issue. Today, we are limiting our discussion only to the public sector. I have been associated with the trade unions, especially textiles, in Ahmedabad for so many years. Therefore, I know something about the NTC which is a major segment in the sick public sector industries. There are 124 mills with 1.6

lakhs workers. There are 80,000 surplus workers who are getting wages without any work. I understand that Government has to be humane and they are giving more than Rs 100 crores per annum as wages to the workers of mills where there is no employment, there is no performance and there is no work. Therefore, it will be a little difficult for me to accuse the Government.

Governments, whether it is Congress—in between we had the Janata Party—the National Front, all of them always came to the rescue of the workers who were suffering when the mills in the private sector were closed due to sickness. They said it was largely a national approach to support these workers. The public sector has grown and I do not want to go into that aspect. I think, the entire India is for the public sector and also for the private sector. But we lost efficiency and this is not being looked into. It is felt that the sick units are not being looked after by the financial institutions. But the financial institutions have their own problems. They say that unless sick units are proposed to be made viable they would not advance money because there is the Parliament and there are people who ask questions. Why are they not becoming viable ? This is a crucial issue. I have said in my meetings with the workers that when the ship is floating, if you add additional weight, the entire ship would sink. Therefore, if there is surplus labour and there is, in the NTC a huge number of it, the management, the Government and the Trade Unions must work out a solution so that surplus labour is taken away. All the viable industries must work for the welfare of the workers and the nation. I have faced this kind of argument. (interruptions). In the communal movement, we have vested interests; in politics, we have vested interests; in the management of public sectors and vested interests in the Trade Union movement also. Therefore, you must realise this. I have been struggling to revive the sick units and to make them viable through the formation of workers' co-operatives. I am a little disappointed because workers are going to be the owners in the co-operative sector when the units are made viable even in such a scenario labour leaders are not forthcoming. Why not come out with a scheme as to what is a co-operative and how they can work it out. But the Government has not worked out a model co-operative unit. They must say that viable sick units would be handed over to the workers at least on a Re. 1 rent basis. Coming to the second point. What about the working capital ? The third point, what about modernisation ? Labour

must come out with a clear proposal. They must work out a formula on the basis of which some guidelines could be fixed so that some people can retire. They should be given the benefit of the voluntary retirement scheme. They should not be made to starve. Or, they must be employed somewhere. But where is the positive approach? If the NTC land is sold, it can bring more than Rs. 500 crores for the NTC. Why do the trade unionists come in the way? They say, "We will not allow you to sell the land unless you agree that all these workers would be re-employed." Now, if the Government...  
(Interruptions)...

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA :** One point of information, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. Something is being said about the trade union movement. I am a member of the Tripartite Committee. The trade unions had agreed on all the proposals. All imaginary allegations are being hurled. I can only say that this was not the position that the trade unions had taken.

**SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA :** I am asking you : Did you, as a responsible trade unionist, put up any model of co-operative movement? You were supposed to say, "This Government should come out with a voluntary retirement scheme; they should come out with a modernisation capital; they should come out with a working capital and they should say that they were prepared to give the surplus labour the benefit of the voluntary retirement scheme, before the workers lost their jobs."

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) :** Please conclude.

**SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA :** Now, the accumulated losses of the NTC are around Rs. 2,800 crores. Their losses were Rs. 190 crores in 1991-92 and on 31st March, 1993, the losses have come to Rs. 442 crores. If the Central Government is paying subsidy or providing budgetary support, it is people's money...  
(Interruptions)...

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA :** It is as if the Government is replying.

**SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA :** It doesn't matter. There has to be a total national view, an objective view. You will not appreciate it because you have a vested interest of the trade union movement. If you say I am speaking on behalf of the Government...  
(Interruptions)...

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA :** I wish the hon. Member becomes a Minister to reply.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) :** Please conclude.

**SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA :** Objectivity is missing. I am criticising the Government. I know very well about the management's corrupt practices. NTC has suffered a loss because the managers and the directors were manipulating the accounts, and nobody has been brought to book. Almost everybody has gone scot-free. I once asked the Chairman of one of the NTC subsidiaries casually as to what he was doing. He said, "I am supposed to collect election funds." And it is this nexus of politicians with bureaucracy that has brought sickness in the mill. Today, I can tell you, in NTC, spinning has gone down from 73 per cent to 52 per cent; weaving from 83 per cent to 35 per cent and production of cloth from 800 million metres to 300 million metres. This is how the whole situation has come around. I will cite an example. There is the Gujarat tractors in Baroda. When they became sick, they did not go to the BIFR because the BIFR prolongs the litigation and hearing for years together. I don't want to say anything against the BIFR; they are doing something with a good intention. But they are not able to succeed. The other day the Labour Minister said that out of 1300 cases that were referred to the BIFR, they had disposed of only 400 cases. What have the workers got to do? The Gujarat Tractors workers found a way out. They formed a co-operative movement on their own and the management also agreed with them. Now, they are making huge profits and some of the workers are getting more salary than what a managing director is getting. So it is the labour movement which has to develop trade unions. And it is not the monopoly of the labour representatives. I do represent labour and before even some of the Members got themselves associated with the trade union movement, I have been working with the trade unions. I had even gone to jail for them.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) :** Now you please conclude.

**SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA :** That is why his information is outdated.

**SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA :** Improvement is required on all sides. The Government is not that sensitive. The Government should tell the managements that they should work out a model co-operative. Why are they not doing this? I asked Mr. Sangma, I asked Mr. Venkat Swamy, to tell the managements of the textile mills to have a workers' co-operative necessity. Therefore, the management, the bureaucracy and the labour, all have to put their heads together and try to find a solution. This is a national crisis which cannot be solved unless

this is done.

Thank you very much, Sir.

**SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI** (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the problem of sickness in the public sector is part of the total industrial landscape, including the private sector. After all, we were told all along that there was no distinction or antagonism between the private sector and the public sector and both constituted a national sector. That itself shows the linkage between private and public sectors, the interconnection between these two or what may be called the transmission effects of one to the other, the dependence of the private sector on the public sector and of the public sector on the private sector in respect both of production and employment. I think both these aspects, the interconnected aspects, have assumed alarming proportions. A lot has been said about the reasons for the sickness. After all, the Reserve Bank of India has gone into this, many committees have gone into this—the cumulative deterioration of the public sector and the totality of the industrial sickness in the country. It is high time that we thought of all this. One fact that stands out separately is that so far as industrial sickness is concerned, it is a great leveller, as somebody has said. It covers within itself both the big industries and also the medium and small-scale industries. It is indeed a big leveller. That shows the failure of the Government policies in respect of these sectors. It actually comprehends or cuts across all the States, all types of industries of varying size and scale. Now this is the kind of situation that is emerging and nobody knows about it better than the Finance Minister himself who is present now and the Minister of State for Industries as to how much money is locked up in these sick industries. Many figures have been given in the *Economic Survey*—every year they are giving—and in certain other reports. I would like to draw your attention to one particular fact which has been mentioned in the statement made by the Minister that a number of loss-making industries were abandoned by the private sector investors. Now my question is, my complaint is, my accusation is that the Government itself is mainly responsible for this kind of a situation. You take over the private sector undertakings without apportioning the responsibility, without imposing any kind of a penalty on them. When we go into these issues, don't we find some kind of a nexus between the Government and the private industry? Because of this nexus, you take over those units. Then you are

not able to devote the attention that is necessary in regard to public sector units.

Sir, I would like to mention that one of the main reasons for this sickness is lack of professionalism in the management. Management has a large number of aspects. It is very difficult for me to go into all those aspects. The funny thing has been this that even though we have established many professional institutions, training institutions, we still find inadequacies and shortcomings creeping into the managements of both the public sector and the private sector. Of course, so far as the private sector is concerned, many of the companies only utilize their talents, or misutilize or misuse the talents of these professional managers and that is why it was described by Mr. Chimanbhai Mehta as corrupt management and so on. Now, who is responsible for this, whether it is in the private sector or in the public sector?

Sir, a mention was made about the work culture. How can you expect the work culture to improve? As was mentioned by Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, if the tripartite committee does not have a meeting, if the Ministers speak in different voices and different Ministers issue different statements, one would not know and one does not know what the "Exit Policy" even today means. For the private sector, it is only "hire and fire". The private sector understands it only that way. But, so far as the public sector is concerned, it is the voluntary retirement scheme. Now, the allegation is that taking advantage of the voluntary retirement scheme, many persons, who would have been useful because they have been trained at Government expense, are leaving the public sector and are just grabbed or gobbled up by the private sector. This kind of a situation has arisen now and it is a waste of public funds. So, my question to the honourable Minister is this : Is it not a fact that you have failed to take any anticipatory action, whether it is in the public sector or in the private sector? No pre-emptive action was taken though you had the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. It was both for regulation and development. It was meant for regulation and also for promotion of industrial development. Your "Exit Policy" by itself is no policy and it has not been spelt out properly. If there is some kind of an ambivalence in the Government, naturally, it creates uncertainty in the mind of labour. Has the "Exit Policy" been spelt out properly? Different things are said by different Ministers at different places. The Finance Minister says that it will be introduced in order to attract funds from the World Bank

and the IMF and other foreign investors and the other Ministers will say that they will protect the interests of labour and so on. Today, the labour is no longer gullible and you can really be fuddle the labour, whatever you may say about the existence of trade unions, of vested interests among the trade unions. But I do not want to go into that question just now. The point is that it is your own handling of the issue that is responsible for this deplorable situation. We had the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. Now, we have the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act... (Time Bell rings)... Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this is a very important subject and I will try to wind up as early as possible and will make a few comments. For want of time, I am avoiding going into the figures. By this Act, the Government sought to fulfil its basic objective by having a quasi-judicial authority, some kind of an apex authority. But, unfortunately, even the functioning of the BIFR is not satisfactory. I do not want to go into all those details. But the Annual Report of the Ministry of Industry and the Economic Survey give the tell-tale figures as to how successful it has been. But the question that remains is this : Has the Government done everything to help the BIFR ? Last year, there were so many vacancies and there are three vacancies today. But the Government has not been able to make up its mind and fill these vacancies. The Board has gone on record saying that there are 480 pending cases and at least six Benches are required for this purpose. There is no decision from the Government. Now, what can the BIFR do if you cannot give it the necessary wherewithal ? Certain figures have been given with regard to the cases referred to the BIFR. So far as the public sector is concerned, I find that these figures are at variance with the figures that we have got from the Economic Survey. According to the Economic Survey of 1992-93, as on 31st December, 1992, 91 industrial companies in the public sector had been referred to the BIFR. Out of these nine cases were rejected at the time of registration, and 11 were under scrutiny at that time, leaving the effective registered figures at 71. I do not know whether there are certain other figures and so on. But that is not the basic question because one always knows the kind of differing figures that come from the Government.

Sir, my basic point is this. Heavy engineering industry has been mentioned. And in continuation of the private sector, we have the Heavy Engineering Corporation. Not only that, one can go to a number of other public corporations

and public companies. But the basic question that remains is : About the heavy engineering, did you heed the warning which the CAG reports and many of your expert committee reports, and the Public Accounts Committee reports had given ? Did you heed their warning and did you try to rectify these things ? It is not only the heavy engineering industry. I can give the examples of a number of other reports. In view of the time-bell, naturally I have to conclude. But, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you permit me to say one or two things, that is about what has to be done. I think, we must be clear about the exit policy. These mealy-mouthed phrases will not do because Mr. Sinha has already asked as to what kind of redeployment and retraining, etc., you have done. These are the amorphous words which do not yield any results. Now, this is the point that we have to consider.

Sir, the fact of the matter is that today the banks and the financial institutions are pressuring the Government because of the new accountancy and new financial norms that have been laid down. A number of things have been said by Mr. Das Gupta about how the public sector funds have been utilised or mis-utilised in the way it has been done. Mr. Jagesh Desai many a time mentioned in this House about the public sector banks and also the functioning of the public sector, and the way, somehow or the other, they had been helping the things which are not conducive to the good of the economy.

Sir, I just want to bring one or two facts to your notice.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) : Last point.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI : A lot has been said about the T. S. Goteswar Committee report. When that report was submitted to the Prime Minister, one does not know what happened to that. But, I have got the Statement of the Minister of State. The report was submitted in February. On 4th March, she gives a very categorical kind of reply as if the job of the Industry Ministry is not to promote industrial development but just to liquidate them, to wind them up, and as if the Labour Ministry will take care so far as the labour is concerned. If this is the kind of fragmented approach that the Government is expected to have then what is supposed to be done by the National Renewal Fund ? And a very paltry sum has been given for that. And, Sir, I want to bring one more fact to your notice because Mr. Venkat Swamy has made very bold assurances about the NTC. And

so much has been said about the NTC, etc. I do not want to go into it because all of us have been pleading in this House.

Why not try the workers co-operatives. And it is always said, and I understand that even in West Bengal, one co-operative organisation is running one of the sick units. There has been that Kamani Tubes. In Bombay, that experiment has been made. But then, you cannot just ask the labour or the workers just to take up the co-operative. They are certainly reluctant. But they will be reluctant till you give them the concrete proposals. The format can be evolved where the role of the various agencies can be spelt out and how they will help those co-operative agencies during their teething troubles. After all, for years we have helped the private sector and the public sector. We talk of the protected industry. All these 40 years, we have protected them. We have regulated them, we have tried to mulch them, only to misuse or abuse that situation. And now you don't want to spell out the detailed policy as to how the workers' co-operatives will really work and what kind of facilities will be given to them.

There are a large number of things I would have liked to bring to the notice of the Minister. So far as the Minister is concerned, she has got enough information. But the question is that the will to acts is lacking. There is already a chasm between the intention or what is spelt out and its implementation. That is the basic problem. It has to be realised by the Government that the kind of unrest that is spreading and the kind of wrong signals that are given by wrong policies to the country will undermine the social stability in this country. I do not want to go into the problem of privatisation and so on. The question is, if you have to liquidate, please do the mercy killing the earlier the better. And then take care of the labour so that your promises are redeemed. Why are you allowing many of those public sector units to deteriorate which are still in a better position? By and by their viability is getting eroded, and that is the basic problem before us. That is why there is now a difficult situation. The Goswamy Committee Report has come. There is a lot of controversy. I do not want to go into its recommendations because even the Finance Minister has gone on record saying, when it was presented in the Finance Ministry by the Chairman of the Committee, that if we go by the definition of the Goswamy committee Report, then there will be a scarcity of entrepreneurs in the country. About the winding up etc., something was said yesterday and also there was a mention about taking away

the powers from the Labour Commissioner. I think these issues will figure sometime later. But before resuming my seat, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to say one additional thing. When the Finance Minister—he is not here now—and I were in the Government as part of the bureaucracy and so on, there was a Committee which was appointed to go to one particular State to look into the problems of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes since that was one of the wings in the Ministry of Home Affairs at that time. Unfortunately, I could not go because of some law and order problem. But I had a detailed discussion with him and he was gracious enough to come and speak to me after returning. What he said was: "Mr. Chaturvedi, for the first time I have seen how by the Marxian aphorism or its prognosis, the State will wither away is materialising I have seen it happening in one particular State". Now I find that he is the Finance Minister of a dithering Government. It may still be a Constitutional fiction; it may be a Constitutional reality. But the point is, from 'dithering' to 'withering' there is not a very long gap between the alphabets 'd' and 'w' and I do think that this Government, at least from the point of view of social intervention, for social good, for the national economy and for public purpose etc., will really abide by the spirit of the promises and the spirit of pronouncements.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRASAD MODY** (Rajasthan) : The situation today is that by 1989-90, select 43 companies in the public sector sick industries have registered a loss of Rs. 9,500 crores. The note that we have received from the Department or from the Minister is a routine note. As usual it refers to the BIFR; it refers to the difficulty of the public sector and it refers that 'we are doing our best' with a very noble thought that it shall be strong again and it shall get back to profit area. I have to apologise and I feel very sorry at the way the country is being run. While the country virtually bleeds with the kind of losses these public sector undertakings are making, while there is a large budgetary deficit and they are selling away the assets of the country and yet routinely they present before the House a piece of paper to say that action is being taken. Repeatedly, we have been told like this. Now, I would give just two examples out of these 44 public sector undertakings which will give the House an idea of how the Government is totally apathetic, is not concerned, is not taking any action whatsoever and is just bringing in the B.I.F.R. and making it a scapegoat. Here, I would like to point out that there is the

deposit what the Goswami Committee has said that the B.I.F.R. cannot just function in the present context. The first example I would like to give is that of the Hindustan Steelworks Construction Corporation. This company was floated when the country's major steel plants were being set-up. Its main job was to set-up steel plants. Today, it employs 8,000 workers. Out of this, more than 4,000 workers have no work at all. They are being paid their salaries day-in and day-out. A budgetary provision of Rs. 35 crores is made every year to give them retrenchment compensation. Naturally, they are getting their salaries from the Hindustan Steelworks Construction Corporation and they are also drawing salaries from elsewhere. The Government says that they are making a provision, but there is no taker. Nobody is taking the compensation. Apart from this, this particular company does not even fall under the purview of the B.I.F.R. This is because the B.I.F.R. Act does not cover service companies. This is not a manufacturing company. Yet the Government says like this. I would like the hon. Minister to tell us what exactly is the position. Do they have any plan for the Hindustan Steelworks Construction Corporation, or, is it only apathy? Sir, the Hindustan Steelworks Construction Corporation alone has lost Rs. 260 crores up to the year 1990. Still the Government says that they are trying to do their best.

The other example I have is of a fertiliser company. This company has not produced a single tonne of fertiliser since its inception. The main area of problem was that it was a technically wrongly set up plant. The workers are being paid for the last fifteen years, but not a single tone of fertiliser has been produced by this company.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** What is the name of the company?

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRASAD MODY :** The fertiliser plant located at Haldia in West Bengal. In this fertiliser company, the workers get not only their full wages paid, not only is there an annual expenditure of nearly Rs. 2 crores towards canteen subsidy, but there is also another impossible thing happening there, namely, overtime is also paid in this company. How can this kind of thing go on? When we ask for Rs. 500 crores by way of relief in the case of personal taxation, when we ask for reduction in individual income-tax where we are being heavily taxed, the Government does not reduce the tax rate, because they are not able to give a relief of Rs. 500 crores. On the other hand,

crores of rupees go down the drain like this. The Government simply says that the B.I.F.R. is looking into it. They say 'We are doing our best and we hope things would revive'. I think the Government should be more serious. The country cannot afford to lose like this. The hon. Minister must ask the Department and advise us on the action proposed. I have given two specific examples. The B.I.F.R. cannot do anything in both of the cases. The Government should go into this question in depth and remedy the situation. As I pointed out, we have the situation of budgetary provision for these companies, but nobody is taking the money. Thank you.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) :** Shri Vithalrao Madhavrao Jadhav. Please restrict yourself to asking only pointed questions.

**SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV (Maharashtra) :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Minister that she has made a very good and comprehensive statement. I now come directly to my questions.

The hon. Minister has said that of the 56 public enterprises referred to the B.I.F.R., 44 cases have been registered for rehabilitation. They have been registered about a year ago. May I know what is the progress in respect of rehabilitation of these 44 companies which have been referred to the B.I.F.R.? I would like to know what progress has been made.

The second thing is, the statement says that in regard to the National Renewal Fund, a provision of Rs. 700 crores has been made. May I know from the hon. Minister how much out of this Rs. 700 crores has been spent for rehabilitation of these sick public sector enterprises?

The hon. Member, Mr. Mody, referred to the Hindustan Steelworks Construction Corporation. This company has made a loss of Rs. 69.4 crores. Then, the top ten public sector enterprises have made a total loss of Rs. 2,494 crores in one year. Out of that RINL, Rashtriya Ispat Nigam Ltd., has incurred a loss of Rs. 986.90 crores, HFC Rs. 330.5 crores, and FCI, Fertilizer Corporation of India, Rs. 225.40 crores. It is a prestigious industry and this loss has caused great concern to the farmers. DTC has incurred a loss of Rs. 203.80 crores, Indian Airlines—the hon. Civil Aviation Minister is sitting here—has made a loss of Rs. 198.90 crores, HEC Rs. 192.70 crores, IDPL Rs. 112.40 crores and HSL has made a loss of Rs. 104.10 crores. So, the top ten public enterprises have made a loss of Rs. 2,494 crores out of the

total loss of Rs. 4,000 crores. The rest of the 30 or a little more than 30 public undertakings have made a loss of over Rs. 1,500 crores. I would like to know when these prestigious enterprises will be revived, when they will be feasible and how much labour is involved which has suffered.

Secondly, is privatisation possible? These are very big public sector enterprises. If these enterprises are incurring losses continuously, what are the measures being taken by the Government to make them healthy? How many employees have suffered on account of the losses incurred by these public sector undertakings?

Apart from that, there are more than 2 lakh small scale units which have gone sick. More than Rs. 15,000 crores have been invested in this small scale sector. The major share of the employment is there in the small scale sector. The hon. Minister may not be directly concerned with the small scale industries, but her colleague, whoever he may be, who is concerned with the small scale sector, should take a serious note of this. A large number of entrepreneurs, qualified engineers and other technicians have lost faith in the small sector industries. A large number of the workers have become unemployed. I would like to know the measures taken by the Government to revive this small scale sector. (*Time-bell rings*).

I am only putting questions. How many agro-based or co-operative industries have gone sick? The other day there was a question about Tribunals and co-operative industries. In Maharashtra we have got a large number of sugar factories. About 70 to 75 per cent of them are making profit. Only 10 to 20 per cent have gone into losses. Some of them have gone into losses because of the fault of the management, but most of them have gone into losses because of bad weather and inadequate rains. So, I want to know how many co-operative industries in Maharashtra and other parts of the country have gone sick.

Now I come to the important question relating to NTC. I am more worried because it concerns my district. The Government has been continuously trying to take over sick textile mills and give relive to the workers. As one of the hon. Members rightly pointed out, one of the textile mills is being run by worker's co-operative management. I am sure, in Maharashtra there are so many workers' unions which are not concerned with the trade unions, which want to do some constructive work. They are prepared to come forward to revive some of

the sick textile mills. If the Government considers very seriously to handover these sick textile mills to the workers' management, they will come forward and run them profitably.

In my district one NTC mill was started during the Nizam regime before independence. The mill was making profit. Ten thousand workers were working in that mill. Two years back it had gone sick. The hon. Textile Minister, Shri Venkat Swamy, has assured this House that he would look into this and see that this mill goes on working. But, till today nothing has been done. An NTC mill, which is a very prestigious mill in the Nanded district of Maharashtra—Nanded is a rural district where rural industrialization is taking place—has gone sick. I request the hon. Minister through you, Sir, to urgently intervene in the matter and see that this mill goes on working.

In Maharashtra we have started Regional Industrial Development Corporations in Marathwada, Vidarbha, Western Maharashtra and Konkan. The Marathwada Regional Development Corporation and the Vidarbha Regional Development Corporation have gone sick. All the revenue officers who were managing these Corporations have swallowed all the money and brought the employees there to tears. All their units have gone sick. Therefore, the Government of India must give some help to the State Government and should also see that the industrial units which were working in those economically backward areas are revived and economic justice is done to the economically backward areas. Thank you, Sir.

**SHRI JIBON BEHARI ROY (West Bengal) :**  
Sir, I have gone through the statement made by the hon. Minister. It is nothing but about NRIs. It has not dealt with even the question of how many revival plans have been sanctioned during the last two years by the BIFR. Government has not given that figure. But we know that not a single plan has been sanctioned during the last two years.

Sir, I represent the trade union movement. My constituency is the trade union movement. Our experience has been that lack of political will on the part of the Government is the main enemy to the revival of sick public sector units. You may take the horse to the water, but you cannot make it drink. Sometimes the Government accuses, and the trade union movement also accuses the BIFR as being mainly responsible for this situation. But the Government has no sense of direction, no political will to guide the BIFR what should be the way to deal with

the sick industrial units referred to the BIFR.

Anyone who is intimately connected with the developments and the sequence of events that take place in the BIFR once a case is referred to the BIFR knows the position. The moment an industrial unit is referred to the BIFR, an ominous signal goes out from the Finance Ministry to the banks and other financial institutions and, immediately, all round, all advances will be stopped to the sick units referred to the BIFR. All orders will be stopped. Even prestigious industrial units like MAMC and HEC do not get Government orders or public sector orders. For example, Coal India does not place orders with MAMC and HEC and, therefore, these and other industrial units are moving almost to the brink of disaster.

Sir, there are nearly 50 cases from the Central public sector undertakings pending before the BIFR. Also there are more than 100 cases from the Central and State public sector undertakings pending before the BIFR, involving more than four lakh workers. Every time the Industry Ministry will be present in the BIFR as a promoter, and in the first meeting it will say that the Government has no money and therefore, it cannot act as a promoter. Consequently, the IDBI is asked to act as the operating agency. The IDBI will call the private sector, and the private sector will enter to fish in the troubled waters. Their main objective, main aim, is to usurp the land of the public sector. They want to sell it in the market. We are getting serious reports from those industries which are not being referred even to the BIFR.

A dangerous signal has come from the BHEL. In the Question Hour the hon. Minister was saying that the BHEL was not getting orders because of competition. The fact is completely different. This year the Industry Ministry itself has lessened the capacity utilisation in Power Sector of the BHEL by 50 per cent. Next year the BHEL's capacity will be further reduced. For the next three years the capacity utilisation in the power sector has been fixed at 30%, 8% and 5%. It means that by 1997 the BHEL will be wound up. Is it because of competition, Sir? The Industry Ministry's Report itself says that because the import is tied up with the IMF loan, orders could not be issued to the BHEL. Therefore, its capacity is being slashed. We would like to know from the hon. Minister what steps they are taking to tackle the sickness arising out of globalisation and out of the loan tied-up with imports. We have information that the Government of India is bringing Power

capacity giving a guarantee of 16 per cent profit on the investment. In that case what should be the investment for creating a capacity of one megawatt? That figure has been fixed at Rs. 4.25 crores against the BHEL's offer of only Rs. 1.20 crores. Is it competition? Is it globalisation? Are workers to be blamed for that?

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the steel workers have a serious complaint against the Steel Ministry and the Finance Ministry. Their complaint is that there is discrimination against the SAIL in favour of a consultant. Sir, you know, the IISCO is a prestigious, premier unit in the steel industry. It is having a property of Rs. 16,000 crores. It is having not one but more than five captive mines, the best coking coal mines and the best iron-ore mines. It is being handed over virtually free of cost, at Rs. 134 crores. 134 crores will be advanced by the SAIL. The new concept is that it will give some interest on the loan advanced by the IISCO. Now the trade union movement raised the question why financial package being extended to the contractor will not be extended to the Steel Authority of India. The reason is simple. Therefore, one of my friends has said that on the 7th of September the entire trade union movement in the steel industry, including the INTUC, BMS, the CITU and all others, is going for a nation-wide strike against this policy.

That is why, Sir, I was saying that it is not a problem of the BIFR alone. It is not some concession here and there. It is a matter of policy, what policy the Government will pursue on the question of public sector and whether you like the public sector or not. I would humbly say that the blind pursuance of a policy dictated by foreign powers has already dragged the Government far away from the policy which it had announced in July, 1991. It has gone away from it. That is why we find that the competition is not the end. The foreigners are grabbing the economy of our country as it has happened in the case of the BHEL. Therefore, the Government has to decide. If the Government is genuinely in favour of the public sector, the Hon. Industries Minister should reiterate here the commitments made by the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister on earlier occasions that the public sector will remain and all forms of its commitments regarding the public sector it will stand by, that the embargo on the release of funds to the public sector referred to the BIFR will be lifted; orders will be provided to those public sector units whose cases have been referred to the BIFR; and orders will also be



given to other public sector undertakings. It has to be reiterated that industries like the BHEL will be protected from the outsiders. At the same time the Government should assure that it will adhere to the revival plan given by the BIFR, and the Government will sanction the required money for their revival. That assurance should come. Otherwise the BIFR in its own reaction will bring about a total bewilderment. In this context I would like to refer to the recommendations of the Goswamy Commission. The report is the annexation of pre-decided notions. Its main objective is to wind up the sick industries altogether to give way to the movement of capital from less profitable areas to the most profitable areas. This will result in flight of capital from one place to another. There are two directives of the Goswamy Commission. One is to shift the role of the BIFR from reconstruction or rehabilitation to winding up the public sector units. The second is to bring about laissez-faire in the matter of their closure. It is not a question of sickness alone, it is giving an open passport for flight of capital from one place to another and in the process "hire and fire" of the workers will continue.

Two points are being raised again and again. It is only to hit the workers. One of my colleagues was talking about the NTC. In the history of the last two decades, this Government in order to help some of the monopoly houses had hit the public sector had nationalised some industries which were already exhausted major part due to over utilisation. Most of the loss-making industries under PSU industries, including the NTC, fall into that category. The very same Government has been blaming the workers for the failure of these units and has been raising the bogey that the public sector itself has to be liquidated.

The question of the co-operatives also has been raised. I would request the Hon. Minister not to draw the working class to a mirage. In a state of globalisation, BHEL is collapsing. Do the Members feel, do the Government feel that workers co-operative will succeed? Even the Government is talking of workers co-operative. Till now the Government did not put forward any detailed scheme opinion in this regard.

Finally, I will mention two more points. One relates to the commitment. The Hon. Prime Minister and the Labour Minister have made commitments on a number of occasions.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.D. SALIM) :** Are you on your last point?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS :** Give him some

more time. This is his maiden speech.

**SHRI JIBON BIHARI ROY :** They have made a commitment before the trade unions. The Prime Minister has said in categorical terms that in those cases where the management and the union are able to come together and prepare a viable plan jointly, they can place it before the BIFR; and the BIFR will automatically sanction it and ratify it. I have the figures. First of all, the Ministry of Industry does not allow the management to sit with the workers and with the trade unions. It embarks a bar between the two.

Secondly, wherever the management and the trade union are coming together to place a common proposal, the Government is not considering those cases. At least I know of a dozen cases where joint proposals have been placed before the Government. For example, the Bengal Immunities, Smith, the Bengal Chemicals Bharath Brakes Valve Cycle Corporation of India Ltd. and many other companies have placed joint proposals before the Government and before the BIFR. They could not finalise a single case because of the resistance from the Ministry of Industry.

Lastly, on behalf of the trade unions I would like to assure the Government that trade unions are ready to discuss everything with the Government except the NRF or the Exit Policy. Under no circumstances the Exit Policy will be accepted by the trade unions. We are ready to discuss everything except exit and settle. In many places negotiations have taken place with the BIFR. Workers have made sacrifices. If the Government is fair, trade unions will make sacrifices and will probably be able to finalise many cases. But the question is : What is the policy the Government is following? That policy must be reiterated and that must be cleared with this, I thank you.

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री मोहम्मद सलीम) :** श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल। आपका तो मेहनत स्पीच नहीं है। आप संक्षेप में बोलें।

**श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** जितना सम्भव दिया गया है, उसमें से हमारा समय नहीं कटता जाएगा।... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहाँ तक सार्वजनिक उद्यमों का सवाल है, वह इस देश के प्रथम प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू की देन है। उनका विचार था कि समयान्तर में सार्वजनिक उद्यमों की संख्या उत्तरोत्तर बढ़ेगी, निजी क्षेत्र के उद्योगों की संख्या घटेगी और अन्त में खाली सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र रह जाएगा निजी क्षेत्र खतम हो जाएगा। ऐसा सपना उन्होंने देखा

था। उनके नाम का ही प्रताप था कि सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के उद्यम कुछ दिनों तक पवित्र गाय समझे जाते थे और कोई भी इनको छूने की हिम्मत नहीं करते थे।

लेकिन आज जवाहर लाल के नाम की रटन करने वाली सरकार जो बैठी है—नरसिंह राव की और डा० मनमोहन सिंह की, वह इन उद्योगों का गला घोटने पर उतारू है। मान्यवर, कैसे-कैसे तरीके इस्तेमाल किए गए हैं ? सरकार कहती है कि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है, इसलिए इन कम्पनियों के शेयर बेच दिए जाएं। वह इस सदन में चर्चा तो चुकी है कि डिस्ट्रिब्यूटमेंट के नाम से किस तरह से शेयर कहां से कहां पहुंचे हैं। प्रस्ताव यह था सरकार का कि सरकार का एक हाथ शेयर को बेचेगा और दूसरा हाथ शेयर को खरीदेगा, लेकिन खरीदने वाले हाथों से खनडिज़ायरेचल हाथों में ये पहुंच गए और इस संबंध में गोल्ड स्टार कम्पनी का भी नाम आया और दूसरी तरफ जो सिक इन्व्स्टीज़ है, उनको भी आई० एम० एफ० के सुपुर्द कर दिया गया। तो भी आई० एम० एफ० आर० का प्रस्ताव पुनर्स्थापना को आने तक सरकार को ध्यान रखना चाहिए था कि उद्योगों को चलाया जाए, उनको काम मिले और इनके मजदूरों को बराबर काम मिलता रहे, इस पर सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिए था। लेकिन सरकार ने यह कर दिया कि इनको किसी प्रकार की सहायता नहीं दी जा सकेगी, इन कम्पनियों के प्रबंधक रोज दिल्ली दौड़ रहे हैं लेकिन उनसे बात तक

[उपसभापति महोदय पीठासीन हुई]

नहीं की जाती, उन्हें हुंकार कर थपिस भेज दिया जाता है। नतीजा यह है कि मजदूर बेकार होने की हालत में हैं। इन्होंने जो सुझाव दिया है एक तो रिन्सुल फंड का और दूसरा कम्पलसरी रिटायरमेंट का, तो मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि रिन्सुल फंड के तहत और कम्पलसरी रिटायरमेंट के तहत कितने मजदूरों को अब तक रिटैबिलिटी दिया गया और भी आई० एम० एफ० आर० में जो केसिज पड़े हुए हैं, उनमें से कितनों का निस्तारण हो चुका है और कितने अभी बाकी हैं ? इस सिलसिले में मैं माननीय सदन का ध्यान इस तरफ भी खींचना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर यह सिकनेस आई कहां से, कौन जिम्मेदार है ? समय रहते सरकार ने इन उद्योगों की टेक्नोलॉजी में और पैदावार में सुधार नहीं किया, एक यह वजह है इसके सिक होने की और दूसरा, सरकार ने खुद अपने इन उद्योगों को काम नहीं दिया। यहीं पर हमने देखा था, जब रेलवे इंजन की खरीद-फरोक्त का मामला था तो एक सार्वजनिक उपक्रम को मौका नहीं दिया गया और इटली की एक फर्म को मौका दिया गया। तो सरकार ने खुद इन उद्योगों को मारा है, इनकी वजह से ही यह सिकनेस आई है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Jaiswal, I have to interrupt you while you are making good points. But the thing is, it was announced that we were going to have the voting between 2.00 p.m. and 2.30 p.m. Now it is quarter to 3. I have got so many names before me. Will you please put pointed questions? I will be thankful... (Interruptions).

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : अभी तो हमको दो या तीन मिनट जेलने का भी मौका नहीं मिला है।

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra) : We can take up this after the voting. It is a question of survival of the public sector. I do not mind... (Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not a question of your not minding. I agree with you. But it is not a question of your minding. The question is, we have never interrupted a call-attention matter in between to take up another issue. We do not want to have new practices introduced in the House. We do not want to do it. Mr. Chairman has arrived now for the Constitution Amendment. I have been able to take everybody's consent that we will not have any discussion. So, I would request Members to be very brief.

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : हुजूरवाला, इतनी देर में तो मैं अपनी बात खत्म कर देता।

उपसभापति : आप तो कर देते, मुझे दूसरों की बातें भी तो खत्म करनी हैं।

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : यह सब इसलिए किया जा रहा है क्योंकि सरकार कह रही है कि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है, इसलिए ये सब चीजें की जा रही हैं और यह विधायक सरकार को मिली है वरल्ड बैंक से आई० एम० एफ० से कि सरकार अपने बजट के घाटे को कम करे। इससे पहले यह समझा जाता था कि सरकार संसद के माध्यम से पूरे देश के प्रति जिम्मेदार है, यहां के किसानों के प्रति, यहां के मजदूरों के प्रति, यहां के आम आदमियों के प्रति जिम्मेदार है, लेकिन श्री नरसिंह राव और मनमोहन सिंह की सरकार ने यह साबित कर दिया है कि यह सरकार देश के प्रति जिम्मेदार नहीं है, वह अगर जिम्मेदार है तो आई० एम० एफ० के प्रति जिम्मेदार है, वरल्ड बैंक के प्रति जिम्मेदार है।... (व्यवधान)...

महोदय, इसी सिलसिले में एक चीज और कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब यह सारी किफायत सरकार को करनी थी है तो जो सरकार के विभिन्न महकमों में फिजूलखर्ची चल रही है तो उस फिजूलखर्ची को क्यों नहीं रोका जाता ? मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार के विभिन्न मंत्रियों के पास जो गाड़ियां लगी हैं तथा उनके प्रकान की जो साज-सज्जा है, जो सिग्योरिटी वगैरह है, जो फिजूलखर्ची है... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभापति : अब आप अपने पब्लिक सेक्टर पर आ जाइए।

श्री अनन्त राम जायसवाल : महोदय, अगर इस फिजूलखर्ची की तरफ सरकार का ध्यान नहीं गया और सरकार सार्वजनिक उद्यमों को मार रही है, वर्कर्स को मार रही है और उसके बाद मंत्री जी यह पृष्ठने की हिम्मत करते हैं कि सार्वजनिक उद्यम पर बात कीजिए। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि

फिजूलखर्ची पर पाबंदी लगाने पर सरकार ने क्या कोई उपाय किया है और अगर किया है तो उसको बताइए ? लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने अपने उस कर्तव्य को पूरा न करके वर्कर्स को मारा है, सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के उद्यमों को मारा है। इसके साथ ही मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

**SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (NOMINATED):** Madam, why should we be penalised?

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No, you are not being guillotined. You are being directed to follow the procedure of the Calling Attention.

**SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR:** We are being penalised. Madam, the public sector has been one of the most important sectors in this country. Every country that has developed, had started with the public sector whether it is Japan, whether it is America, whether it is England or whether it is any other country. All these countries started with the public sector. Later on, the public sector was changed. They had their own bad experience and they stopped in between and saw to it that the public sector which was there, remained as a public sector. What we are trying to do in our country is to kill the public sector. We feel that the public sector has outlived its life. I do not know what the view of the Government is about the overall picture. But let me make one thing clear that even in the capitalist world, the capitalistic system is undergoing a change and a new system is being evolved, is being worked out. What we find there is that those multi-nationals, which were there in the seventies, have started crumbling and they are again coming back to the smaller units, which are more viable and which are financially more strong. This is the system to which they are coming back.

Now, I come back to my own country. We have been saying that the public sector has become sick. But what are the reasons for its sickness? I would like to mention two basic reasons for its sickness. One is, in the public sector as well as the private sector, we have made one thing compulsory that every public sector unit or the private sector unit will have its own R & D, which is one of the basic things because with the passage of time, every industry undergoes a change, and any modernisation which is required, is required only in the research and development wing. If that is established, I think we can overcome so many difficulties. The second part, which is the most

important part, is the management of these units. We have been appointing IAS officers in the public sector undertakings. I have no grudge against them. But there is a difference between being an administrator and being a manager. A manager cannot be a good administrator. Similarly, a good administrator cannot be a good manager at the same time. If we have to revive the public sector undertakings, then as we have a separate cadre for the IAS officers, we should have a cadre for management, for marketing and for financial side also. If this suggestion is accepted by the Minister that there should be a separate cadre for management, marketing and financial side in the public sector undertakings which will ultimately look after all these things, I think the public sector can become viable.

Secondly, instead of making the public sector subjected to the Secretaries or Joint Secretaries, why don't we give full powers to the Managing Directors, the Directors and the Chairman and hold them responsible if they don't make them financially viable as well as profitable? The third point which I want to make here is that many of the units, which have been referred to the BIFR, are viable units. I will give only one example of Richardson and Cruddas. They have got their own plants in Bombay, Madras and other places. They employ more than 25,000 people at times. They have been asking for funds to the tune of Rs. 6 crores for the last one-and-a-half years. The Finance Minister is not here. The Industry Minister, who is here, will take care of this point. It is not running in loss today. It is at a break-even point. They have pointed out that if they do not get funds for modernisation of their machinery, it is likely that they will be referred to the BIFR and they will become a sick industry. There are some industries which are on the Border line. If financial assistance is given to these industries, which are on the border line, I think we can stop these cases being referred to the BIFR. Fourthly, in many of the cases, which are referred to the BIFR, the labour have come forward to invest in those companies if the BIFR is ready to provide assistance.

They are asking for participation and they say, "We will make these industries as viable units." Is the Minister going to consider these proposals and come and say in this House what exactly they are going to do?

**विपक्ष के नेता (श्री चिकम्बर बख्त):** सर साहिब, मैं यह कह रहा था कि 77वाँ कॉस्टीट्यूशन बिल ले लेते।

चेयरमैन साहब बैठे हैं, उनको बुझाए भी है । इसको पहले खत्म कर लीजिए ।

نیتا اور ودھی دل، شری سکندر بخت؛  
 صدر صاحبہ میں یہ کہہ رہا تھا کہ ۷۷ دان  
 کانسی ٹیوشن بن لے لیتے۔ پیرمین صاحب  
 بیٹھے ہیں۔ ان کو بخار بھی ہے۔ اس کو پہلے  
 ختم کر لیجیے۔

**उपसमापति :** यह तो जे लोगे अगर हाउस ऐंटी करता है ।.....

If the House agrees we will take it up. But with one rider. It doesn't mean that since we took up the Constitution (Seventy-seventh Amendment) Bill, Members are free to speak as much as they like. Still I will insist that the Members should be very brief even after we pass the Constitution Amendment Bill. Mr. Thulasi Reddy. He is not here. Mr. Saurin Bhattacharya, please withdraw your name at my request.

**PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal):** Our names can be dropped by your prerogative as other's names have been dropped.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Nu, no. You will be speaking. (*Interruptions*)... Mr. Bhatlacharya, you will be speaking on the Calling Attention. We are only stopping the process of the Calling Attention for the time being so that we can pass the Constitution (Seventy-seventh Amendment) Bill as the Chairmansahib is there and he will preside over.

**PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA:** Sir, you are setting a bad precedent all the same.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** It is not I. Unfortunately, Mr. Bhattacharya, I would request you to stop passing comments on the Chair, otherwise, I am going ahead with the Calling Attention. I don't accept the proposal made by the Leader of the Opposition and the House. I wouldn't take it up. Either you withdraw your comment or I will go ahead with the discussion. *(Interruptions)*... You withdraw... *(Interruptions)*... No. I have got my suggestion. *(Interruptions)*... I wouldn't go ahead.

**PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA:** It was

**your comment...**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not my comment.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: ....  
that the Calling Attention Motion should not be  
interrupted. I take that...(Interruptions)...

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Bhattacharya, It was not my suggestion. You didn't pay attention to the Leader of the Opposition. It was his suggestion that we should stop it. You withdraw and don't make such comments without knowing what you are talking.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: I  
withdraw.

3.00 PM

**THE CONSTITUTION (SEVENTY-SEVENTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1992**

**THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL):**

Madam, I beg to move :

"That the bill further to amend the constitution of India, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Madam, it gives me great pleasure to move for consideration in this august House, the constitution 77th Amendment Bill as passed by the Lok Sabha. This seeks to amend Article 323(B) of Part IV (A) of the constitution of India to insert a new clause after sub-clause (g) to enable the appropriate legislature of States and Union Territories to enact legislation for the establishment of Rent Tribunals. The constitutional amendment will exclude the writ and other jurisdiction of the High Court as provided under Articles 226, 227 and 228 of the Constitution. As in the case of Central Administrative Tribunal, only the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court under Article 136 of the Constitution will be retained in the new set-up for adjudicating rent control cases in different states. The proposed constitutional amendment is an important element of the Model Rent Legislation which has been laid before both the Houses of Parliament. It is only an enabling provision which authorises State Legislatures to set-up Rent Tribunals and exclude jurisdiction of High Court. The move to set-up the Rent Tribunal has been endorsed by State Governments in the conference of Chief Ministers and State Ministers convened by me (Mr. Chairman in the Chair)