

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Madam, I requested you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House is run by the Chair and not by the Minister.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Madam, I know your prerogative I request you one minute. One question.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Just listen to me. If I allow this practice, I have somebody there. Then there will be another question. Then there would be Mr. Ahluwalia asking. Then there could be somebody else also. I cannot discriminate between you and Mr. Ahluwalia or somebody else behind So, I cannot allow you. That matter is closed now.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : One point has not been answered by the Minister of Defence.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That you may write to the Minister.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY—contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Shri Shabbir Ahmad Salaria. Absent. Shri Bhadrashwar Buragohain. Absent. Shri Prakash Yashwant Ambedkar will you speak ?

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (Nominated) : Yes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Actually I must say the time allotted for the Ministry of Industry is over.

छोड़ो आप किसी और चीज पर बोल देना

Because excess time is being taken on this discussion, let the Minister reply.

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR : Madam, I am a nominated Member. The nominated Members don't belong to any political party.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Nominated Member. O.K. Don't take too long. Take only two minutes.

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR : Let me make my point absolutely clear. It is not my case. Before me also those who have spoken have faced the same pattern. At least nominated Members do not belong to any other party.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : After Mr. Prakash Ambedkar speaks, Ram Awadhesh Ji

आप भी बहुत संक्षेप में बोलना क्योंकि मंत्री जी को जवाब देना है और समय भी बचाना है।

[The Vice-Chairman (Shrimati Sushma Swaraj) in the Chair]

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR : The point that I was making is that the nominated Members come last and when it comes to the question of time they are axed. Some of them, I think, can make a better contribution on issues and professions to which they belong. They are selected to the House on the basis that they have certain special traits in certain departments. So, I think they can make a better contribution and they should be regarded as such by the House.

Madam, I now come to the industrial issues. The Industry Ministry has been discussed threadbare. The industrial policy that we have been following since 1956 was a mixed economy. Saddled mixed economy have now changed over to the private economy. It is a mixed up economy. Now, the question is whether in this world the private economy that existed has done justice to the common man. Is it a fact that this private economy that exists in the world is undergoing a change ? It is being said everywhere, specially by the leaders of your own political parties, that even private economies are unstable and we will have to think in terms of a new economic order. I think there the industrial policy becomes more important. Madam,

while framing the industrial policy with regard to industrial relations, we have to take into consideration the Centre, we have to take into consideration the States. As we see the Department of Industry has never taken into account the States. The financial viability of the State is as important as the financial viability of the Centre. Industry is one department which generates resources. If we do not take the States into consideration while framing the industrial policy, we are going to have weak States and we are going to have States which are going to depend on the Centre for their resources and for their survival. In this situation, in this cycle which has been going on in this country for the last 40 years, may I make a suggestion to the hon. Minister ? What is essential here is a sound industrial policy. A sound industrial policy is not merely based on production and efficiency. According to me, these things come later. We have been flogging the public sector. Let me give you an example of the Hindustan Machine Tools. (*Time hell rings*). In two minutes I will complete. The Hindustan Machine Tools has received a contract in Malaysia which was to be completed in 13 months. But they have completed the project in 11 months. If the public sector can show efficiency in other countries, why can't they show efficiency in this country ? It is the question of bureaucratic control which comes in. I am not going into it. But I will come to the main aspect with which I was dealing. If we want to have a sound industrial policy, then, first we have to see what type of industries are to be controlled by the Central Government and what type of industries are to be controlled by the States and give the rest of the industries to the private sector. The whole industry has to be divided. Only those industries be placed with the Central Government which are essential for them. Those industries should be controlled by the Central Government. For making States viable, for making States financially sound and to make them stand on their own legs, only those industries may be placed under the control of the States which can

be classified as necessary industry. Once the industries are divided between the Centre and the States, whatever industries are left out, those may be given to the private sector. A new environment has to be created. I know that the public sector is not working satisfactorily. Everywhere in the world, the corporate sector has come into being. But even the private sector is not working satisfactorily.

For framing a new industrial policy, I suggest certain industries be kept under the control of the Central Government and some other industries be kept under the control of the State Governments and the rest be given to the private sector as a national unit. If this system is followed, then, I think we don't have to change our industrial policy time and again and confuse the masses. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAI) : Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur.

आप पाँच मिनट में समाप्त करिये ।

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR (Bihar) : Madam, I will be very cooperative.

Madam, so far as the industrial policy is concerned, a lot of discussion has taken place. Unfortunately I was away for the last two days. You have kindly given me the opportunity. The new industrial policy has been introduced after a long gap with

a lot of hope. One problem 4.00 P.M. that I visualise is that whatever

may be the Central Government's thinking, that thinking is not shared down the line in the State Governments, belonging to one party or the other. That sharing is necessary because the implementation is not necessarily confined to or is marginally confined to the Central Government. There may be a good policy, but its implementation could be terrible. As a result, you would have, definitely, sort of, missed the benefits of that.

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur] The second area where a public controversy is going on is about the status of the public sector. I want to go on record that collectively and certainly as Congress party, in this country we do want a strong, visible and efficient presence of public sector because the bulwark of self-reliance of Indian economy has been a strong public sector in critical and strategic areas. It is true that the public sector or units have slackened and have become complacent. They do not allow their technology to be updated. Their efficiency norms have been compromised. And they have become employee-centred rather than consumer-centred, customer centred. That does not mean that we should throw them away. I am sure that is not the intention of the Government. But, how do we deal with the public sector? We have to now give a very clear picture. There are efficient public sector units. There are some which are not that efficient but can be made more efficient. And there are others who are dead load. Let us take the tail-end fust, the dead load. How do we deal with them? One way is to throw people on the road. Another way is to think in terms of some amalgamation or retrieving or Whatever. I believe a case-by-case effort is being attempted at. The speed at which it should be implemented needs to be accelerated.

The Same is true of the second category, trie units which are performing, but can perform a lot: better, particularly in such areas Where there is scope. For this, the market should be sufficient; technology should be available; and there should be joint partners from the private sector, domestic or international.

So far as the efficiently operating public sector enterprises are concerned, as a member of the Committee on Public Undertakings, in the last one and a half years, I have Had the opportunity to interact with a series of them. I can say with a certain degree of confidence that there are several such public enterprises which can be promoted into world-class units provided the Government takes a deep interest in them and gives push and support to the excellent

management teams that are running them. They are in the petroleum sector, they are in the engineering sector and they are in several other sectors. I need not go into that. My submission is that, based on the available data, I am not sure whether the managements of these enterprises are getting clear and absolutely unmistakable signals that the Government is fully behind them and they should take unadulterated corporate decisions based on commercial criteria with all the freedom of managerial decision-making. In this, it should be open to them to have global presence if they want to have joint ventures even with an overseas company, public or private. I know that several such proposals are there on the drawing board or even ready to get launched. But then, it is not clear how many of them are there in such areas who have the real potential to take the driving seat on the world scene. From whatever little I see, with the course correction in the management of the public sector, some progress has been made. In my other capacity, I was actually involved in that. Again, there is some evidence that the Bureau of Public Enterprises, the Department of Public Enterprises, is trying to push the Memorandum of Understanding as an instrument to support the efficient operation of the enterprises. But when it comes to the implementation stage, there is some hitch. I do not want to identify any individual. But it seems to me that what the bureaucracy or the management and the bureaucracy are doing jointly on the agenda within the framework of the Government policy is not fully shared with or brought within the knowledge of the executive heads. That cross signals are going. It is creating problems. (*Time bell rings*).

I will cooperate with you. I will try to live up to the promise I made.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) :
पांच मिनट आपके पूरे हो गये । अब आप कन्क्लूड कर लीजिये ।

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR : The main points I am trying to make are three. Number one, from the current stage

of state of operation of the industrial sector, if you want to move on to an efficient stage, there is a transition period and the real challenge is in managing the transition with least cost, both economic and social. In our anxiety to restructure and modernise, there is a risk that could be foreseen that the social costs on the vulnerable section are disproportionate and this is where we need the safety net.

Now, the point I am trying to make is that within the framework of the policy thinking, there is a National Renewal Fund as safety net. But the clarity or at least the communication with regard to whatever clarity the Government may have had is not fully appreciated down the line. I associate myself with the trade union movement also. The other day, I was there in the Working Committee of the Indian National T.N. Congress. There also, the primary question was, what is going to be there for us in terms of safety net? Are we going to be left high and dry? Will it be a re-training for everybody or will it be a voluntary retirement scheme? What will it be? Will it be a mutual fund in which you take up the units and you get a share of it? So there is a need for involvement of those people who are likely to be affected either directly or through their representatives in consensus agenda because in transition managing phase, cooperation of everybody is very critical. Otherwise, we may run into the difficulties which other countries have run into because of social consequences of fear of transition. In fact, in that context, I would submit to the Government that if the thinking is slow, it should be accelerated; if the thinking is blurred, it should be clarified and if there is already a clear thinking and an agenda, it should be communicated effectively and cooperation sought from all those who are likely to be affected.

The last point, Madam, is that we have a licence-free regime now. I belong to a State—Bihar—which produces resources but does not get the benefit. The new policy does not allow the benefit to come

to the resource-producing States. Now, in the absence of licensing, how are you going to ensure the regional balance? Is techno-economic feasibility the only criterion? Then what will happen if the quality of infrastructure and what kind of a financial support with what conditionalities for the financial support are going to be there to link it to the regional location as a consideration? Without this, there is every risk that the developed regions will become further developed and under-developed regions will be falling further behind, and that will create a breeding ground for such kind of regional imbalances which will be socially explosive. Now, we have a situation where we need self-reliance with efficiency. We also need a regional balance. At the same time, being a labour surplus economy, our agriculture capacity to absorb labour in farm sector is limited. Non-farm job opportunities are not going to be at par with it. So within that context, it is necessary that in the new industrial programme that is emerging, employment orientation cannot be ignored whether it is in the organised sector or in the informal sector or the small scale sector, that is a matter of detail. But employment orientation in the total package of industrial programmes will have to be given a priority. As I said, I represent the State of Bihar. I would like to submit that in the future investment decision, whether it is coming from the Central Government, the private investors, the joint sector or the foreign investors, the case of Bihar in national interest, not in the interest of Bihar, should be considered on a priority basis for target location of new industrial programmes outside the coal and steel sector. Whether it is down-stream coal-based industry or downstream metal based industry, the share, for Bihar in the investment, whether it is in the public sector or private sector, should be stepped up. Otherwise, you are going to face a nightmare, political, social as well as economic. An under-developed Bihar is not the tragedy of Bihar. It is a drag on the development of the whole country and I have made this point more than once. Several other Members have

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur] made this point. I only hope that the Government will listen carefully and not only listen to forget but take some action with a programme agenda, publicly known, where people of Bihar will be able to see that they not only lose to the rest of the country but they also get something in return. Thank you.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : श्री राम अवधेश सिंह। आप भी पांच मिनट में पूरा करें और नयी प्रथा डालिये तथा गागर में सागर भरिये। पांच मिनट में आप समाप्त करें।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत सरकार ने जो अभी अपनी औद्योगिक नीति में परिवर्तन किया है, उसका अंजाम क्या निकल रहा है, इसके बारे में हम लोगों को सोचना होगा। आज इसका अंजाम यह निकल रहा है कि अमरीका ने अपनी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दादागिरी हमारे ऊपर थोपना शुरू कर दी है। उसको इस बात का आभास हो गया है कि औद्योगिक विकास के लिए, भारत को आगे बढ़ने के लिए हमारी सहायता के बिना उस का काम नहीं चलेगा। इसलिए वह ऐसी-ऐसी शर्तें थोप रहा है, जिसका कोई हिसाब नहीं है। इसलिए हमारी जो मौजूदा औद्योगिक नीति है, उसका ऐसा अंजाम नहीं निकल रहा है कि देश के अन्दर उद्योगों का विकास सही दिशा में हो सके। अभी जो भारत की आर्थिक स्थिति है उसमें छोटी मशीनों की संस्कृति चलाए बिना पूरा विकास नहीं हो सकता है। डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने आज से करीब 30 वर्ष पहले न केवल भारत के विकास के लिए बल्कि पूरी दुनिया को भूख, युद्ध और गुलामी से छुटकारा दिलाने के लिए छोटी मशीनों की संस्कृति को विकसित करने के लिए कहा था क्योंकि हमारी समस्याएं भिन्न हैं। हमारी समस्याएं यूरोप की तरह नहीं हैं, अमरीका की तरह नहीं हैं। इसलिए हमको अपनी नीति उनसे भिन्न रखनी होगी। पुरानी इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी जो 1956 की थी उसमें कुछ-कुछ इसका सपना था क्योंकि बेसिक

हेवी और की इंडस्ट्रीज एक्सक्लूसिवली पब्लिक सेक्टर के अन्दर थी। उस पालिसी में यह बुनियादी बात थी। मीडियम साइज की जो इंडस्ट्री थी, उनको ज्वाइंट सेक्टर में रखने की व्यवस्था थी। स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज में कंज्यूमर गुड्स बनाने के लिए व्यवस्था थी। छोटे-छोटे गृह उद्योगों में स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज में माल तैयार करने की व्यवस्था की गई थी। लेकिन धीरे-धीरे कांग्रेसी सरकार ने बिगाड़ते बिगाड़ते इतना बिगाड़ दिया कि अब यह उसके कंट्रोल से बाहर हो गया है और सरकार बिल्कुल सरेंडर कर के उस व्यवस्था को खत्म कर के बिल्कुल प्राइवेटाइजेशन की तरफ निजी उद्योगपतियों की गोद में पूरी अर्थ व्यवस्था को धकेल रही है, न केवल देशी पूंजीपतियों की गोद में भारत की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को धकेल रही है बल्कि आर्थिक सोवरेनिटी, देश की आर्थिक सार्वभौमिकता को भी गिरवी रख रही है। मुझे याद है 1962 में जब अमरीका ने चीन के युद्ध के वक्त हमारी सहायता की थी तो उसका हर्जाना या लाभ तुरंत प्राप्त करने के लिए हम जो बोकारो में कारखाना बनाने वाले थे अमरीका ने यह कहा कि यह हमारी शर्तों पर बनेगा। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने कहा कि मैं तुम्हारी यह शर्त नहीं मान सकता। तुमने हमारी चाइनीज एग्जेशन में मदद की है, इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम तुम्हारी शर्तों पर बोकारो का कारखाना बनायेंगे। उसके बाद रूस की सहायता से सोवियत संघ की सहायता से बोकारो का कारखाना बना। आज क्या हो रहा है? आज वह कह रहा है कि रूस मिसाइल टेक्नोलॉजी देगा तो हम रूस और हिन्दुस्तान दोनों पर आर्थिक पाबन्दी लगायेंगे। इससे बढ़ कर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय गुंडागर्दी कुछ नहीं हो सकती है आज जो अमरीका कर रहा है, हमारी औद्योगिक नीति की विफलता है

(व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : गति बढ़ाइये और समाप्त कीजिये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मैं थोड़ा अपने देश के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। देश की औद्योगिक नीति फेल कर गई और जो पब्लिक सेक्टर फेल कर रहा है। उसके कारण हैं कि हम पब्लिक सेक्टर के कर्मचारियों पर खासकर अफसरों पर जो जवाबदेह है उन पर जिम्मेदारी फिक्स नहीं करते हैं। जब तक रिस्पांसिबिलिटी एक आदमी पर एक कारपोरेशन पर फिक्स नहीं करेंगे उसके घाटे और लाभ की जिम्मेदारी फिक्स नहीं करेंगे तब तक हमको कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है और न हमारा विकास होगा चाहे जितनी नीतियां बदल दें। आज जो नीति बदल रहे हैं उसका क्या लाभ होगा। मैं एक उदाहरण आपको देना चाहता हूँ। यह जो टाटा है वह सबसे ज्यादा स्टील के डीकंट्रोल के पक्ष में था। क्यों? क्योंकि अब उसको प्रोडक्शन दिखाना नहीं पड़ेगा कि कितना किया। अगर करेगा 3 मिलियन टन तो दिखा देगा। मिलियन टन और खुले बाजार में बेचेगा, इन्कम टैक्स चुराएगा, एक्साइज ड्यूटी चुराएगा, बिक्रीकर चुराएगा और हमारे खजाने पर हमला करेगा। इस नीति बदलने से क्या लाभ? पब्लिक सेक्टर में भी वही हाल है। पब्लिक सेक्टर में इम्प्लेन्टेड प्रोडक्शन दिखाते हैं, प्राइवेट सेक्टर में ग्रैंड रेटेड प्रोडक्शन दिखाते हैं। दोनों का उद्देश्य एक है। इन पर हमको रिस्पांसिबिलिटी फिक्स करनी पड़ेगी। महोदया, मैं एक उदाहरण कोट करना चाहता हूँ। पिछले दो-ढाई साल से मैं इस सदन में उस सवाल को उठाता रहा हूँ लेकिन अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि कांग्रेस की सरकार बुजदिल है और कांग्रेस की सरकार में हड्डी नहीं है, बिल्कुल बिना हड्डी की है, कोई कार्यवाही नहीं करती है। एक जमाना ऐसा था कि यहां संसद में किसी विभाग के बारे में दो शब्द दो अल्फाज भी उठाये जाते थे तो उस पर कार्यवाही शुरू हो जाती थी, कम से कम जांच तो जरूर शुरू हो जाती थी। महोदया, मैंने हिंदुस्तान फोटो फिल्मस के जो सी.एम. डी. हैं, चैयरमैन कम मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर उनके बारे

में दो बार यहां सवाल उठाया। उसने इस देश की सम्पति में कम से कम 200 करोड़ का घाटा लगाया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : अब तो आप उद्योग नीति पर बोल लीजिए। देखिए समय भी समाप्त है। इस तरह के उदाहरण देंगे तो समय बहुत लगेगा।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : महोदया, नीति है

उसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज)
पर समय नहीं है।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : ये नीतियां हैं — (व्यवधान) डा० लोहिया ने एक बार कहा था कि चाहे जितनी नीतियां बदल दो, कायदे बदल दो, रास्ते बदल दो लेकिन उनको कारगर करने वाले अगर वे ही पुराने लोग हैं तो सारी नीतियां बेकार हो ही जाएंगी। इसलिए रिस्पांसिबिलिटी फिक्स करने की नीति मैं कह रहा हूँ। आप चाहे जितनी नीतियां बदलो कायदे बदलो, कानून बदलो लेकिन रिस्पांसिबिलिटी फिक्स करो। जब तक रिस्पांसिबिलिटी फिक्स नहीं करोगे तब तक कोई रिजल्ट नहीं निकलेगा। वहीं मैं कहने वाला हूँ कि उसने क्या क्या घपला किया। मैं दो मिनट में आपको बताता हूँ। दो मिनट से तीन मिनट नहीं लूंगा। पोलिएस्टर की मेडिकल एक्सरे फिल्म, ग्राफिक्स आर्ट्स फिल्म इंडस्ट्रियल एक्सरे फिल्म बनाने के लिए अमेरिका की ड्यू पांट कम्पनी को एक प्रस्ताव भेजा कि 168 करोड़ की लागत से यहां बनाएंगे जिससे 12 मिलियन स्क्वायर मीटर फिल्म बनाई जाती। 168 करोड़ से फिर बढ़ाकर 264 करोड़ कर दिया। लेकिन ई.सी. बीच में एक प्राइवेट कम्पनी गरबारे कम्पनी को कहा गया तो 6 मिलियन—वहां 12 मिलियन था यहां 6 मिलियन—स्क्वायर मीटर तैयार करने के लिए इन्होंने 68 करोड़ का बनाया। इनका 68 करोड़ और उनका 264 करोड़ में 12

[राय अवधेश सिंह]

मिलियन। यह क्यों कर रहे हैं? क्योंकि इसके बीच में उनकी लूटने की योजना थी। 1977 में हिंदुस्तान फोटो फिल्मस ने खुद पोलिएस्टर मेडिकल एक्सरे फिल्मस का निर्माण किया और फिर उसी टेक्नालाजी को इम्पोर्ट करने के लिए ड्यू पॉट अमेरिकी कंपनी से 101 करोड़ ...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : डिटेल्स में जाकर क्यों आप सदन का समय ले रहे हैं।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : एक मिनट और। अभी दो मिनट कहा, एक मिनट लिया है, एक मिनट और।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : आपने कहा दो मिनट, मैंने तो जो समय दिया है वह कब का समाप्त हो चुका है। आप प्लीज कनक्लूड करिए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : प्वाइंट 2, कि 12.60 करोड़ प्रति वर्ष के हिसाब से 5 वर्षों के लिए पुनः अमेरिकी ड्यू पॉट कंपनी से एक्सरे ग्राफिक आर्ट, इंडस्ट्रियल एक्सरे, जम्बो फिल्मस खरीदने का निर्णय करके सी. एस. डी. ने कोई 62.50 करोड़ की योजना बनाई।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : समाप्त करिए राम अवधेश जी।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : जहां इंटरनेशनल बाजार में 3.25 डालर प्रति स्क्वअर मीटर पोलिएस्टर मेडिकल फिल्म का दाम था, वहीं 5.225 डालर प्रति स्क्वअर मीटर की दर से इसने खरीदा।

महोदया, इंदू फोटो फिल्मस मेकर उसके मशीन यू० के० से मंगवाई, दो सौ यूनिट्स मंगवाये और वह सारे बीस साल पुराने हैं। जिन-जिन लोगों को वह देचे गये, उन्होंने चिट्ठियां लिखी हैं। उस चिट्ठी की एक लाइन में पढ़कर आपको सुनाता हूँ यह अंता कापियर,

भिलाई का है। उसने हिंदुस्तान फोटो फिल्मस को लिखा है कि हमसे नई मशीन का पैसा लिया और आपने हमको पुरानी मशीन दे दी। तो उसने लिखा है --

The initial reading of the counting machine was more than 1700. So according to me the unit is an old one.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : अब मैं दूसरा स्पीकर बुला रही हूँ राम अवधेश सिंह जी, प्लीज बैठिये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : महोदया, मुझे एक मिनट और दीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : एक-एक मिनट कह करके आप कैसे सदन का समय लेंगे।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : अच्छा आधा मिनट और दे दीजिए, मैं कनक्लूड करता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज) : आप अपने कनक्लूडिंग रिमाक्स कहिए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक सेक्टर की सफलता के लिए सरकार को थोड़ा सजग होना पड़ेगा और अपनी शरीर में हड्डी मजबूत करनी पड़ेगी, क्योंकि इन के पास तो कोई हड्डी है नहीं, एक्शन यह लेते नहीं। अब ऐसा ग्लेयरिंग एक्जाम्पल है। इस पर जांच तो शुरू हो और इस पर अमानत में ख्यान्त का मुकदमा सरकार चला सकती है। एक अफसर पर, पब्लिक सेक्टर पर मुकदमा चला करके उसको सामने खड़ा कर दे, ती दूसरे पब्लिक सेक्टर के लोग भी डरेंगे और वह समझेंगे कि यह सरकार का पैसा है। यह पब्लिक सेक्टर का पैसा किसका है? टैक्स-पेयर्स मनी है। तो टैक्स-पेयर्स मनी का इस तरह से दुरुपयोग नहीं कर सकते हैं। एक तो कार्यवाही करनी चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुमता स्वराज) :
ठीक है, राम अवधेश सिंह जी, अब आप
बैठिये ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : तो, महोदया, मैं
चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक सेक्टर सफल हो, लेकिन
वह तब सफल होगा जब सरकार थोड़ी कड़ाई
और सख्ती से कार्यवाही करेगी । (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती सुमता स्वराज) :
ठीक है, राम अवधेश सिंह जी, अब मैंने दूसरे
स्पीकर को बुला लिया है ।

SHRI S- VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu) : Madam Vice-Chairman, thank you, for having given me this opportunity to speak on the Industrial Policy pursued by the Government. Actually the policies and working of the Industry in case we take from last July, it is very difficult to recollect what has happened since July 24 because so many changes have taken place. In the Industrial Policy after Independence from 1956 some concrete shape has taken place. Since 1956, the Government has decided to pursue a policy by which the rate of growth is accelerated periodically and economy is developed. From 1965 to 1972 the same policy was adopted. Then in 1973 there was a little, change in the policy. We had concentrated only, on accelerating the rate of growth. In 1973 they thought that large industries could also take their own share and foreign companies also could play a role. In 1973 the Government of India decided to help the large-scale industries so that industry developed in India. But subsequently what happened after 20 years? some six months back I raised a question in this House regarding the share of exports from the industries as well as the large-scale industries. Regarding the small-scale industries the Government was able to give me information. But regarding the largest industries the reply I was able to get from the Government side was that such information had not been collected so far. No data was available because the Govern-

ment did not have the information regarding the large scale industries. I was surprised to note the reply. But on that day I could not raise the issue because, to my memory, it was an Unstarred Question. In 1977, the Government of India started to think about the decentralisation of industries. They wanted to promote the role of the small scale industries. With the same capital, six times more of employment could be generated in a small scale industry compared to a large scale industry. But in 1980, the Government changed its policies. At that time, they said that to promote competition in the domestic market, technological upgradation and modernisation were required. After modernisation, they put another slogan, that is, rationalisation of industries. When they started using the word 'rationalisation', from that day onwards, the Government started walking on anti-labour policy. Licensing policy also changed from time to time. Now I do not want to go deep into it because the time at my disposal is not adequate for me to go into the details of that. In 1854-55, the textile industry was started. It was with the Indian Capital. In 1855, the jute industry was started in Calcutta with foreign capital. And slowly, they developed it. After the First World War, we were able to develop it only to some extent. Only after Independence, it took some concrete shape. In the Second Five Year Plan, we can say that the Government of India wanted 'to develop the industries. In the Fifth Five Year Plans, more than 50,000 crores of rupees were invested in the public sector while only 16,000 crores to 18,100 crores of rupees were invested in the private sector. Pandit Nehru believed in socialism, in the sense, real socialism. This socialism which he had envisaged at Avadi was very conveniently buried at Tirupathi. They selected the place, Tirupathi, so that they could do the last rites. Now in the Industrial Policy, they have invited the Indian capitalists and the multinationals. When we asked the reason, they said "There is no other alternative. We are in a fix. We have been cornered." If there is any other alternative, please show us." Who has actually

[Shri S. Viduthalai Virumbi]

led us to such a situation ? For instance, in 1980, interest to the tune of Rs. 7,400 crores was paid by the Government. In 1989-90, we had to pay Rs. 28,000 crores as interest. In 1980, how much was our domestic loan ? The Government had to pay Rs. 48,450 crores or round about Rs. 50,000 crores. In 1989, the Government had to repay debts to the tune of Rs. 2,00,000 crores. In 1985, our foreign debt amounted to about Rs. 45,000 crores. In 1989, in just five years, it increased to Rs. 1,55,000 crores. As a result, the successive Governments could not get loans unless they mortgaged gold with foreign banks. This means that there is no country in the world where we have not gone with a begging bowl. We were led into such a situation that the Government tried to put a curb on the subsidy. What is subsidy, after all ? It is nothing but the transfer of income from one section of the society to another. In spite of that, they wanted to put their hands on it. What did they say ? They said that there was no other way. When we asked why, in the name of liberalisation, they were acting against the interests of labour of this great country, their answer was that there was no alternative. So, they have led this country to this sort of a situation. I want to know one thing in this connection. The Government is so much particular about inviting foreign capitalists into this country. But the same Government is not at all shameful about the Super 301 and the pressures exerted by the United States. The Government is ready to invite the black money that has accumulated in foreign countries into India. What I want to know is why the Government is not so particular about tapping the black money available in India itself. Black money amounting to nearly two lakh crores is available in India itself and this black money is running a parallel government against the Government of India. So far, after the New Industrial Policy was announced and after the policy of liberalisation was announced, the Government has not at all tried to tap

this black money and utilize it for the welfare of the masses. What I feel is that this Government would not do it and the policy that they are pursuing now is nothing but a policy of burial of the welfare of the Indians.

With these words Madam, I conclude. Thank you, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ) : Now, the honourable Minister.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P.J. KURIEN) : Madam, first of all, I thank all the honourable Members who have taken part in this three-day-long discussion. I should say that the discussion was very useful. A number of good suggestions have been made. Of course, there were criticisms. But these criticisms are of a constructive nature and I have no hesitation in saying that those criticisms are welcome.

Now, a number of points have been made and they have been made quite often after the announcement of the New Industrial Policy itself. I do not know whether I should repeat all those things. However, some of the points which I find pertinent I will touch upon.

The main criticism levelled against us by quite a few Members is that we have given a total go-by to the Nehruvian policy. Well, there are differences of opinion. Both the versions are correct. I am not going to subscribe to either. But I would like to quote what our honourable Prime Minister has said. He has said : "This is change with continuity". It is for us to think over whether it is possible in this present-day world to stick to some philosophy or dogma forever, without adapting ourselves to the changing environment. Having said that, I would like to bring to the notice of the honourable Members what the essence of the Nehruvian policy is. As I understand it, it was certainly for rapid industrialisation of the country, it

was certainly for employment generation, it was certainly for self-reliance and it was certainly for special emphasis on the public sector in a mixed economy. All these aspects were there. I have no time to deal with every one of these things. One or two points I will touch upon which, I think, have some relevance to the public sector. Yes, at that point of time, when that policy was enunciated, Pandit Nehru, as just now referred to by the previous speaker, was a hardened socialist. Yes, he was a hardened socialist. But he found it necessary to say that the private sector had a vital role to play. At that point of time he adopted a mixed economy which was never, never a copy of anywhere else. It was what suited to India. It was not a copy anywhere. And, therefore, in that mixed economy the vital role of private sector was mentioned. An at what point of time ? When the private sector in this country could not produce substantially anything, when we had no private sector worth the name, its potential for investment, its capability; it had no ground and it was not much. At that point of time, the private sector, Panditji said, has vital role. Therefore, he said : mixed economy. And look at it today. Today, yes, we have mixed economy. What is it that we have done ? We have only reduced the reservation to the public sector from 17 to 8. We reduced it. But what is the position ? Today in contrast to that point of time, you have a well grown up private sector, a private sector which can generate resources, a private sector which has got management expertise, a private sector which has potential in every respect. And at the same time, we have a public sector which cannot generate resources. Some of them are sick. I am not going into why they are sick and all that. But I am only making a statement. Today the fact is that in the mixed economy scenario you have the private sector, well grown up potential, and a public sector which cannot generate adequately.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Kerala) :
Madam,

SHRI P.J. KURIEN : No, no. I won't yield. Sorry. After I sit, you can.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ): You continue.

SHRI P.J. KURIEN : That is the position. And, yes, we want to invest in the public sector. We want the public sector to have the dominant role again. But how could you do that ? You should have the resources. So either you tax the people more, have more inflation, take the money from there and put it in the public sector. Do you think that Panditji wanted a sick public sector always ? Do you think that Panditji wanted that public sector to be flush with the taxes of the common man or the poor man, and the public sector to eat away the common man's funds ? I don't think Panditji wanted that. Do you think that Panditji wanted no new investment in the name of a dogma that we will invest only in public sector ? I think that is what is called a dog in manager policy. I would like to reiterate that if we have funds, if the Government has surplus, if the public sector can generate surplus yes, we will invest. But the fact is that there is no surplus, and the fact is that we have a potential private sector. Should we not making use of the private sector ? If the essence of the industrial policy is industrialisation and employment generation, I have no doubt that we should make use of all avenues possible in this country for industrialisation. And, therefore, the public sector cannot generate funds. Yes, the private sector should be used. This is what we are doing. Still our foundation of mixed economy remains. Still we are keeping 8 important areas reserved for the public sector. That has been reiterated.

Madam, much has been said about self-reliance. It is said that we have given a go-bye to self-reliance. What is self-reliance ? Well, as I understand It, it is not that keep what I have, however incompetent it is. If the opponent is coming with a machine-gun, you are going with a revolver, saying, I have only this, and this

[Shri P. J. Kurien]

is self-reliance', you are finished. Self-reliance is for the best. If it as technology, you must have the best technology if you make it. If you cannot make it, acquire it; you have to acquire it, and make it yourself. That is the essence of self-reliance. Somehow or other, we began to think that only what we make—not like that. We should have the best.

Madam, what has Japan done ? Every Member is praising Japan for the industrial growth. Some Members mentioned also about Japan, what Japan has done. It is not that they invented the technology. They got the technology from wherever it was available. They worked upon it. They made it their own technology. And I don't think that simply because they have the best technology, they are the best country. I have read in a book that gun powder has changed the course of history. Gun powder has changed the course of history of the world. But who could do that ? Is it those people who invented the gun powder ? No. It is those who could acquire it and use it. This is the essence of self-reliance. I have no doubt, self-reliance is the very catch word for us. We should have the best technology. We should make it. If we cannot make it, we should acquire it. We should have the best technology. That is what the country needs today. And that is self-reliance. There is no going away from self-reliance.

Madam, then the question is asked, yesterday Prof. Menon asked and some others asked : Do you think that foreign investment will be followed by, accompanied by redundant technology ? But in this connection, I would like to ask : What will happen if they bring obsolete technology ? We have also the condition that dividend repatriation is to be balanced by exports.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): But the World Bank

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : No, no. Let me continue. I am not yielding.

So, that is the condition. And we are also saying competition. Market economy means competition. And in the market economy, there is free competition. If somebody is bringing obsolete technology, it is at their own risk; they cannot survive. So, necessarily, technology that is possibly the best technology should come. Then only that unit or that investment will become meaningful. Then only they can export. Nobody will invest in this country for 'moksha'. If they invest, they want to make profit. If they want to do it, they have to export. That is the policy. You please read the Policy. We have made it necessarily a condition that the dividend should be balanced by export. And then the question is : How is it in high priority areas ? Yes, 80 per cent of foreign investment has been in high priority areas. All automatic proposals are in high priority areas. That we have made in Annexure-3. So, there need not be any apprehension as to whether the technology coming to our country will be the latest or the State of the art or the obsolete technology. I have no doubt that we will have the best technology. I have already mentioned about .

SHRI ASHIS SEN (West Bengal) : I just want to put a question.

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : I am not yielding.

SHRI ASHIS SEN : I do not want to interrupt.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ) : He is not yielding. Let him complete the reply first.

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : I am not yielding because I have no time. That is the point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ) : You continue.

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : I have already mentioned about the public sector. And I said that we do not want to denigrate the public sector. But, what is the criticism today ? Many hon. Members mentioned about the BIFR. Why public sector is sent

to BIFR ? Yes, if a unit is sick, are we not to take cognizance of that ? Are we not to do something about it ? Who is to do that ? Is it only by transferring the Managing Director ? No. Somebody, some agency, someone who is knowing, who is an expert should make a thorough study as to what is to be done. And this is all what BIFR is doing. And somebody said that referring to BIFR is closure. No. In most of the cases referred to BIFR, they are studying. May be, they have recommended closure in a few cases. They are reviving most of them with the consent of the workers and the management. Kamal Morarkaji yesterday said that only the workers are being thrown out. No. In most of the cases where BIFR has taken a decision, managements have been displaced, not the workers. So, this is a misconception that referring to BIFR amounts to closure or we are going to close the public sector. No. We want the public sector to be revived and revitalised. And, therefore, a proper agency should study that and come out with proposals. But let me ask one question. Does anybody think that any unit in the world can survive by taking money from outside always ? No. It is not possible. Somehow the sick unit has to turn around. Otherwise, the sick unit cannot exist. That is the hard reality. That is what we are trying to do. And at the same time, in the event—and that is the last resort—an industry cannot further survive and remain alive, it has to be closed. The most important thing is that the interest of the work force and the labour should be protected. I can assure that. The Prime Minister has amply made it clear in the other House that there will be no human distress and workers' interest will be protected properly. Not only there will be an adequate compensation but there will be a mutual arrangement whereby the workers will be retrained and re-deployed. For that, we have constituted a National Renewal Fund, and that will be used for re-training and re-deploying the workers. If a worker willingly wants voluntary retirement or a golden handshake as somebody put it, yes, adequate compensation will be given to such workers. That I can assure. Madam, you

may be aware that there are sick units in the country. I know textile units are sick and closed. I know how workers are thrown on the street. I have been told by persons who directly know it. In some parts of the country, textile units have been closed for a long time and the workers are getting nothing. Workers are on the streets, and there is no consideration for those workers. But what we are saying is that such a situation will not arise when our policy is implemented. No worker will be thrown out on the road. Their interest will be taken care of. In the State of Gujarat where textile mills are closed for years, the workers are on the streets. You consider what has happened to them. Therefore, we do not want any worker to be thrown out even if the industry is chronically sick. If the industry is chronically sick, we will ensure that the workers are protected, and that is why, National Renewal Fund is constituted. This was made amply clear by the Prime Minister.

A mention was made about the industrial production index and that it has become negative or is more or less stagnant. I do not want to say anything against anybody. But we should also think as to when this situation had started and at what point of time the industrial production was the lowest. Let us think about that. In 1989 and 1990, the infrastructure performed in a most miserable way. Industrial production has a direct relation with the infrastructure. If infrastructure performance is poor this year, next year the industrial production will be less. There is a one to one relationship. During 1988, 1989, 1990 and 1991, the infrastructure performed very badly, and further when this Government took over, everybody knows what our financial position was. Balance of payments position was the worst. Naturally, not because we wanted it, but we were forced to impose certain import restrictions, and my colleague, Chidambaramji is here; he had to put import restrictions. That was to save our country. Import restrictions naturally adversely affected the industry.

[Shri P. J. Kurien]

and again the Finance Minister had to apply a credit squeeze. What was the impact of all this ? The industrial production became stagnant. In spite of this adverse or negative scenario in which we are, the industrial production has remained stagnant. It is more or less stagnant. Earlier it was negative; it has picked up and has remained more or less stagnant. But I do not want to draw a gloomy picture. I can assure you that after the measures we have taken, after the announcement that the Finance Minister made in the Budget speech after we have reduced the import duties, and also given some concessions in the financial sphere, with all these measures, I am confident that industrial production would pick up from this position, stagnant position, and, in 1992-93, we will, certainly, have a positive industrial production in all spheres.

Prof. Menon asked a very important question. He wanted to know whether we were doing anything for employment generation. He said that the policy was encouraging capital-intensive industries and that nothing was being done for employment generation. For the information of the House, I would like to mention the impact of the policy. From the time of the announcement of this policy, the industrial policy, i.e. 24th July, 1991, up to 31st March, 1992, a total of 4,926 industrial proposals have come through. When compared with the corresponding previous year, it is double. These proposals are from within the country. Therefore, this new policy has created an atmosphere which is very conducive to more investment in the country. As I said, the number of proposals has doubled, nearly doubled. Even if investment is in capital-intensive industries, employment generation has to be proportionate to investment proposals, to investments. But, for the information of the hon. Members, I would like to point out, that most of these proposals are not capital-intensive. These proposals are from within the country. They are medium and small. Therefore, there is no question of encouraging capital-intensive industries.

Another point is, after the announcement of this policy, 1,062 foreign collaboration proposals and 364 foreign investment proposals, up to March, 1992, amounting to more than Rs. 1,257 crores have been cleared. When compared with the corresponding previous year, when it was Rs. 94 crores, it is more than 12 times. Again, there is more investment, foreign investment. They are in the high priority area. Capital-intensive industries are also there. But most of them come under Annexure III. Eighty per cent of them are in Annexure III, where food processing is there, and a number of other industries are there, which are employment-generating.

Combining these two, internal investment proposals and foreign investment proposals, you can see that the number of investment proposals is going to be much more than the corresponding previous period. There is no need for any apprehension that there will not be any employment generation. In fact, there will be much more employment generation.

[The Vice-Chairman (Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur) in the Chair]

There will be much more employment generation because of the atmosphere that has been created. Madam,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Madam has been replaced. (*Interruptions*) He was looking at Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM) : You can declare 'madam' as a unisex term.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Good idea.

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : A point was made about the encouragement to be given to small-scale industries. Employment generation will be mostly from the small-scale sector. For unit investment in the small-

scale sector, employment generation is six times, more than six times, when compared with the medium sector. Therefore, we are doing everything possible to encourage the small-scale sector. There has been some complaint that the small-scale sector is neglected and that we are not doing anything. I would like to point out that, for the first time, Government had announced a special, separate, policy for the small-scale sector. The reservation policy, where 836 items have been exclusively reserved for production in the small-scale sector, has been reiterated. They will be in tact, we are not changing them. Violations, if any, in this will be strictly dealt with.

Technological support is being provided to the small-scale sector by a chain of technology-oriented institutions and services, including 27 small industries service institutes, 10 tool rooms, process-cum-product development centres. Further, I would like to announce that 5 new tool rooms costing Rs. 150 crores have been programmed for the Eighth Five Year Plan only for technology assistance and upgradation of small scale sector.

Then, the Government is continuing the policy to make preferential purchase from the small scale sector. Government has also permitted excise relief to Government Corporations, both in the Centre as well as in the States which will market products from the SSI.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I think you will keep it up.

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : Yes, we will keep it up. Government is committed to provide adequate credit according to the normative basis for this sector. Further, I would also inform the House that the Government is considering raising the limit for concessional credit from Rs. 2 lakhs to Rs. 5 lakhs. The Finance Minister has already agreed for this and I hope the announcement will come soon.

The Reserve Bank of India has set up a Committee for working out the modalities

for providing adequate credit to small * scale sector. Madam, further

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar): Again he is addressing the Chair as 'Madam'.

The problem is, he is looking at Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh) : I hope nobody is complaining on that side.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : The only person who can complain is the Chair. *{Interruptions}*.

AN HON. MEMBER : I think he is feeling jealous.

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : Sir, in spite of the pressures on the Central budget, Government have continued the policy to provide excise benefits and reliefs to small scale industries. Besides, the benefits arising out of the operation of the MODWAT scheme have also been continued.

Further, the new import policy has taken care not to permit items reserved in the small scale sector. All this show *{Interruptions}*. I am not yielding. Sir, as per our figure, a total of 19.38 lakh units were registered under this sector and the estimated production in the year ending 31st March, 1992, was of the order of Rs. 1,60,000 crores. This sector contributes about 35 per cent of the total production of manufacturing sector and provides employment to 12.6 million people. Its share in the direct and indirect export of the country is estimated at 42 per cent and the total bank advances are Rs. 17,151 crores. (March 1991—Village and Small Industries).

All these details I gave to inform the hon. Members that this sector will continue to get the importance that it was already having. We are not in any way going to downgrade the importance of this

[Shri P. J. Kurien]

sector. It will continue to get all the concessions which were hitherto available to it.

Then, something was mentioned about agricultural-based products. We have already got Food Processing Ministry. Food processing has been included in Annexure III of priority investment. From foreign investment 51 per cent automatic permission is also given. Mr. Ramdas 5.00 P.M. Agarwal said that the policy so far followed was a failure, that the 1956 Nehruvian policy was a failure. Since I see a number of new supporters to the Nehruvian policy on that side, I hope I need not answer that question.

Mr. Sukomal Sen criticized that the number reserved for the public sector has been reduced. I have already answered that point and so I do not want to take more time on that. Further Mr. Sen wanted to know why Coca Cola was granted a licence here. For the information of Mr. Sen and hon. Members, I would like to say that the project sanctions will ensure an inflow of foreign exchange to the extent of 60 million US dollars in five years and 190 million US dollars in 10 years. So, that project is in the best national interest.

Prof. Menon was doubtful about attendant technology, which I have already explained. So I do not want to repeat it again.

Mr. Jagesh Desai wanted to know whether we allow foreign collaboration even though we have the domestic production capacity. Well, one point has to be noted. It is not enough today that we have the production capacity alone. It is equally important to see how competitive your product is. That is the problem we are facing today.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : Last year you had rejected a proposal.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : He is not yielding.

SHRI P.J. KURIEN : I am not yielding. So, it is not enough. Today everyone will accept that it is not enough that you only produce but it is more important that you have to produce something which is quality-based and competitive in the international market. Even in the Indian market, if the quality is poor and the cost of production is very high, the industry will suffer. Therefore, we need competition.

Mr. Jagesh Desai was again mentioning about the inadequacy of allocations for infrastructure for power generation. Yes that is why in the power generation sector we are allowing private investment and also foreign investment. For the information of hon. Members I would like to say that 16 proposals have been received for setting up an additional generation capacity of 8,500 megawatts involving an investment of Rs. 20,000 crores. This is in addition to the Plan allocation.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : I am happy.

SHRI P.J. KURIEN : That is the impact of the policy. Therefore, the allegation that investment has not come for the infrastructure is not correct.

Sir, there are some other hon. Members also who have mentioned some important points. I know I have the constraint of time. Dr. N. Thulasi Reddy mentioned about Growth Centre funds and said that, that is the litmus test and, to know whether the entire rice is cooked or not, it is enough just to test one grain of rice. Therefore, for the information of the hon. Member I would like to say what has happened to the Growth Centre funds. For 1990-91—please remember the period—the allocation was Rs. 30 crores, and only Rs. 15 crores were spent. For 1991-92 the allocation was Rs. 40 crores, and Rs. 36.5 crores were spent. It is not that we could not spend the remaining Rs. 3.5 crores. We wanted more money but there was, equally and more importantly, the transport subsidy which we had to give. Due to the financial crisis we had no funds. Transport subsidy

was to be given in the north-eastern States and also in the hilly areas of Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, including Darjeeling, and for that we had a shortage of funds. Therefore, in order to take care of those most backward areas, Rs. 3.5 crores has been diverted from this and given for the transport subsidy. No that we could not spend it. Now I hope the answer is very clear.

Then, Sir, again, Dr. Reddy mentioned about decline in the industrial production. I have already replied to that point.

Another point he mentioned was that foreign investment meant foreign debt. Well, by no logic can I understand how foreign investment is foreign debt. I am not an economist, but to my understanding, in a debt if you borrow from abroad and invest in any project, you will have to return the capital, also with interest, even if in the investment you have a loss, whereas in foreign equity they invest, and they benefit only if there is profit. Very simple. Therefore, foreign investment . . . *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) :: No interruptions, please. He is concluding.

SHRI P.J. KURIEN : Foreign investment cannot be equated with foreign debt. Foreign investment should be understood with a different angle. That is a decision we have taken deliberately to receive foreign investment, and that is in the best interests of the country.

Mr. S.K.T. Ramachandran wanted that the excess staff in the Industry Ministry should be used for collection and dissemination of information. I would like to inform the hon. Member that we have already restructured the DGTd, and 174 excess posts have been abolished. DGTd today is restructured to do promotion work for collecting information. They have also a data bank of technological information. That work they are doing. I hope in the days to come they will do it better.

Mr. Kamal Morarka again wanted the same thing, that the DGTD excess staff should be reoriented. I have already mentioned about that.

He said that the exit policy should be for management also. In many cases, how is management to be changed ? That is restructuring by the BIFR. So, not that we are considering only about workers.

Hon. Member Mr. Dayanand Sahay wanted that labour-intensive projects should be supported. I have already mentioned that we are giving adequate support to the small-scale sector.

Again an hon. Member mentioned about the offloading of the shares. He wanted 20 per cent of the shares to be offloaded in the market. I would like to inform the Member that by offloading just 8 per cent of the identified public sector units, we could mop up more than Rs. 3,000 crores, whereas our target for last year was only Rs. 2,500 crores.

Yesterday many Members suggested that this offloading should have been done directly in the capital market. Hon. Mr. Morarka also mentioned that. Well, Sir, I would like to submit that it is a very dangerous proposition. If we had done that, if we had offloaded the entire shares in the capital market in order to mop up these Rs. 2,500 crores, the capital market would have crashed, and the prices would have fallen. So, it should never be done. That is why, we thought that we would first offload it to the mutual trusts and financial institutions. They will gradually offload it to in the market so that the impact is not felt in the market.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : Please tell us, of the face value of the shares, whether you got 100 per cent, 200 per cent or 300 per cent. What did you get ? This is very important because there is public sector loss.

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : That is what I am saying. Had I off-loaded it into the

[Shri P. J. Kurien]

market, the realisation would have been still less. Do you want me to do that ? With 8 per cent we mopped up, we could get Rs. 3,000 crores more. If we had offloaded that into the market directly, we would have got still less. So, we have taken the correct decision, I would inform the House that we have appointed a Committee to examine all possibilities so that offloading in 1992-93 can be done in the best possible way. Dr. S Madhavan wanted that finance should be made available to licensed factories. Financial assistance is given by the financial institutions subject to viability.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Mr. Minister, may I ask you something ?

SHRI P.J. KURIEN : No. I don't yield.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : He is not yielding to women also. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : Because there is paucity of time, I cannot touch all the points. So, whatever points I have not been able to touch, I am ready to write to the hon. Members concerned. I would use this opportunity to thank all the Members who have taken part in the discussion. All their suggestions will be taken note of. I will try to accommodate them to the maximum extent possible, but differences are always there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Including mine.

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : Yes Sir. I would like to say one thing that the hon. Members whether on this side or that side, all wanted a vibrant economy for our country. They all wanted our industry to prosper, more employment generation and self-reliance. On all these points we are all agreed, but on the implementation side we have a slight difference.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : And the Minister is looking happy.

SHRI P. J. KURIEN : I request the cooperation of all the hon. Members on the positive steps taken by the Government. Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Now, we take up the Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1992.

SHRI ASHIS SEN : Will you please allow me just one sentence to be recorded before the Minister goes ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR) : Discussion on that has concluded. That is over. The Minister has gone. (*Interruptions*)

THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 2) BILL, 1992

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI SHANTAR AM POTDUKHE) : Sir, I beg to move—

"that the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1992-93, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration".

The Bill provides for withdrawal out of the Consolidated Fund of India of the amounts required to meet the expenditure for the year 1992-93 charged on the Fund as well as the Grants voted by the Lok Sabha.

Gross disbursement of Rs. 233,398.91 crores are provided in the Bill. After setting of recoveries, receipts taken in reduction of expenditure and transactions in the nature of accounting adjustments, the net provisions aggregate Rs. 1,19,087 crores. Of this, an amount of Rs. 34,612 crores is for Central, State and U.T. Plan. The provision for Defence expenditure is Rs. 17,500 crores, for interest payment