

SHRI BUTA SINGH: If they are so disappointed by the things happening there, they have every right, why not? They can represent to Mr. Barnala.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Both the Congress (I) and Badal boycotted the meeting.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Well, Vajpayee Ji don't really press me to say who is near Badal—whether the Congress (I) or the BJP. He was your champion here and he was your champion in Punjab twice, but I am not quarrelling simply because you are trying... I say your party also in Punjab along with other parties is joining. We are fighting a national menace. It should be fought in the same spirit and we should not try to see any political gain out of it. There is no political gain which we can achieve if we are able to really save the life and property of the people in Punjab, bring out the communal harmony among the people in Punjab and also rejuvenate the same sense of patriotism, dedication and love for the rest of the country. in the Punjab. If that is done, I think we have done the job. I am sure my colleagues here in this House will be one with me when I request them to condemn terrorism unequivocally and also stand up as a national force to fight the anti-national tendencies.

Terrorism has to be eradicated. It has to be eliminated. We will not shirk our responsibility in doing that. No cost is higher than eliminating the terrorism from the soil of Punjab.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Since he mentioned the flanking movement of the terrorist, would he like to comment on a news item which has just now been published in the Daily Telegraph that the Dal Khalsa has extended its total support to Subhash Geishing for Gorkhaland. Would you like to make a comment on that?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): Please sit down.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: What about Pakistan's involvement? Are you prepared to issue a White Paper?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): Sardar Jagjit Singh Aurora's remark that "it is a total nonsense" may be deleted from the debate.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Why?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): This is an unparliamentary sentence.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: No, Sir. Nonsense is permitted. Nonsense is not unparliamentary. I am in Parliament for the last 28 years. 'Utter nonsense', total nonsense, 'fantastic nonsense', Pandit Nehru used to say. It is not unparliamentary.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): If it is unparliamentary, then it will be deleted.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Pandit Nehru has said 'fantastic nonsense' many times.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): We will look into the records. If it is unparliamentary, then we will delete it, otherwise not.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We hear so much of it from that side. How can you ban it?

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Most of us talk nonsense most of the time. If you take objection to it, it is all right.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): Please don't repeat the word so many times. This is yet to be decided whether it is Parliamentary or not.

THE INDUSTRIAL FINANCE CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1986.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): I was trying to find out to what extent I may extend my support to this Bill. I must confess, Sir, that I have failed and then I decided to leave it to Mr. Jha.

[Shri Nirmal Chatterjee]

for extending full support to the Bill. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): No interruptions please.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: No, Interruptions are very welcome.

I will like to begin from the end, before I come to other things. At the end of this proposed Bill, they have provided a Schedule for secrecy. Now, the schedule, this is a declaration on fidelity and secrecy which has to be signed by the employee. It says that I further declare that I will not communicate or allow to be communicated to any person not legally entitled thereto any information relating to the affairs of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India or to the affairs of any person having any dealing with the said Corporation. Any affair of any person who are dealing with the Industrial Finance Corporation of India is thus completely protected—whether he takes loan from another bank or enters into fraudulent relationship with any Council of Ministers, one cannot mention that. Now, this is one of the amendments that is sought to be introduced. Frankly, Sir, I am not opposed to secrecy as such. Everybody knows that even Jesus Christ had to lead an underground existence in order to lead the slaves. But, Sir, in this particular case the people who were dealt with, I am sure Mr. Poojari will agree with me, are not representatives of Jesus Christ. We all know that because of these secrecy clauses which are increasingly being inducted into our financial transactions something is happening in Swiss Bank and equally glorious things in our banks also.

Periodically the Finance Minister, not Mr. Poojari, assures us that he believes in workers management even at the top level of at least public sector institutions. This certainly implies that to the employees the secrecy of accounts would be opened up. Let us remind this august House that after the Revolution of October, 1917, before nationalising industries the thing that was done to control industries in the Soviet Union was to open the accounts to the

workers and the people. These industries were not taken over in order to control them and in order to prevent them from their waywardness. But the step that was postulated was to control over accounts, abolition of secrecy and control over management.

Now, Sir, in the name of socialism—in the course of the last few years—I say increasingly the Government is trying to impose secrecy whether with commissions or with financial accounts. So, this is one thing which I have failed to support and, therefore, I could not lend my support.

Sir, then what else is there is the Bill. I will just sum it up in this manner. The first one is it extends to have larger finances as share capital, permission for borrowing and underwriting certain other institutions. Very interestingly it empowers the Managing Director apart from the Chairman to take decisions with these enlarged funds. Why cannot I support this Bill is for a very simple reason. Sir, let us go into the record of the functioning of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India. Before I talk about the record, perhaps, I should say another thing, when we talk about industries, Mr. Poojari is particularly in the habit of saying: Are not our industries growing? Sir, there is no doubt about it. There is no quarrel on that issue. Certainly it is a positive rate of growth. What we are interested in and what from Visveswarayya onwards, all the people of the country are, when they fought for independence. The reason was not the growth in industry. What was desired was industrialisation of the country. This industrialisation is neither explained in terms of a positive growth nor in terms of simple diversification at a low growth rate. I will give just one figure. Industrialisation, if anything, of a country is indicated by two indicators; one is that the percentage of income, the contributions to true national income from the agricultural sector would be reduced very much and the proportion of Contribution from industry would rise very much. Now, what has happened in the course of all these 40 years of post independence development? What has happened is this criterion has been fulfilled. The contribution from the agricultural sec-

tor is coming down and Sir, there is another criterion which is that the population dependent on agriculture, working force dependent on agriculture will also simultaneously come down and the population engaged in industry will go up. Has that happened? If that has not happened, if only the share of the income has come down in agriculture and the working force in agriculture remain at the level, what does it mean? It means very plainly that poverty has shifted on to the rural countryside. Previously, 75 per cent of the agricultural population was contributing 50 per cent or more of national income. Today, it is the same fraction of the working force and population are dependant on 40 per cent or below of national income. Basically when we say a country is getting industrialised, it is by these two indicators that we try to judge and not in terms of whether there is a positive growth rate or not. Everybody knows that our industries, after the first year of the Sixth Five Year Plan started... (*Time bell rings*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): You are supporting the Bill.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Sir, may I just make a request to you. We have contributed one Vice-Chairman from our side. Had you been present, you would have seen that she was liberal to the ruling party. Kindly provide as much indulgence to me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): I am just reminding you.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Thank you, Sir. So, since Sixties, the situation is the industrial growth, everywhere, this is not developing. I want to remind, in order to achieve industrialisation in the true sense of the term, the rates of growth should have been much higher than even what were posulated in the planning report. Unfortunately, even the plan targets are never fulfilled in the course of all these Five Year Plans including the glorious one that is the Sixth Five Year Plan about which frequent references are made to. Even today, after all these concessions, after all these efforts to garner black in-

come whether generated abroad or deposited abroad or deposited inside the country, the rate of industrial growth is far short of the projected Planning Commission's rate of growth which itself is very much lower thing than called for to industrialise the country and not merely having a diversified structure and have a positive growth rate.

Sir, it was pointed out to me when I spoke on the IDBI and I mentioned the 'sixties—I do not see my friend here today; he pointed it out—that I mentioned all the negative things but did not mention that banks were nationalised. Had he been present, I would have thanked him. At least let me go on record because that is an argument in my favour. I precisely want to say that even after nationalisation of banks nothing has happened of which we can be proud. Taking credit is very easy. Can you be proud of our industrial growth rate even after bank nationalisation? And how does it go in my favour? I was just making an argument that when the Industrial Finance Corporation of India was established, it was long before nationalisation. Why proliferation to day? Why can't you merge all these institutions into one? As there is a tax cell for cinema artistes, have a centralised sector for MRTP companies so that you can correlate, you can discover who is rying to corrupt whom and at what price. Now, why am I worried, why am I objecting to further growth of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India? It is because of its record. I have got the figures as available in the report. For a very much larger number of people, the Rural Development Ministry is able to have concurrent evaluation, but unfortunately for the Finance Ministry, for a smaller number of people being aided by these institutions, we do not have concurrent evaluation so that we are always backdated. I invite the Finance Ministry to take up the challenge and introduce concurrent evaluation as in the Rural Development Ministry, for these areas also. Now, why does the record worry me and make me not extend my support? The Industrial Finance Corporation of India takes credit for functioning as a wonderful catalytic agent. While it has actually disbursed Rs.

[Shri Nirmal Chatterjee]

1,098 crores, or nearly Rs. 1,100 crores, the catalytic effect is to the extent of Rs. 14,600 crores. That adds to my worry. If we give them more, its catalytic effect will be more. Why should I not be glad about it, if this much of amount from the 14 banks is visible? The simple reason is its lending pattern. What is the lending pattern of the IFCI? The pattern is this: private sector—63.4 per cent joint sector—13.4 per cent; public sector 11.9 per cent; and co-operative sector—11.3 per cent. Even this would not have sent tremors through my heart. The picture in 1984-85 is still more telling. In 1984-85, the pattern is slightly changed. The private sector gets 73.5 per cent, instead of 63.4 per cent. The entire bias, to the satisfaction of the Finance Ministry as well as Mr. Jha, is towards enriching the private sector. One believes that by enriching them, the country is enriched, exactly the opposite of what I believe. Even within this private sector—may I draw attention to this other splendid fact—the MRTP and FERA companies have been particularly fortunate. In the course of one year it rose from Rs. 22 crores to Rs. 87.77 crores. That is, the percentage rose from 6.2 to 19.3. Honestly do you want a Communist to support? Do you want anybody interested in, anybody in tune with, the Constitution of India to extend funds to an organisation which goes against the Directive Principles which state that the State should strive for reduction in inequalities of income and wealth? The additional amount that would be given would be utilised more for these MRTP companies, these large houses, despite restrictions in the definition. Just imagine, it is in this context that it is said that the Managing Director would be allowed to take decisions independent of the Board between two Board meetings without any proviso that if he takes a decision, he has to come back to the Board and he has to take the decision in writing explaining why he has extended a particular loan to a particular person. It is for this reason that I am unable to support even this provision that is made here.

Then there are certain other things about technology and managerial development. The less said the better about them in view of what we have learnt about Mr. Pathak. They are trying to develop management

consultancy here. Would anybody believe it after what we have gathered in terms of the Pathak Consultancy firm? Now they say they give funds for modernisation. Very recently we learnt that for jute industry in West Bengal only last month the Prime Minister had to give funds to the tune of some Rs. 250 crores to West Bengal which would be available for the development of jute industry. It would be perhaps operated through, if I am not incorrect, the IDBI, a part of it, and not IFCI. This is IFCI's record in terms of jute industry managed by MRTP companies. The misfortune is it is placed in West Bengal. (Interruptions) I do not want these organisations to finance or extent these loans in this manner. Even then, I want to mention just a few other facts. It has a great deal of catalytic effect. Now, you would be surprised that the funds from IFCI also flow to units in particular industries wherein the utilisation of capacity is less than the average that the industry has, and there are certain units where the utilisation of capacity, it is shameful, not only less than 50 per cent, is less than even 20 per cent. I can read out, Mr. Desai can also read out, from page 144-145-146 of the Official Report, a back-dated one. The present figures, I think, would be gloomier. That is why the concurrent evaluation is not there. There are a whole series of units where IFCI, under the indulgent leadership of the Ministry, offered funds. And I can mention one such unit. Look at the responsibility that they show. We know that there is an eruption and volcanic wind of production of mopeds in the country. Very recently we have seen reports that the Government is now caught in the contradiction of efficiency of scale and establishment of a multiplicity of units in the name of competition. Therefore, it is unable to decide which way to go in the motor vehicles sector and the IFCI has loaned to a moped unit and this moped unit is utilising its capacity to the extent of 20 per cent. Now, tell me, if this is the background of this organisation, if this is the result which it is generated in the economy and that too in the background of the need for industrialisation of the country, whether I should support it. Do you want me to support it? I am sorry, I am unable to support it. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): Now, Mr. L. K. Jha.

SHRI LAKSHMI KANT JHA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I happened to have the good fortunate or bad to follow Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Bad!

SHRI LASHMI KANT JHA: I did not want to say so; but you have said it. I say this, Sir, because in reality I am following him in point of time, but I was unable to follow his logic. In one breath, Sir, the shed tears over the fact that industry is contributing more to the national income, a higher percentage to the national income of the country, than it did in the past and that the agricultural share has gone down.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: True. I made a mistake by not mentioning that the major contribution has come from the public sector. I have those data also.

SHRI LAKSHMI KANT JHA: And, Sir, in the same breath, he went on to complain that the industrial growth rate has not been good enough. Now, Sir, the conclusion that he drew that because the share of industry in the national income has grown relative to agriculture, the agricultural people have been impoverished is, to my mind, not tenable at all because the whole national income has gone up so much that it is conceivable that the share of one sector may go up while the income of the other sectors also has gone up substantially. Now it is a fact that the proportion of the people living on agriculture has not gone down as much as it should and, therefore, we have to accelerate industrialisation which I hope, is the common ground between us.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: That is right.

SHRI LAKSHMI KANT JHA: And, if that is so, then we have to look upon this Bill to amend the Act and to enlarge its role as something worthy of our support. What are the features of this enlargement? It widens the range of activities which it covers through its assistance including such things as power generation which is a major bottleneck. Maybe that

the State Electricity Boards may take advantage of it and others too side by side. But I think that there is a point again with Mr. Chatterjee was objecting to. There is power given to the Managing Director to take decisions. Now, Sir, the whole object of it is to speed up the disposal of cases and it is on this point that I must say that I am not happy with the performance of the financial institutions as a class and I do not want to pick on the IFCI as being particularly bad. But let me here make a point. The Prime Minister has announced, very rightly, in my opinion, that sick industries should not be taken over by the State as there is no case for the State having to nurture them when they are sick as a result of the mistakes of the previous Managers. Equally important is the fact that units in the country are facing increased competition. Now, it is as a necessary counterpart of these policies that modernisation and rehabilitation of the older units should be done with greater speed. I emphasise speed here because any time taken usually means that in that interval, while the case is under consideration, the company is losing money and the amount of money which it eventually needs to stand on its own becomes greater. Therefore, that which speeds up the process of decision-making is, to my mind, a very very important factor. Now, look at the record, not of the IFCI, but in general. It is disappointing to find that the class of cases, where less than five crores of rupees of borrowing is involved, which means cases of rehabilitation, are so often delayed. In fact, the Industrial Reconstruction Bank of India has the largest pendency of cases over one year old. Now, here is a category of reconstruction in which less than five crores is the amount involved and the pendency is over one year. I think it is very, very important that you impart speed to the working of these financial institutions. But one of the factors which impedes this effort is that most of such industries apart from the fund they get from the IRBI or IDBI or anybody else of a long term nature, need working capital for which they have to go to their normal banks. And time and again cases have been brought to our notice where the bank with whom they have been doing normal

[Shri Lakshmi Kant Jha]

business is so anxious to recover the money it has loaned earlier that it does not care about the rehabilitation, it is trying somehow to get its money back, even stopping the sale of goods which have been produced. Even if the long-term institutions have cleared the loans, the bank can still holdup their utilization.

Now, the question is, how do we ensure that such cases are corrected, looked into? The Finance Ministry and the Finance Minister have very rightly taken the attitude of encouraging these institutions to function autonomously. Now, autonomy must go with accountability. And, therefore, I would urge that some steps should be taken in order to keep the actual performance of the institutions in terms of time taken in disposal and in terms of the situations where an institution frustrates the working of another, under some kind of watch, so that there is an opportunity to apply corrective, not on the recommendation or the representation of anybody but on the basis of some objective data.

In this context, I also must say that I do not feel happy with a situation in which anyone is at the mercy of someone else, some single entity. Now, in the matter of commercial banks, even State-owned banks, public sector banks, those who have an account with them do not have the freedom to move from one bank to another. While we talk of competition in general, competition between public sector banks also is not allowed full play, so that if the unfortunate party has, for some reason or the other, even offended the top management of the bank, he is dealing with, well he has had it! Now, we must not allow the concept of autonomy which I fully subscribe to, to take a shape, in which there is no redress, no way of getting something, looked into. Where, of course, there is a separate Managing-Director and separate Chairman, the Managing-Director can be operative, while the Chairman can be supervisory, looking at it from a little distance, yet knowing the whole working. Then there are Government Directors. They are in a minority. But they can make their voice heard; yes,

the minority can make its voice heard. In this my friends in the Opposition can give them a very good lesson, because they have developed it into a fine art. But my point is that we must get a certain sense of dynamism and urgency into the financial institutions and make them realise that the employment of workers, revenue to the State - direct and indirect - and the output which the community needs are at stake and whatever time they take in decision-making is at the cost of all these. Therefore, Sir, since this Bill is taking steps in the right direction, I give it my full support and I ask the House to give it its full support. At the same time, I would urge upon the Minister to follow up these powers with other measures, which are not a part of the law but a part of the administration, to improve the efficiency and helpfulness of the system so that the objective of speedy industrialisation, which I and my friend, Shri Nirmal Chatterjee, hold in common esteem, is fulfilled within the plan time frame.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): Prof. Lakshmananna.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): I have given my name in the morning itself.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Audhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, normally speaking, an amendment of this nature should have been supported by all sections of the House. But if there are reservations on the part of some Members representing some sections of the society, the Minister for Finance should try to look at it in the spirit in which it should be seen.

Sir, one of the amendments proposed by the Bill, as stated by the Minister of State for Finance yesterday, was to confer power on the Central Government to direct the I.F.C.I. to take up any activity which the Central Government might approve from time to time. I would like to ask the Minister as to what those omnibus powers are which they would like to take. If this power, by amendment, is given to the Central Government, it is in a way side-stepping the powers of the Parliament

by a single amendment of this nature. The Union Government would like to take away the entire powers of directing this particular bank to take up any activity which it deems fit administratively. Therefore, this is a sort of amendment which seeks to give enormous powers not to the bank but to the Government. To give such powers either to the bank or to the Government itself is not perhaps a very desirable thing. So, from that point of view, it cannot perhaps be accepted.

Secondly, another objective of the amendment was to augment its resources for future expansion of its finances. Sir, I do not know how the Minister is supposed to augment the resources when the resource gap to finance or to implement the schemes in the Seventh Five Year Plan amounts to 3435 crores taking IDBI, ICICI and IFCI together. For the current financial year, the gap is 430 crores which will go up to 740 crores in 1987-88. It will go up to 949 crores in 1988-89. Finally, it will go up to Rs. 1310 crores in 1989-90. If this is the resource gap as on today, I do not know what the Minister is meaning by increasing to augment the resources for future expansion of its business. I would like to seek a clarification on this which I am not able to understand.

Sir, another thing which makes a little sceptical is about the differential stands taken by the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Industry. The Industrial Finance Corporation of India is supposed to be working within the precincts of the Department of Industry because its main aim is to promote industrialisation of the country. If that is the case, Sir, the Ministry of Industry has come out with a programme of liberalisation. Sir, the Department of Industrial Development of Ministry of Industry, in order to promote textile industry engaged or proposed to be engaged in the spinning of yarn, namely worsted or non-worsted, wholly or partly from wool, having a total capacity up to 5,600 worsted spindles in backward areas, 4,800 worsted spindles in other areas and 3,200 non-worsted spindles for backward areas has given exemption from the operation of some Sections. On the other hand,

the Ministry of Finance has taken a decision to curb this. There has been an inherent contradiction between the stand taken by the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Industry. Therefore, I would like to ask as to what is the working together of the Ministries under the Union Government. And this becomes pertinent when the Ministry of Finance on the one hand puts curbs if it is a real curb and if it is desirable, that is a different matter and it is for the Minister to discuss with his counterpart and come to a decision and at the same time they want to augment the industrial growth of India. The stand taken by the Minister of Finance is that there is a saturation point reached as far as items which are mentioned earlier are concerned. If there is a saturation point already reached, how is it that another Ministry of the same Government works at cross purposes? Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister that they should look into this problem.

Sir, the hon. Member, Shri Nirmal Chatterjee, has referred to the break-up of the assistance given by the IFCI to different sectors—private sector, joint sector, co-operative sector, public sector and so on and so forth. I have an apprehension and I rightly share that with my friend, Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee, that by increasing the scope, by amending the existing clauses of the act, the entire intention is to strengthen the hands of the private industry at the cost of the public sector. I would have been happier if the Government had come forward to strengthen in terms of finances those agencies which are primarily committed to strengthening the public sector. But, unfortunately, as we have been observing, the trend of the present Government during the last two years has been to increasingly privatise even those public sector areas which have been exclusively kept for the public sector. Therefore, I doubt the intention, and I have got my own suspicion about the intention of the present amendment in enlarging the scope of investment. Now, I would not have minded it even if the private sector had been helped. But unfortunately the amount that has been put into the private sector and the results have been

[Prof C. Lakshmanna]

at variance. The number of sick industries has been going up. There are as many as, the Minister himself corrected the figure of an hon. Member in the other House who mentioned a slightly smaller figure, and the Minister has stated that there are as many as 1,01,063 sick units, which amount to an investment of Rs. 4,699.20 crores. Therefore, Sir, I would like to ask the Minister what corrective steps have been taken before enlarging the scope of pumping in more money into the private sector, whose share had gone up as per the figures given by Prof. Nirmal Chatterjee, as evident from the Annual Report of 1984-85? (*Interruptions*) He has also stated about 1985-86. The percentage has gone up as per the figures that are given in 1984-85 from 64 per cent to, what is given in the 1985-86 report, according to Prof. Nirmal Chatterjee, 71 per cent, which means the share of the private industries in the capital investment of IFCI has gone up and with the present augmentation of finances it is bound to go further in favour of private industries and private industries in this country have been playing a dubious game, they have been duping the country. They will take the money, take back their share afterwards make the industry sick, add to the number of sick industries and throw them at the Government, at the people. I think the Government will not be able to take over the sick industries because their number is increasing and investment becomes much more, and at the same time it cannot do anything. Therefore, it is only creating a problem of industrial stagnation instead of increasing the industrialisation. Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister to kindly look into it (*Time bell rings*)

Sir, there are just one or two more points. Regarding the setting up of a board for industrial and financial reconstruction the hon. Minister in the other House stated, although by that time the Board had already been set up but the Minister stated that this Board will be set up soon, but by the time the Minister made the Statement, the board had already been set up, that those people who are mismanaging the industries and are performing duties highly detrimental to the interests of

the country and diverting funds for other purposes will be identified. I would like to ask what efforts have been really made to identify them. Have they been able to put their finger on them and have they been able to find out who these people are who are taking help from the financial institutions like this and then diverting them for other purposes creating the type of problem which the country is facing. (*Time bell rings*)

Therefore, I would like to ask finally has there been really technology financing in this country? What is the percentage of financing which has gone to improve those small entrepreneurs who have got the necessary technical expertise to put their knowledge and technical expertise into the industry, to what extent has the IFCI been able to do it? (*Interruptions*). (*Time bell rings*). I know they will not be covered because the entire gamut of operation is only for the medium and large scale industries. I know, I realise. But if you are making amendments, if you are bringing in amendments, my question is why cannot you think in terms of helping those entrepreneurs who are small, who are imaginative, who are innovative, who are largely available in this country, so that they could really become the captains of the industry? You will not think in terms of those amendments because you will think that conveniently somebody else will do it or some other financial institution will do it, and ultimately nothing happens. Therefore, instead of increasing the share of those who have been responsible for the type of industry's health in this country, why don't you think in terms of those amendments? I think it will not be done because it will not suit the philosophy for which the present Government has been standing for the last two years. That is the least I can say. I cannot use stronger words than this. Therefore, in view of some of the points which I have mentioned there could be any number of them it becomes difficult for us to fully support the amendments that are proposed in this Bill. Not that we do not want industrialisation; not that we do not want industrial growth. Industrial growth has to be strengthened it has to be augmented. As far as that part is concerned, we are in

full agreement but the way in which the present Government would like to do it, we have a difference of opinion. Therefore, I cannot support the present Bill proposing amendments.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BAGODIA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, this institution, the IFCI, was established due to farsightedness of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru immediately after Independence in 1948. In 38 years, they have given loans for long term and medium term to private industries to the extent of Rs. 3200 crores, to about 2200 units. Recently, they have also started a National Institute for Entrepreneurs and also 17 technical consulting institutes. But unfortunately, they do not have proper coordination. They are only financing these units. The Seventh Plan has given so much stress on technical upgradation and cost reduction techniques. About Rs. 56,000 crores have been allocated for private sector based on 8 per cent per annum growth. With all this money, IFCI has to add more to its activities as the present amendment requires that some promotional work has to be done by IFCI also. I can understand that IFCI has certain limitations of staff, resources, etc. and I will be happy if they can be courageous enough and come to the Ministry and say that they want more resources, more staff, or they cannot handle this kind of promotional work, and stick to the banking work of giving loans. Our dynamic Prime Minister has put so much importance on productivity and, therefore, the industrial policy and the economic policy of our country has been greatly liberalised. But this liberalisation, unfortunately, has not percolated to junior levels or at the administrative levels. On this point, if we try to compare what is happening in developed countries and our country, we will find that in developed countries, the workers are getting wages about 20 times more than our workers their managers get ten times more in salary than what they get in our country. And still their industries can produce goods with much lower cost. Here you compare one of the most important industries, which is textiles, our oldest and supposedly very advanced industry in our country at the moment. We have the maximum acreage under cotton.

We have the maximum number of workers engaged in textiles, in the world. We have the maximum number of textile engineers and maximum number of managers. Still, we are not able to produce goods with proper costing, at lower cost, and as a result, we are not able to fulfil our commitment even for exports to the EEC countries. As individuals, we Indians are no less than anybody else in the world. But what we lack is the team spirit. Till the 14th century, India was at the helm of economic affairs in the world. But during the last 500 years, the situation has deteriorated. I do not dispute that we need to import technology, the latest technology in the world. But we should not import their ethos. We have very unique social values of our own. If the imported technology can be combined with our own ethos, with our own culture, I am sure, the productivity of our industries can improve immensely.

What I fail to understand is, what has the IFCI really done during all these 38 years except lending money to large and established industrial houses? How many new entrepreneurs they have been able to help? How many sinking industries they have been able to save? With all the existing powers and with all the new powers, they have full control over the units which they are financing. The Managing Director is appointed with their permission. The Directors are appointed with their permission. They have a number of Directors of their own. In fact, *de facto*, they have 66 per cent control on the boards of most of the companies. When the industries started getting sick, instead of helping them, they started trying to find faults. I have known cases where they have taken five to ten years even to think of what to do about the sinking or the sick industries. In the process, the sick industries were dead. What is the IFCI doing about it? This is an important question. They have a lot of powers already and they are going to get new powers. I agree. I support the Bill. But I would request the hon. Finance Minister to look at this from this angle also. Mr. Finance Minister, you will be surprised to know that in your own department, we have seen a number of times that IFCI

[Shri Santosh Kumar Bagodia]

will not send the files to you even for two, three or four months because they are not comfortable. In the present extremely clean image of the Finance Ministry, this kind of situation is really worrying.

Now, there are a number of complaints being sent to you. But if these complaints are to be sent to the same officers for reply, the very purpose of sending these complaints is defeated. I would request the Hon. Finance Minister to deal with these complaints in some other suitable manner which will help the industries and which will help the country, specially the Ministry. You will be surprised to know that the IFCI management is not granting interviews even for two or three months. Then, even after the loans are sanctioned, the disbursements are delayed on flimsy grounds. There have been cases where units had to withdrawn from exports due to reasons, valid or invalid, given by some individual government agency or department. The IFCI has a strong hold on the country's finance. They should come forward to help them to approach the department because their finance is also involved in the whole set-up.

I can understand the motivation with the IFCI is limited. With the low salaries, they may not be able to get the best talent available in the country. Of course, I must admit, at the moment, we have one of the most honest management in the IFCI. There is no doubt about it. But they also have to increase productivity. Can they shirk their responsibility merely because the work is too much? Mr. Jha has mentioned about bankers. If one bank is not happy with one particular individual, the party cannot approach any other bank because all the other banks are nationalised and they have to get NOC which is as good as impossible. Therefore, they are at the mercy of one individual.

Here, I would like to make a few suggestions. Only today, it has been reported that our worthy Chairman has signed an agreement for foreign exchange loan on very very good terms. Will these good terms, these favourable terms, percolate to

the consumers, namely, the industrialists? Will this advantage go to the industrialists also, or, will this extra profit go into the pocket of the IFCI? Of course, interest on foreign exchange loans may be charged at the international rate, but they should not be allowed to make a large margin of profit. When we come to modernisation, there should be no limit for concessional finance for modernisation as Shri Jha Saheb has just now mentioned about modernisation. If you put a limitation, if the industry needs Rs. 10 crores and you sanction Rs. 5 crores because of the limit... (Time bell rings). I know Mr. Vice-Chairman, you are in a hurry. You have given a lot of time to the opposition Members.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): I have already given you nine minutes.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BAGODIA: Mr. Jha has taken a very short time. Give me some extra time, I will not take more.

Then, Sir, debt-equity ratio should be maintained at 2:1 ratio. The next point is, Promoters contribution should not be increased. If you want that the large houses should promote the industry, you can pursue the same policies which are being pursued but if you want the new boys to come up, if you want the new industrialists and new entrepreneurs should develop, you have to reduce the promoters contribution. Even the promoters share was as high as 34.796 per cent in 1985-86. Then, there should be no commitment charge. As Jha Saheb has said, on a number of occasions long-term commitments have been made but the actual working capital or the sanction for the same has not been received from other department. So, he has to wait and in the meantime the cost increases because of the commitment charge. The next point is, the criteria for use of convertibility clause should be clearly established. The next point is, common loan agreements should include LIC, GIC and UFI. The next point is, there is a great anomaly in loan assistance for units which came into production between 2nd March, 1981 and 1st April, 1983 in back-

ward areas. These units are paying higher interest rates against units which came into production before or after this period. The interest rates are increased but are not reduced when there is general reduction.

Next, benefit of increased incentives must be effective at least from 3 years retrospectively.

Next, there should be complete coordination with banks for working capital. Many times the unit gets ready for production but cannot really go into production because banks are not willing to advance loans for working capital. This is, in fact, a repetition of this point that many times the production has not come up because the working capital is not available. For that the IFCI has to come forward and help the new entrepreneurs.

Next, personal guarantees should be completely removed. Our late Prime Minister Madam Indira Gandhi had mentioned that personal guarantees are superfluous. In fact, no director can ever meet the commitment of his personal guarantees in case the industry goes sick. Since this fact is well known to him also, he does not get scared either.

A very important point, which again was repeated by Mr. Jha, was that the IFCI has reached a saturation point. All the money for industrial commitment is concentrated in one part. For some reason if any officer does not like an individual's face, that individual can never put up an industry in this country because without their finance no industry can be put up and they will not give the finance. So, we must have one or two more similar institutes in the country which can compete between themselves for providing better services. Here there are instances when some officers have actually threatened the new entrepreneurs, that is they tried to pursue their case, for lifelong they will not be able to put up an industry in this country. This situation can change only if there is another institute where this kind of finance can be available.

Then, there should be constant dialogue with the industry and with a clear mind.

I would rather say that these institutes should reserve 30 per cent capital to be loaned only to the new entrepreneurs. This capital is one of the items which is very important with the IFCI. There are instances when this capital has been given to non-graduates who have not gone to any college, whereas there have been instances when foreign returned technical engineers and technocrats have been denied this kind of capital on the whims of individual officers. Further, Sir, the present amendments desired by the hon. Finance Minister are of a general nature, giving more powers, covering more areas which I fully support but if he can look into all other points, I will appreciate it as this will help the industrialists of the country better. Thank you very much.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM: Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, I extend our support to this Bill moved by our Finance Minister. In order to meet the growing needs of the industries and to introduce new features in operational matters of the Finance Corporation, this Bill has been brought for the consideration of this august House. We are aware of the fact that IFCI set up in 1948 is one of the most important financial institutions. It has been an acknowledged purveyor of finance to all projects, big and small, at national level as well as State level.

The functions of IFCI are mostly promotional and developmental. We are pleased to know that so far it has given financial assistance to 2262 projects which involve the aggregate financing of Rs. 3153.75 crores. The promotional activities of IFCI are no doubt fruitful to the development of industries.

By sponsoring the scheme of Risk Capital Foundation, the IFCI has served the technologists and professionals to a large extent and helped them to start new industries with the help of free interest loans and other facilities.

The formation of Technical Consultancy Organisations—TCOs—has been helpful in providing low-cost consultancy services to the entrepreneurs. Similarly the establishment of EDPI—Entrepreneurship Develop-

[Shri Aladi Aruna *alias* V. Arunachalam] ment Institute of India—is much helpful in accelerating entrepreneurship training and other research efforts required for the improvement of managerial capacity. The promotional subsidy scheme extended to six avenues since 1977, though covering large areas, must be extended to other areas too. The scheme of one-time subsidy subject to certain limits and introduction of subsidy for interest to the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes with a ceiling limit, though steps in the right direction, have not given the expected results.

The hon. Minister has duly proposed many amendments to the parent Act of 1948 so as to cover all needs and contingencies. The definition of “industrial concern” in the parent Act fails to cover areas such as setting up of hospitals, medical services, electronic service, leasing, sub-leasing and hire-purchase of industrial plots etc. But the present Bill covers vast areas so as to help all sections of the people.

On the administrative side, the introduction of the office of Managing Director in addition to the office of Chairman is no doubt a good move. The proposal to open deposit accounts with other banks outside India and to invest in the shares of any financial institution and to borrow loans from LIC, Unit Trust of India etc. are all much helpful to mobilise the resources of IFCI so that it could extend the area of financial assistance.

The proposal to enhance the authorised capital from Rs. 100 crore to Rs. 250 crore no doubt will increase the business of the Corporation.

There will be no difference of opinion among the Members about the importance of the amendments, but the difference arises only on implementation of the Act. We have to examine, number one, whether our schemes have yielded the expected results and number two whether we are giving financial assistance by adhering to the policy statement of the Seventh Five Year Plan. Mr. D. B. Dawar, the Chairman of IFCI, very often used to praise the performance of the Corporation. He claims credit for the ratio of sanction of advances

and disbursement of loans. But the figure is in very sorrowful condition. The sanction of loans stood at Rs. 579.40 crores for the year 1985-86. The disbursement for the same year is Rs. 413.92 crores.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Throughout it is like this.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Yes, yes. What the claims in the 38th Annual General Meeting is that it has performed excellently, that so far they had not witnessed this type of disbursement. But he has totally forgotten to mention that despite sanctions, the undisbursed amount is Rs. 165.53 crores. In the past the percentage of the undisbursed amount was very heavy. For example, in the year 1982-83, the sanctioned amount was Rs. 105.48 crores but the disbursed amount was only 54.33 crores. It is only 51.5 per cent. In other words, the undisbursed amount, despite sanctions, is 48.5 per cent.

Now the definition of “industrial concern” has been changed to cover larger areas. We are happy with this amendment. But, contrary to the objects of the Bill and to defeat the very purpose of the Bill, the IFCI has taken a decision to stop financial assistance to four sectors, namely, (1) gelatine capsules, (2) spinning units, (3) paper manufacturing units, and (4) cement factories. Mr. Davar, the Chairman of IFCI, has disclosed this decision recently in a press conference. He has stated that these sectors have reached the point of saturation. This decision of the IFCI is detrimental to the development of these industries. The reason put forth by the Chairman is quite obnoxious and it is a retrograde measure. No industry in India, I think, has reached the point of saturation as claimed by Mr. Davar. If you go through the document of the 7th Five-Year Plan, you can see that financial assistance to these sectors is quite essential. Even though we are facing a crisis in the textile industry, it is not because of reaching the saturation point but because of other factors. At present the per capita consumption of cloth is 13.7 metres. In the 7th Five-Year Plan we have fixed the target of 15.14 metres. To achieve this objective, financial

assistance is necessary to the textile industry.

The demand for paper and paper board is also increasing. The demand will be 18 lakh tonnes in 1989-90 but the installed capacity is only 15 lakh tonnes. So, in the paper industry also financial assistance is necessary.

So, the point of saturation having been reached, as claimed by the Chairman of the IFCI, is not based on any facts. It is quite against the interests of the development of the industries. Therefore, I appeal to the honourable Minister to withdraw the decision of the IFCI and come forward to give financial assistance to all the industries without any restrictions.

With these words, Sir, I conclude my speech.

श्री मीर्जा इशार्दबेग (गुजरात) :
मान्यवर, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय

श्री अश्विनी कुमार (बिहार) : श्रीमान
अब तो 6 बजने वाले हैं। यहीं पर
खतम कीजिये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री एम० पी० कौशिक) :
अभी इनको बोलने दीजिये।

श्री मीर्जा इशार्दबेग : मान्यवर,
देश के समूचे विकास के लिए देश में
सक्षम आर्थिक अस्तित्व आवश्यक है तथा
सातवीं योजना के लक्ष्यों की पूर्ति की
दिशा में भी अभिनव अभिगम आवश्यक
हैं। इसी संदर्भ में औद्योगिक गणना
दूर करने एवं आर्थिक व्यवस्था में सुधार
लाने के लिए यह औद्योगिक वित्त निगम
(संशोधन) विधेयक, 1986 लाया गया
है। इसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ।

मान्यवर, पिछले चार दशक से आई०
एफ० आई० देश की आर्थिक प्रगति में
निरंतर योगदान दे रही है और इसमें
3230 करोड़ रुपये से 2272 प्रोजेक्ट्स
लागाये गये हैं। मान्यवर, इसका मैं उल्लेख
जरूर करूंगा कि उसके 53 प्रतिशत उद्योग
जो हैं वे पिछड़े इलाकों में लगे हैं और
उन्होंने पिछड़े इलाकों में उद्योग
लागकर कांग्रेस सरकार की पिछड़ापन
निर्मूलन नीति की सुसंमतता को साबित

किया है। आई० एफ० सी० आई० की
सुविधाओं का लाभ उठाकर बहुत से
मोनोपलीज सेक्टर ने उत्पादन के क्षेत्र
में तथा वित्तीय संस्थाओं के साथ धोखा-
धड़ी करके औद्योगिक अक्षमता तथा
औद्योगिक गणना का निर्माण किया है
और इससे उन्होंने अधिक लाभ उठाया है
और सरकार तथा मजदूरों को उन्होंने
नुकसान पहुंचाने की कोशिश की है। मान्य-
वर, मैं कुछ आंकड़े देकर यह बताना
चाहूंगा कि देश की जो आर्थिक प्रगति
है उसमें यहां से उन्होंने सहायता लेकर
जितने भी हमारे औद्योगिक एकम थे,
उनको रुग्ण बनाकर जो हमारी आर्थिक
क्षमता का ढांचा था उस पर उन्होंने
दाग लगाने की कोशिश की है। मान्यवर,
आई० एफ० सी० आई० द्वारा जो
फिक्स् दी गई है उसके अनुसार सिक
यूनिट्स देश में 1 लाख एक हजार
तैसठ हैं जिनमें 4699.20 करोड़ रुपये
फंसा हुआ है। करीब सड़के चार सौ
यूनिट्स में एक करोड़ रुपया लगा हुआ है और
66 हजार यूनिट्स एकानामिकिली वाइवल
नहीं हैं। मान्यवर, 90 यूनिट्स हजार स्माल
स्केल में हैं और 1285 यूनिट्स मीडियम
तथा अन्य 545 यूनिट्स हैं। मान्यवर,
श्री निर्मल चटर्जी यहां पर मौजूद हैं।
उनको ज्ञान के लिये मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा
और यह उल्लेखनीय भी है कि ये जो
सिक यूनिट्स हैं इनमें से 29 हजार
स्माल स्केल की यूनिट्स सिर्फ पश्चिम
बंगाल में हैं। मान्यवर, जो अन्य यूनिटों
की बात आई थी जिनकी संख्या 545 है,
इनमें से भी 105 यूनिट पश्चिम बंगाल
में स्थित हैं। अब देख लीजिये, कौन लोग
आर्थिक नीति के आधार पर देश
को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं और कौन लोग
देश को पीछे ले जाना चाहते हैं। मान्यवर
एक संवर्धन के अनुसार औद्योगिक सिक-
नेस जो है वह 51 प्रतिशत मैनजमेंट के
कारण है और दूसरे 15 प्रतिशत प्लानिंग
के कारण है और मैं सदन में कहना चाहूंगा कि
सिर्फ 2 प्रतिशत सिकनेस ऐसी है जो
मजदूरों की वजह से हुई है। मान्यवर,
इसका पूरा इल्जाम अगर दिया जाना
चाहिए तो यह किस लोगों को
को दिया जाना चाहिए और अगर इसमें
कुछ सुधार की आवश्यकता है तो किस

[श्री मंजी इशादिबेग]

क्षेत्र में उसकी आवश्यकता है जो लोग सबसे ज्यादा इसके कारण सफर कर रहे हैं वे हमारे मजदूर हैं। उनके खाने पीने की समस्या है। मिस मैनेजमेंट के कारण यह सब हो रहा है। मान्यवर, देश के 184 एरूम में 50 करोड़ रुपये से अधिक वसूली अभी बकाया है और यह भी उल्लेखनीय है कि जो टैक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री है, मैं गुजरात राज्य से आता हूँ, गुजरात में टैक्सटाइल की बहुत सी मिलें हैं, वहाँ मैनेजमेंट के घपलेबाजों के कारण लाखों लाख मजदूर बेकार पड़े हैं। मान्यवर, मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस और आकषित कराना चाहूंगा कि वे इन मुद्दों पर खास ध्यान दें। अभी जैसा कि शा साहब कह रहे थे कि एक बोर्ड का गठन हो और उनको बलैक लिस्ट करना चाहिए। मैं भी इस सदन में मांग करता हूँ कि ऐसे लोगों को किसी भी चीज के लिये किसी भी प्रकार की सहायता नहीं दी जानी चाहिए। उनके कारण आज लाखों करोड़ों मजदूर भूखों मर रहे हैं। मान्यवर, एक तरफा प्राइवेट सैक्टर ने 65 प्रतिशत की पूँजी का लाभ लिया हुआ है और दूसरा चित्र यह है कि 80 प्रतिशत जनसंख्या वाज़ा किसान अपनी सूमची मेहनत के बंधवजूद जो उस पर 177 करोड़ रूपया बकाया है उसको नहीं दे पा रहा है। मान्यवर, गवर्नमेंट उनके खेतों को हराज करके, उनके बैलों और बर्तनों को हराज करके और उनके मकान को नीलाम करके उनसे वसूली करती है लेकिन ये जो सफेदपोश लोग हैं और जो कार में घूम रहे हैं, बड़े बड़े बंगलों में रहते हैं उनकी पूछने वाला कोई नहीं है। वह अभिगम का सवाल है।

(Interruptions) No, no, our Minister is doing well in this respect.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: That is not in West Bengal, you agree. All this is happening outside West Bengal.

SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG: No, no.

मान्यवर, इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि जो सही मोनेटोरिंग होनी चाहिए उसका अभाव है।

मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि हमारा जो इंडस्ट्रियल फाइनेंशियल रिकंस्ट्रक्शन बोर्ड है उसके जितने प्रावधान हैं जितनी जल्दी हो सके उनका अमल करण किया जाना चाहिए। मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ हालांकि वह इस बिल से संघे संबंधित नहीं है लेकिन इस ब्यूरोक्रेसी का एक चित्र मैं आपको दिखाना चाहता हूँ। जो सरकार को न त्ति है जिसको जनता के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं, उसकी यह किस प्रकार से धुतकारते हैं, यह मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्व-रोजगार कार्यक्रम की घोषणा की और उसके अनुसार देश के अन्दर प्रोग्राम चलाए गए। इस संबंध में आपके सामने 1985-86 के आंकड़े पेश करना चाहता हूँ। इसमें कुछ राज्यों का विवरण मैं बताना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि मेरे पास समय कम है। मैं आपके सामने गुजरात, बिहार, महाराष्ट्र तथा उत्तर प्रदेश के आंकड़े रखना चाहता हूँ। मान्यवर, गुजरात में जो हमारे औद्योगिक केन्द्र हैं उनमें जितने आवेदन आये उन आवेदनों में से उन्होंने 16088 का चयन कर के बैंकों को दिया लेकिन बैंकों ने उसमें से 6522 का चयन किया यानि इतने ही लोगों को उन्होंने इस योजना का लाभ दिया जबकि लक्ष्य 10,700 लोगों को लाभ पहुंचाने का रखा गया था। बिहार की बात मैं कर रहा हूँ। जिला औद्योगिक केन्द्रों ने 40591 उर्मद्वारों का आवेदन-पत्र स्वकार किया लेकिन बैंकों ने सिर्फ 26376 को मंजूर किया जबकि 29600 का लक्ष्य रखा गया था। महाराष्ट्र में जिला औद्योगिक केन्द्र ने 29229 आवेदकों का चयन करके भेजा लेकिन उसमें से सिर्फ 13848 को स्विकृत किया गया जबकि लक्ष्य रखा गया था 15,500 का। उत्तर प्रदेश का यह हाल रहा कि जिला औद्योगिक केन्द्र ने 38734 आवेदन-पत्र स्विकृत किये और बैंकों ने सिर्फ 25,210 को लाभ दिया जबकि लक्ष्य 31,300 का रखा गया था। यह भावना है आज हमारे कुछ लोगों की देश में काम करते की। सरकार जो न त्ति बनाती है कि इतने लाख नवयुवकों को रोजगार दिलायेंगे और इसके लिए सरकार ने एक

कमिटमेंट किया था और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक स्पेशल प्रोग्राम दिया तो ब्यूरो-क्रेसी ने यह काम किया है। आज जो लोग करप्शन करते हैं, ब्लैक मार्कीटियर्स हैं, बैंकों का करोड़ों रूपया जो लोग दबाए हुए बैठे हैं उनके घर आ कर बैंक के अफसर पैसा मंजूर कर देते हैं। आज अफसर रिश्वतखोर बन गया है। मान्यवर, इस संबंध में मैं आपके समाने अकबर इलाहाबादी का एक शर सुनाना चाहता हूँ जो मुझे अब याद आ रहा है -

“हाकिमे एंटी करप्शन, फिक्के गिरफ्तारी न कर छूटने की कोई तरकीब सोच ले के रिश्वत फंस गया है दे के रिश्वत छूट जा।”

अब अगर यह बात माइंड में चलती रहे तो मैं समझता हूँ यह कार्यक्रम को अच्छे ढंग से कार्यान्वित नहीं कर सकेंगे। मैं मंत्री जी को अभिनन्दन देना चाहता हूँ कि बैंक के इस मिस मैनेजमेन्ट के कारण बैंकों की मैनेजमेन्ट को सुधारने के लिए ताकि उनका अभिगम प्रजा की तरफ बने इसके लिए पुजारी जी ने व्यक्तिगत तौर पर बातें की हैं और बैंकों में जा कर के खुफिया तौर पर अधिकारियों के रुझान को भी देता है उन्होंने अच्छे कदम लिये हैं इसलिए मैं उनको अभिनन्दन देना चाहता हूँ। इस विधेयक के संबंध में दो तीन प्वाइंट रखना चाहता मान्यवर जैसे कि श्री साहब ने कहा टर्म लेंडिंग इंस्टीट्यूशन तथा आई0एम0सी0 आई0 के बीच में जो एक लिंक होना चाहिये उसमें जो कमजोरी पाई जा रही है वह लिंक जरूर उसके बीच में होना चाहिए इससे बिलम्ब का निवारण हो सकता है। मैं यह आग्रह करूंगा कि तीन महीने की अवधि में जो प्रोसेस होना चाहिए उसको सम्पूर्ण करना चाहिये ताकि जिन लोगों को उससे लाभ मिलना है

उनको जल्दी से जल्दी लाभ मिल सके इस विधेयक से लीजिंग को अपने हाथ में आप लेना चाहते हैं इसकी मैं सराहना करता हूँ। इससे और ज्यादा सुधार ला सकेंगे तथा कार्यक्रम को गतिशील बना सकेंगे। जहां तक इंडस्ट्रीज को मार्डन बनाने का सवाल है उसके लिए जो चार करोड़ की सीमा रखी गई है मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि इसको और आगे बढ़ाया जाना चाहिए क्योंकि और कई इंडस्ट्रीज ऐसी हैं जिनको थोड़ा पुश देने से हम उत्पादन बढ़ा सकते हैं।

मान्यवर, स्वास्थ्य और चिकित्सा सेवाओं की सहायता की जो बात कही गई है उसके बारे में जो इन्होंने निवेदन किया है मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ लेकिन मैं यह आग्रह करना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे डाक्टरों को व्यक्तिगत और पर न दिया जाये, किसी व्यक्ति को न दिया जाए किसी एसोसिएशन को, या कारपोरेशन के आधार पर जो इंस्टीट्यूशन बने हुये हैं उनको लाभान्वित करना चाहिए।

मुझे खेद है कि जब और सब बातें इस विधेयक में बताई गई है लेकिन एग्री इंडस्ट्री के बारे में कोई बयान नहीं आया है। मैं मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि यदि हो सके तो एग्री इंड्ट्री में शामिल कर लिया जाए। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ आपने जो मुझे बोलने का समय दिया इसके लिए मैं आप का आभारी हूँ। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. KAUSHIK): The House stands adjourned till 1.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at six minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 12th November, 1986